

ABSTRACT OF THESIS

Name of Candidate James Byron Spencer

Address _____

Degree Ph.D. Date November 1, 1965

Title of Thesis "Self-denial and self-sacrifice in the life and teaching of Jesus".

The sacrificial principle forms the background for the concepts of self-denial and self-sacrifice in the life and teaching of Jesus. The underlying purpose of sacrifice in the Old Testament was the offering of life to God. In accomplishing this purpose, sacrifice came to have three general aspects: gift, communion and expiation. The various forms of sacrifice were expressions of certain principles of substitution, representation, commutation of sacrifice, human sacrifice, and the practice of vowing persons to Yahweh.

Expressions of self-denial and self-sacrifice appear in the lives of early patriarchs, but with the prophetic denunciation of improper sacrificial activity came a spiritualising of sacrificial terminology alongside the continued offering of material sacrifice. Thus language indicating concepts of self-sacrifice appears to a great extent in the Psalms; but the highest expression of self-sacrifice is found in the character of the Suffering Servant of Deutero-Isaiah.

The extra-canonical writings show how individual sacrifices were considered to be offerings of one's own soul. The Qumran discoveries shed light on the sacrificial cult and suggest possible contacts with the concepts of self-denial and self-sacrifice as practiced and taught by Jesus.

Certain attitudes and concepts with regard to self-denial and self-sacrifice in the life and teaching of Jesus bear the influence of Rabbinic Judaism. These include the yoke of Christ, obedience to death, the doctrine of merit, renunciation, finding greatness in service, humility and the losing of one's life to find it.

In his attitude toward sacrifice, Jesus was conscious of the real value of the cultus but was quite aware of its limitations. He seems to have assumed a position of "detachment with acquiescence" in regard to the cult.

The unifying element in Jesus' thoughts concerning the self-denial and self-sacrifice of his life is the principle implicit in the Old Testament sacrifices. Jesus sees his work defined in the Suffering Servant.

In this thesis a distinction is made between the Jesus of history and the kerygma of the church with regard to the Son of man sayings. The conclusion is drawn that Jesus united

in his mind the three different usages of the term Son of man and employs the title in clarifying his intention of fulfilling his work of self-denial and self-sacrifice.

Jesus' ethical teaching concerning self-denial and self-sacrifice demanded that the disciples understand their personal welfare to be subservient to the work of the kingdom. He taught that greatness and exaltation came through service, humility and suffering. All of this has come to be included in the terms self-denial and self-sacrifice.

In the fourth Gospel there is evidence that special Son of man words may be quite reliable for presenting the mind of Jesus. This is particularly true of John 3:14, 8:28, 12:32 and 12:34 which express belief in only the rejection and exaltation of Jesus.

With regard to self-denial and self-sacrifice in the life of Jesus according to the presentation of the fourth Gospel, the author editorially declares that God gives Jesus for the world. He uses the good shepherd narrative to present the passion of Jesus as a voluntary self-sacrifice.

The fourth Gospel emphasizes the parallel sufferings which the disciples are to undergo. Some of the sayings may well present a tradition nearer the common original than those of the Synoptics. This seems particularly true of John 12:25, where to hate one's life is to keep it, and John 13:16, where a servant is not greater than his master. This Gospel indicates that self-denial and self-sacrifice formed a principal facet of Jesus' teaching.

The thesis concludes with the inference that there is no real distinction between the terms self-denial and self-sacrifice and that these two concepts become the unifying force which is central in Jesus' life and teaching as the means of accomplishing his purpose of offering the Kingdom of God to all.

**SELF-DENIAL AND SELF-SACRIFICE
IN
THE LIFE AND TEACHING OF JESUS**

by

James Byron Spencer



**Thesis presented for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
of the University of Edinburgh in the
Faculty of Divinity**

October, 1965

TO THE DUCHESS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am indebted to Columbia Theological Seminary, U.S.A., for making me a recipient of the Fannie Jordan Bryan Fellowship which created the incentive for this undertaking.

I wish to express appreciation to The Reverend Professor Allan Barr and The Reverend Professor David M. G. Stalker who have supervised this research. The guidance of these authorities has been invaluable.

Unless otherwise stated the translations from the Hebrew and Greek Testaments, as well as general spelling rules such as the use of both capital and lower case letters in the designation, "Son of man," follow that of the Revised Standard Version of the Holy Bible copyrighted in 1946 and 1952 by the Division of Christian Education of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
INTRODUCTION	1
 Chapter	
I. THE BACKGROUND OF SELF-DENIAL AND SELF-SACRIFICE IN THE LIFE AND TEACHING OF JESUS	5
A. The Old Testament	5
1. Terminology	5
2. Three aspects	7
3. Purpose	7
a. Kipper as expiation	7
b. The underlying principle of bestowal of life	9
4. Principle of substitution	10
5. Examples of self-denial and self-sacrifice	13
6. Prophetic denunciation of sacrificial practices	15
7. Individualisation and spiritualisation of sacrifices	20
a. Psalms	23
b. Proverbs	26
c. Ezekiel	26
d. Ecclesiastes	27
8. The Suffering Servant	28
a. Terminology	28
b. Identity	31

Chapter	Page
c. Self-denial and self-sacrifice in the Servant Songs	31
d. Expiation in the Servant Songs	36
e. The Servant and the Messiah	37
9. Summary	39
B. The Extra-Canonical Writings	39
1. Ecclesiasticus	40
2. The Maccabees	43
3. Wisdom of Solomon	44
4. The Letter of Aristeas	45
5. Summary	46
C. The Dead Sea Scrolls	46
1. The Sect as a sanctuary	46
2. Expiation	48
3. Spiritual sacrifices	49
4. Individuality	50
5. Self-renunciation	50
6. Essenes	52
7. Comparison of the Covenanters with Jesus	53
8. Summary	54
D. Rabbinic Judaism	55
1. Difficulty in using Rabbinic literature	56
2. Solidarity of Judaism	57
3. Sacrifice	58
4. Substitutes for sacrifice	62
5. Rabbinic teaching and the teaching of Jesus	63
a. The yoke of the Torah and the yoke of Jesus	63
b. The doctrine of reward	66
c. Self-denial	67

Chapter	Page
d. Suffering	68
e. Greatness through service	70
f. Humility	72
g. Losing life to find it	75
6. Summary	76
II. JESUS' ATTITUDE TOWARD SACRIFICIAL PRACTICES	79
A. Jesus Accepted the Sacrificial System	79
1. He supported the temple	79
2. He paid the temple tax supporting the sacrificial ritual	80
3. His activity with regard to the passover	80
B. Jesus Encouraged Others to Support the Sacrificial System	81
1. Mark 1:44	81
2. Luke 17:14	82
3. Matthew 5:23	82
4. Matthew 23:17 and 23:19	83
5. Mark 14:24	83
C. Jesus' Reservations with Regard to Sacrificial Practices	83
1. He anticipated the replacement of the sacrificial cultus	83
2. No direct attack upon sacrificial practices of the Temple	84
3. Jesus challenged the presuppositions of sacrificial practices	84
a. Matthew 9:13	84
b. Matthew 12:7	85
c. Provisional value of sacrifices	86
d. Mark 12:28-34	86

Chapter	Page
e. Mark 7:18-23	87
f. Spiritualisation of sacrifices	87
g. The presentation of the Fourth Gospel	88
D. Summary	89
III. SELF-DENIAL AND SELF-SACRIFICE IN THE LIFE OF JESUS AS PRESENTED IN THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS	91
A. According to the Markan Order	91
1. Mark 2:19f.	91
2. Mark 8:31	94
3. Mark 9:31	94
4. Mark 10:33f.	94
5. Mark 9:12b	101
6. Mark 10:38	103
7. Mark 10:45	105
8. Mark 12:1-11	114
9. Mark 14:8	117
10. Mark 14:18-21	118
11. Mark 14:22-25	120
12. Mark 14:27	128
13. Mark 14:34	129
14. Mark 14:36	131
15. Mark 14:37	133
16. Mark 14:41f.	134
17. Mark 14:48f.	136
18. Mark 15:34	136
B. Sayings Peculiar to Luke	138
1. Luke 12:49f.	138
2. Luke 13:32f.	141
3. Luke 17:25	142
4. Luke 22:15-20	144
5. Luke 22:27	147
6. Luke 22:28ff.	148
7. Luke 22:37	149

Chapter	Page
8. Luke 22:53b	151
9. Luke 23:34	152
C. The Servant of the Lord	154
1. The significance of the term for Jesus	155
2. Relation to Jesus' Baptism	155
3. Sacrificial implications	158
D. Summary of Self-denial and Self- sacrifice in the Life of Jesus as Expressed in the Synoptic Gospels	160
IV. THE SON OF MAN AS PRESENTED IN THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS	164
A. The Three Groups Identified	165
B. General Statements about the Son of Man Usage	166
1. Present sayings	167
2. Suffering sayings	168
3. Future sayings	168
4. Jesus distinct from Son of man	169
5. Son of man and Servant	173
C. The Source of the Term	174
1. Ezekiel	174
2. Daniel	174
3. Apocalyptic literature	174
4. Summary	179
D. The Present Usage of Son of Man Sayings According to the Markan Order	181
1. Mark 2:10	181
2. Mark 2:28	183
3. Mark 10:45	186

Chapter	Page
E. The Present Usage of Son of Man Sayings in Q According to the Lukan Order	188
1. Luke 7:34	188
2. Luke 9:58	189
3. Luke 12:10	192
F. Present Usage Peculiar to Matthew	194
G. Present Usage Peculiar to Luke	194
H. Editorial Comment of Matthew	194
I. Editorial Comment of Luke	195
J. The Suffering Son of Man Sayings	195
K. The Future Usage of the Son of Man Sayings According to the Markan Order	196
1. Mark 8:38	197
2. Mark 9:9	198
3. Mark 13:26	199
4. Mark 14:62	200
L. Future Usage of Son of Man Sayings in Q According to the Lukan Order	203
1. Luke 11:30	203
2. Luke 12:8f.	203
3. Luke 12:40	205
4. Luke 17:24	205
5. Luke 17:26	206
M. Future Usage Peculiar to Luke	206
1. Luke 17:22	206
2. Luke 17:30	207
3. Luke 18:8	207
N. Future Usage Peculiar to Matthew	208

Chapter	Page
1. Matthew 10:23	208
2. Matthew 13:41	209
3. Matthew 19:28	209
4. Matthew 24:39	210
5. Matthew 25:31	210
O. Future Usage of Son of Man Editorially Expressed	211
1. Matthew 16:28	211
2. Matthew 24:30	211
P. Summary of the Son of Man as Presented in the Synoptic Gospels . .	212
V. SELF-DENIAL AND SELF-SACRIFICE IN THE TEACHING OF JESUS AS PRESENTED IN THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS	217
A. According to the Markan Order	217
1. Mark 6:8f.	217
2. Mark 8:34	218
3. Mark 8:35ff.	233
4. Mark 9:35	237
5. Mark 9:43-47	241
6. Mark 9:49f.	243
7. Mark 10:21	244
8. Mark 10:29ff.	245
9. Mark 10:38f.	247
B. Jesus' Teaching about Self-denial and Self-sacrifice in Q According to the Order of Luke	250
1. Luke 6:20-31	250
2. Luke 6:37f.	253
3. Luke 6:40	254
4. Luke 9:59-62	255
5. Luke 10:3	257
6. Luke 12:51ff.	257
7. Luke 14:11	258
8. Luke 14:26	260
9. Luke 16:13	265

Chapter	Page
C. Teachings on Self-denial and Self-sacrifice Peculiar to Luke . . .	266
1. Luke 14:28-33	266
2. Luke 17:10	267
3. Luke 22:27	268
D. Teachings on Self-denial and Self-sacrifice Peculiar to Matthew	270
1. Matthew 7:13f.	270
2. Matthew 11:29f.	272
3. Matthew 13:44ff.	276
4. Matthew 19:12	277
E. Summary of Self-denial and Self- sacrifice in the Teaching of Jesus as Presented in the Synoptic Gospels	279
VI. SELF-DENIAL AND SELF-SACRIFICE IN THE LIFE AND TEACHING OF JESUS AS PRESENTED IN THE GOSPEL OF JOHN	284
A. An Introduction to John	284
B. The Son of Man in the Gospel of John -- An Introduction	289
C. Son of Man Sayings as Recorded in the Gospel of John	293
1. John 1:51	293
2. John 3:13f.	294
3. John 5:27	298
4. John 6:27	300
5. John 6:53	300
6. John 6:62	302
7. John 8:28	303
8. John 9:35	305
9. John 12:23	306

Chapter	Page
10. John 12:34	307
11. John 13:31	309
12. Summary	310
D. Self-denial and Self-sacrifice in the Life of Jesus as Presented in the Gospel of John	313
1. John 1:29	313
2. John 2:19	317
3. John 3:14	318
4. John 3:16	319
5. John 6:51-57	320
6. John 10:11	322
7. John 12:20-36	324
8. John 13:3-17	328
9. John 18:11	329
10. John 19:28ff.	330
11. Summary	331
E. Self-denial and Self-sacrifice in the Teaching of Jesus as Presented in the Gospel of John	333
1. John 12:25f.	334
2. John 13:14f.	338
3. John 13:16.	340
4. John 15:19, 20b	341
5. John 16:2	342
6. John 16:33	343
7. Summary	343
SUMMARY OF THE RESEARCH	345
CONCLUSION	353
BIBLIOGRAPHY	355

INTRODUCTION

The words self-denial and self-sacrifice carry rather obvious meanings. Perhaps this explains the apparent neglect of detailed research in this area of ethics. Much has been written concerning the specific self-sacrifice of Jesus but apparently little effort has been expended in relating his self-sacrifice and life of renunciation to the self-sacrifice and self-denial demanded of his followers.¹ Concerning the sayings of Jesus indicating that he intended men to participate in his self-offering, Vincent Taylor declares, "This is a side of the thought of Jesus to which insufficient attention has often been given, in consequence of the tendency to think of the Atonement as a 'finished work' which man has simply to accept as a gift of grace. Everything has been done by Christ; man has only to receive the benefits of his death."²

¹Cf. however, the work of Eduard Schweizer, Lordship and Discipleship (Naperville, Illinois: Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1960), E.T. of Erniedrigung und Erhöhung bei Jesus und seinen Nachfolgern. See also second German edition of 1962.

²Vincent Taylor, Jesus and His Sacrifice (London: Macmillan and Company, 1959), p. 265.

F. C. Grant says of the texts stating renunciation as the rule for all followers of Christ, "(They have) been the irritating grain of sand in the oyster."¹ William Penn has said, "We must either renounce to believe what the Lord Jesus hath told us, that whosoever doth not bear his cross and come after him cannot be his disciple, or admitting that for truth, conclude that the generality of Christendom do miserably deceive and disappoint themselves."² These statements express the importance of research in the area of self-denial and self-sacrifice in the life and teaching of Jesus.

It is interesting to note that the early portrait of the perfect man drawn by Plato pictures self-denial and self-sacrifice in a way that resembles the likeness of Jesus to a striking extent: "Though doing no wrong, he must have the greatest reputation for wrong-doing . . . he will go forward immovable even unto death, seeming to be unjust throughout life but being just, . . . he will be scourged, . . . and finally after suffering every kind of

¹F. C. Grant, The Earliest Gospel (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1954), p. 235.

²William Penn, No Cross, No Crown: A Discourse Shewing the Nature and Discipline of the Holy Cross of Christ. 10th Edition. (London: Luke Hinde, 1762), p. 2.

evil he will be crucified."¹ There is similarity to the teaching of Jesus in the words of Antigonos of Soko who, in the third century B.C., made a distinction between slaves who worked for the sake of reward and those who worked from no such motive. He urged his hearers, "Be not like slaves who serve their masters with the expectation of receiving a gratuity, but let the fear of heaven be upon you."²

It is the plan of this thesis in dealing with self-denial and self-sacrifice in the life and teaching of Jesus to deal with the Old Testament sacrificial terminology and then trace the growth of the sacrificial principle from the stage of its material practice through the stage of its spiritualisation as found in the life and teaching of Jesus.

A parallel effort in the approach of this thesis is that of tracing the development of characteristics of self-denial, humility, and renunciation from ancient times to the age of the early Church. Special attention is given those areas which may have been influential in the life

¹De Republica, lib. ii. The Loeb Classical Library, Plato The Republic by Paul Shorey (London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1930), pp. 122 and 124.

²G. F. Moore, Judaism (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927), I, p. 35.

and teaching of Jesus.

After treating the background found in the Old Testament, the Extracanonical literature, the beliefs of the Dead Sea Sect, and Rabbinical literature, the research centers around an analysis of the presentation of Jesus' sayings about his own self-denial and self-sacrifice as found in the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke. The next stage of the research deals with an exhaustive analysis of the presentation of Jesus' demands for self-denial and self-sacrifice from his followers as found in the synoptic Gospels. A separate chapter analyses self-denial and self-sacrifice in the life and teaching of Jesus as expressed in the Gospel of John. The thesis concludes with the inference that self-denial and self-sacrifice are central in Jesus' life and teaching as the means of accomplishing his purposes.

There has been no clear distinction drawn between the terms self-denial and self-sacrifice; in most instances this terminology is interchangeable.

CHAPTER I

THE BACKGROUND OF SELF-DENIAL AND SELF- SACRIFICE IN THE LIFE AND TEACHING OF JESUS

The Old Testament

Research concerned with self-denial and self-sacrifice in the life and teaching of Jesus must deal with the background of that subject. Since the sacrificial practices of the Old Testament were for many worshippers the primary agent for expressing self-sacrifice and surrender in a truly spiritual approach to Yahweh,¹ a general treatment of the cultus will be presented.

From an analysis² of the Old Testament sacrificial vocabulary, three main forms of sacrifice appear.³

¹Vincent Taylor, op. cit., edition of 1937, p. 59.

²A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament, edited by Brown, Driver and Briggs (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1906), serves as the source.

³Johannes Behm, " Ⲑ ⲓ ⲛ ," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, edited by G. Kittel (Stuttgart: Verlag von W. Kohlhammer, 1938), Band III, p. 183. Hereafter this source is abbreviated, T.W.z.N.T.

I. Words expressing the idea of gift

הָלַח (286 times) meaning "burnt-offering," literally, "the ascender."

כֹּלֵל (2 times) meaning "whole burnt-offering."

הַנְּחִיחַ (162 times) meaning a gift as from a subject to a king, and later, "meal-offering," a general term.

II. Words expressing the idea of Communion with Yahweh

זָבַח (162 times) meaning "sacrifice," used for sacrificial rites in which a part of the offering was burnt and part eaten in fellowship with the deity.

שָׁמֵן (87 times) There is divided opinion as to whether the meaning is "sacrifice for alliance" or "peace-offering."¹ Only the fat and blood were placed on the altar; the rest consumed at a sacrificial meal.

III. Words expressing the idea of expiation

זָבַח (135 times) meaning "sin-offering," sacrificed for sins committed in ignorance.

זָבַח (14 times) meaning "guilt-offering."

It seems possible to distinguish behind these forms, three

¹Brown, Driver and Briggs, *op. cit.*, p. 1023. See Exodus 32:6, II Samuel 6:15f. and II Kings 16:13.

aspects of a single purpose. That purpose was the "communication personally and actively of God with his people."¹ Sacrifice takes its place as part of the general purpose of the cult, that purpose being the affirmation of the sovereignty of God.²

Only in a limited sense do these words convey the original purpose of sacrifice. The purpose is more nearly expressed in the Hebrew word כָּפַר which is commonly used in connection with the sacrificial rites. "As a technical term כָּפַר means simply to perform an act of atonement."³ It appears 91 times in the Old Testament, 69 of them in the priestly writings.⁴ Whether the root meaning is "to cover" or "to wipe away" must remain a mystery.⁵

¹Behm, op. cit., p. 183.

²Edmund Jacob, Theology of The Old Testament (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1958), pp. 268f., E.T. of Théologie de l'Ancien Testament by A. W. Heath and Philip J. Allcock.

³Gerhard von Rad, Old Testament Theology (New York: Harper Brothers, 1962), p. 262, E.T. of Theologie des Alten Testament by David M. G. Stalker.

⁴Ludwig Koehler and Walter Baumgartner, Lexicon In Veteris Testamenti Libros (Leiden: E. G. Brill, 1953), p. 451.

⁵J. Herrmann, " Ἰλασόκομας," T.W.z.N.T., III, p. 302.

The Septuagint renders כָּפַר regularly ἱλάσκεισθαι or with words of a similar root. The LXX translators did not regard כָּפַר when used religiously as conveying propitiation, the appeasement of an angry God but expiation, the removal or covering of sin.¹ After the time of the Priestly Code the Hebrew verb is sometimes used with an accusative of the thing that is in a state of sin, but never with God as an object. It seems probable that "to make expiation" is the most adequate rendering of כָּפַר in its technical sense and without a direct object.²

Many efforts³ have been made to determine whether sacrifices were originally intended to be gifts expressing submission and homage or experiences of communion with the deity. The result has only proved that sacrificial practices arose in a variety of ways which intersected and overlapped themselves as the consequence of desperate

¹C. H. Dodd, The Bible and The Greeks (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1935), pp. 82f. and 93.

²Ludwig Köhler, Old Testament Theology (London: Lutterworth Press, 1957), pp. 213f., E.T. of Theologie des Alten Testaments by A. S. Todd.

³See George Buchanan Gray, Sacrifice in the Old Testament (Oxford: At The Clarendon Press, 1925), p. 1.

attempts at self-renunciation in order to deserve salvation.¹

There is one underlying principle which is basic to the idea of sacrifice, the bestowal of life. A study of the cultural patterns of the Near East during the third millennium B.C. shows an instinctive craving for life. This led to various theories as to how death could be overcome. The theories and resulting ritual centered on the release of the basic element of life, the blood.² In all its manifold modes of expression the fundamental idea in the sacrificial cult has been the promotion and conservation of life, and while this often entails the death or destruction of the person or thing offered, this is merely incidental in the process of liberating life.³

¹Köhler, op. cit., pp. 182 and 198.

²E. O. James, Origins of Sacrifice (London: J. Murray, 1933), p. 48. Cf. Genesis 9:4.

³Ibid., p. 219. E. O. James gives three reasons for the setting free of life: "(a) to augment the power of the god or spirit approached to enable him to perform his beneficent functions on earth; (b) to meet the forces of death and destruction by a fresh outpouring of vital potency, and so to strengthen the worshipper against malign influences and to 'cover' or 'wipe out' the transgression; (c) to establish or re-establish a bond of union or covenant with the benevolent powers in order to maintain a vital relationship between the worshipper and the object of worship and so to gain free communication between the natural and supernatural order." pp. 256f.

The primitive idea of sacrificing life of one type to preserve it in another form creates the background for the principle of substitution which has a highly ethical significance in some religions.¹ The practice of substitution can be traced back to Babylonia and Assyria from whence it was assimilated by the Hebrews and finds its highest spiritual significance in the suffering servant. Some underlying beliefs which strongly affected the Semitic principle of exchange² include a strong conviction that the psychical nature of inanimate objects would give them at times special manifestations,³ a belief that a part may stand for the whole, the concept of equivalence in which a material image or an animal might represent or substitute for a person, and the principle of corporate personality.

The existence of corporate substitution seen in the specific class of persons acting as substitute for

¹James, op. cit., p. 186.

²S. H. Hooke, The Siege Perilous (London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1956), p. 205.

³Cf. H. Frankfort, The Intellectual Adventure of Ancient Man (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956), p. 6 and Wheeler Robinson, Inspiration and Revelation in The Old Testament (Oxford: University Press, 1956), pp. 12f.

the people¹ presented problems which the eighth and seventh century prophets were determined to eliminate by their attack upon the mechanical sacrifices. They were responsible, as we shall see, for the transference to a moral emphasis and a direct relationship between Yahweh and individuals. The individualism is clearly expressed in Ezekiel 18. The principle of representation is also exemplified in Ezekiel. Yahweh instructs the representative of the people, the prophet Ezekiel, to perform a symbolic act in which he is to lie on his left side for 390 days and bear the punishment of Israel, and on his right side he is to bear the sins of Judah for an additional forty days.² In this action Ezekiel symbolically "represents the sinful nation which is to suffer calamity" itself.³

The practice of commuting bloody sacrifices into money and of thinking of sacrifices in terms of their material value was probably an increasing tendency in the Hebrew religion. Even in the earliest laws the firstborn

¹Numbers 16:48, "And he (Aaron) stood between the dead and the living" for whom he had made atonement (וְיָשָׁב אֶל-יְהוָה). Cf. Numbers 3:44f.

²Ezekiel 4:4-6.

³Rabbi Dr. S. Fisch, Ezekiel (London: The Socino Press, 1950), p. 20.

of men were required to be redeemed.¹ Whether or not the firstborn were ever actually sacrificed before the existence of these laws is a much debated question. The method in which they were redeemed in this early period is not clear either. It is possible that a ram was substituted² as in the case of the firstborn of the unclean animals. The story of Isaac seems to suggest this. The later law states clearly that money payment was required as a substitute for the firstborn of men.³

"The burnt-offering had in the earliest days reached its highest effort in human sacrifice; and again that had to go (for the Hebrews) if the character of God were to be understood; but even the cruelty of human sacrifice had a truth in it without which the later burnt-offering could never again be so real an offering of self."⁴

There was also the custom of vowing persons to

¹Numbers 3:44f.

²Th. C. Vriezen, An Outline of Old Testament Theology (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1958), p. 300, E.T. of Hoofdlijnen der Theologie van het oude Testament by S. Neuijen, says that it is difficult to say just how far ideas of substitution were present in the O. T. sacrifices, but that they did not dominate the cult.

³Numbers 18:16.

⁴F. C. N. Hicks, The Fullness of Sacrifice (London: Macmillan and Company, 1930), p. 119.

Yahweh. Jephthah's daughter is the primary example of this practice.¹ The victim acting courageously and devoutly accepted the validity of the vow and became by her willing choice a vivid picture of literal renunciation and self-sacrifice. Leviticus describes the requirements for redeeming persons vowed to Yahweh. This shows, at least, that the custom of vowing had outlived that of human sacrificing.²

All of these sacrificial concepts held out to the worshipper the possibility of approaching God and clarified in the mind the fact that reconciliation with Yahweh was a costly process.

If the system could have satisfied the need of the individual to identify himself with that which could will and experience vicarious sacrifice in a form that was spiritual and ethical it would have supplied a perfect ritual of expiation for all sins. But to say this is to recognise that underlying the Old Testament system were lofty spiritual ideas capable of development into what stands forth in the New Testament.³

¹Judges 11:30-40. Whether or not she was actually sacrificed with the loss of her life is of no concern here.

²Gray, op. cit., p. 36.

³Taylor, op. cit., p. 60.

There are further ideas of self-sacrifice that are expressed in the Old Testament. It is the attitude of self-denial that breathes strongly in Moses' prayer, "Alas, this people have sinned a great sin; they have made for themselves gods of gold. But now, if thou wilt forgive their sin - and if not, blot me, I pray thee, out of thy book which thou has written."¹ Similarly David speaks, "Lo, I have sinned, and I have done wickedly; but these sheep, what have they done? Let thy hand, I pray thee, be against me and against my father's house."²

The Rechabites appear in the ninth century B.C. as a result of the decadence and syncretism of that period. The purpose of the sect was to counteract this laxity. This group exerted its influence by advocating the nomadic ideal and a return to the ways of the desert. This was a form of asceticism and renunciation in its rejection of all agriculture and urban civilisation.³

The Nazarites appear from the time of the Judges to the early Christian era, clearly seen at one period and then disappearing during another. Ordinarily, men made

¹Exodus 32:31f.

²II Samuel 24:17.

³Vriezen, op. cit., p. 309. See Jeremiah 35:6ff. and II Kings 10:15.

material offerings to their God, but the Nazarites offered themselves. Their purpose was to live a dedicated or consecrated life which involved both positive and negative qualities. The characteristics of self-denial appeared in their abstinence from wine, refusal to cut their hair, and avoidance of contacting the dead.¹

A prominent feature of the preaching of the eighth and seventh century prophets was the denunciation of public worship as it existed in the sanctuaries of that time. The prophetic criticism naturally led to a judgment of the whole system of sacrifices. There are many passages showing the attitude of the prophets.

Amos was quite emphatic as Yahweh spoke through him, "I hate, I despise your feasts, and I take no delight in your solemn assemblies. Even though you offer me your burnt offerings and cereal offerings, I will not accept them . . . But let justice roll down like waters and righteousness like an over-flowing stream. Did you bring to me sacrifices and offerings the forty years in the wilderness, O House of Israel?"² Scholars differ as to

¹S. M. Cooke, "Nazarites," Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics. Edited by James Hastings (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1907), IX, pp. 258f. See Numbers 6.

²Amos 5:21-25.

how Amos' message is to be interpreted because of his insinuation that sacrifices were not offered in the wilderness.

Amos must have been aware of the fact that sacrifices of some type were presented during the wilderness sojourn. It is possible to explain this apparent contradiction by the fact that in Amos' time the sacrificial cult was considered to work, more or less, ex opere operato. This was a change from the earlier practice which had been more restricted in scope and had emphasised a peculiar spiritual atmosphere¹ in a simple setting. It has also been suggested that Amos expected an affirmative² answer to his question. The meaning would be: "Did not your forefathers offer me sacrifices which were acceptable because they were offered in faithfulness and sincerity? The implication being: Why then do you offer sacrifices which, on account of your sins and on account of your false ideas about your

¹Vriezen, op. cit., p. 26, points out that "During the period of the genesis of the people the focal point of the sanctuary is the ark with the tables of the law," and not the place where blood was shed and sacrifices offered up.

²Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar. Edited by G. W. Collins and A. E. Cowley (Oxford: At The Clarendon Press, 1898), paragraph 150d: Verse 25 begins with a Hebrew particle (interrogative) which permits of either a negative or affirmative answer.

God Yahweh, are worthless and unacceptable."¹ Another interpretation declares that Amos was reminding his hearers that the sacrifices and offerings brought during the forty years in the wilderness were not acceptable to Yahweh because they were presented to gods made for themselves.² But concerning this difficult problem³ it seems best to agree with the opinion that Amos rated daily conduct above sanctuary duties, sacrifices in particular.

Even though the prophets repudiated the popular attitude toward sacrifice there is no evidence that they made any effort to substitute some other theory of worship. It would be a complete removal of the sacrificial system. "What would he as one who faced realities offering purely spiritual worship have suggested as a substitute if all sacrifices were to be abolished?"⁴

¹W. O. E. Oesterley, Sacrifices in Ancient Israel (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1937), p. 195.

²Adam C. Welch, Prophet and Priest in Old Israel (London: SCM Press, 1936), p. 55.

³See R. S. Cripps, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on The Book of Amos (London: S.P.C.K., 1929), p. 198.

⁴W. O. E. Oesterley and Theodore H. Robinson, Hebrew Religion, Its Origin and Development (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1930 and 1937), p. 336. Against this see W. A. L. Elmslie, How Came Our Faith (Cambridge: At The University Press, 1950), pp. 260f., who says Amos wished to "consign the whole bloody bestial business to the nethermost pit."

Hosea's message is "I desire steadfast love and not sacrifice, and the knowledge of God rather than burnt offerings."¹ Isaiah writes, "What to me is the multitude of your sacrifices? says the Lord; I have had enough of burnt offerings of rams and the fat of fed beasts, I do not delight in the blood of bulls or of lambs, or of he-goats."² The author of Micah says, "With what shall I come before the Lord, and bow myself before God on high? Shall I come before him with burnt offerings, with calves a year old? . . . He has showed you, O man, what is good; and what does the Lord require of you but to do justice, and to love kindness, and to walk humbly with your God?"³

In these attitudes can be seen the difference between the prophetic and popular conceptions of sacrifice. In the mind of the average Hebrew was the idea that a physical bond existed between God and his worshipper by means of sacrifice. Any break in relationship with the deity could be immediately corrected by increased emphasis upon sacrificial activity.

Jeremiah, even more forcibly than his precursors,

¹Hosea 6:6. Also see Hosea 5:7 and 4:19.

²Isaiah 1:11. See also vss. 12-17.

³Micah 6:6-8.

does not simply rebuke the abuse of the sacrificial cultus, but declares with sarcasm that as far as Yahweh is concerned the worshippers might just as well eat the burnt offering, which was customarily entirely burnt on the altar, along with the peace offering, which was mainly eaten by the worshipper. "Thus says the Lord of Hosts, the God of Israel, 'Add your burnt offerings to your sacrifices, and eat the flesh. For in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, I did not speak . . . concerning burnt offerings and sacrifices. But this command I gave them, "Obey my voice, and I will be your God, and you shall be my people; and walk in all the way that I command you" . . .'"¹ The whole system had been abused for it was no longer basically functioning on the revelation of Yahweh upon which the national religion was founded. Even in bygone days, obedience, not sacrifice, was what counted in Yahweh's sight, and in the eyes of Jeremiah the cultic element is almost but not entirely superseded by knowledge of and obedience to Yahweh.²

A. B. Davidson, speaking of Jeremiah in relation

¹Jeremiah 7:21ff.

²Curt Kuhl, The Prophets of Israel (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1960), pp. 119f., E.T. of Israels Propheten by R. J. Ehrlich and J. P. Smith.

to other prophets, says, "Prophecy had already taught its truths, its last effort was to reveal itself in a life."¹ It is the self-sacrificing characteristic that is striking. This man presents the beginning of a shifting emphasis from the exclusively corporate or social solidarity with the nation or family as the religious unit, to an emphasis which also pointed up individual spirituality. Religion should no longer mean altar, temple, and law, but should be an individual relationship with Yahweh. This is the most obvious characteristic of Jeremiah's piety, individualism. It is brought about by the strange circumstances of his life and it may be that only such an exceptional experience as his could have opened the way for the personal faith of the later Jewish Church and Christianity.² The element of individuality is emphasised in his prophecy: "'Behold, the days are coming,' says the Lord, 'when I will make a new covenant with the House of Israel and the House of Judah, not like the covenant which I made with their fathers when I took them by the hand . . . But this is the covenant

¹Hastings' Dictionary of The Bible, edited by James Hastings (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1898-1904), II, p. 576.

²John Skinner, Prophecy and Religion. Studies in the Life of Jeremiah (Cambridge: At The University Press, 1922), p. 223.

which I will make . . . I will put my law within them, and I will write it upon their hearts; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people."¹ The new individuality did not exclude the fact that even the new covenant was still a covenant with the nation.

Another characteristic is seen in Jeremiah's identifying himself with his people. The voice of Jehovah comes to him, "Do not pray for this people."² Jeremiah says, "For the wound of the daughter of my people is my heart wounded . . . O that my heart were waters, and my eyes a fountain of tears, that I might weep day and night for the slain of the daughter of my people!"³ "It is a comfort and delight to him that he suffers reproach for Yahweh's sake."⁴ He had come to think of his inner life as no longer his own but something "laid on the altar for God." Thus religious experience itself may become sacramental.

There is, of course, the other side of the picture. Jeremiah was persuaded that the truth of God depended upon

¹Jeremiah 31:31ff.

²Jeremiah 7:16.

³Jeremiah 8:21 and 9:1.

⁴Skinner, op. cit., p. 221, and Jeremiah 15:15f.

him and he felt assured that he would be vindicated, as he was by the destruction of the city he loved. He felt he could not hold to the truth if Yahweh should leave him naked to his enemies' scorn. He regrets having been born. This attitude shows that he had not found the secret of the Christian ideal of victory through defeat and death.¹ He had not developed spiritually to the point where the thought of self was entirely lost and surrendered to the will of God. The externalisms of religious activity crucified his spirit. He says of himself, "I was like a gentle lamb led to the slaughter."²

"Hence, in the conception of God set forth in the utterances of the shepherd-prophet, amplified and elaborated by his successors, there is implicit the gradual rejection of every element of ritual until the climax of the process in Jeremiah's rejection of the holy city itself, with temple, ark, sacrifices, seasonal festivals, leaving nothing but a relation based on the will of God written on the heart."³

Some passages in the Psalms echo Jeremiah's

¹Skinner, op. cit., p. 224.

²Jeremiah 11:19.

³S. H. Hooke, op. cit., p. 109.

opposition. "Sacrifice and offering thou dost not desire; but thou hast given me an open ear. Burnt offering and sin offering thou hast not required. . . . I delight to do thy will, O God; Yea, thy law is within my heart."¹

The idea prevalent among the people concerned was what they, the sacrificers, were losing rather than what God, the recipient, would gain. It is a simple transition from this to the thought of self-surrender. The external sacrifice was of no value without the inward one which became an acceptable and sufficient substitute when men were hindered from meeting the sacrificial requirements of the law. A further example states, "For thou hast no delight in sacrifice; were I to give a burnt offering, thou wouldst not be pleased. The sacrifice acceptable to God is a broken spirit; a broken and contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise."² These are the sacrifices, the broken spirit, the contrite heart, and the readiness to conform to the law of God written in the heart, which

¹Psalm 40:6, 8. Compare Hicks, *op. cit.*, pp. 82ff., suggesting the translation "with sin" as against "sin-offering" of the word הַטְּחָת. Cf. Psalm 50:13, 23.

²Psalms ⁵¹6, 22, 28, ⁵¹56, and 69. I am indebted to G. von Rad's *Old Testament Theology*, pp. 402ff., from which this treatment of individualisation and spiritualisation is derived.

are always accepted and never refused.

The individualisation appearing in the Psalms affected the attitude toward sacrifices. After praying at the so-called priestly oracle of weal, individuals experienced a change of mood showing they gained personal assurance and comfort from Yahweh.¹ Though suffering was seldom interpreted as a service of training which might become a factor in God's determination for man's salvation, occasionally the deity was described as "testing," "chastening" or "afflicting" a man to bring him into a more intimate relationship with Yahweh.² This was a "spiritualisation of the old doxology of judgment," for what was formerly punishment could now, by reflection, be seen as a helpful discipline. This was a bold step in view of Israel's difficulty to see in suffering anything other than hostility to life. w/

This individualisation takes a further step in the spiritualisation of the principle of sanctuary asylum³

¹Psalm 51:16f.

²Psalms 66:10; 118:18 and 119:67, 71.

³See von Rad, op. cit., p. 403, who points out that the expression "Yahweh is my portion" is a spiritualisation of the sacral allotment for the Tribe of Levi (Deuteronomy 10:9, Cf. Micah 2:4 and Numbers 18:20). This expression probably appears in the Psalms as a result of the fact that the principal temple-singers were of the Tribe of Levi.

which offered refuge for one being pursued. The oppressed spiritual man could "seek refuge" and be "hid" with Yahweh¹ completely independent of anything external. The men who use these words are not ascetics but individuals who have lifted everything to such a spiritual plane that they cannot be successfully assaulted from the outside. Yahweh is "my fortress; I shall not be greatly moved,"² they can say. The statement of Psalm 63:3, "thy steadfast love is better than life," illustrates how deeply the spiritualisation had taken place, for the love of Yahweh was distinguished from life. Such a distinction was entirely new and points up the fact that faith could be a reality apart from "saving history or objective rites."³

The religious life of the Psalmists centered in the Temple and its sacrificial system; therefore, it is doubtful that complete destruction of external sacrifice was intended by any of them. The attack was not directed toward sacrifices but toward the lack of the spirit of penitence in which they were offered. The intention was not to abandon the ritual of sacrifice, but to raise it to

¹Psalms 16 and 62. Cf. 27:1, 5 and 36:7.

²Psalm 62:2.

³von Rad, op. cit., p. 403.

a lofty and acceptable standard. In so doing the new covenant was anticipated.

The Book of The Proverbs takes a similar position stating that, "The sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination to the Lord, but he loves him who pursues righteousness."¹ And "to do righteousness and justice is more acceptable to the Lord than sacrifice. . . . The sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination; how much more when he brings it with evil intent."²

Ezekiel presents Yahweh as saying, "A new heart I will give you, and a new spirit I will put within you"³ in picturing sacrifice as central in the worship of the restored Temple.

The post-exilic period of Jewish history brought with it the efforts of the returned exiles to restore the Temple and its services. From the time of rebuilding the Temple under the influence of the teachings of Haggai and Zechariah up to the Roman destruction of the Temple, A.D. 70, the re-establishment of the whole sacrificial system was the focus of Jewish life. Significantly it was

¹Proverbs 15:8.

²Proverbs 21:3.

³Ezekiel 36:26.

purified of much of the abuse against which the prophets had directed their strong protests.

The author of Ecclesiastes in speaking of sacrifice improperly offered, "Guard your steps when you go to the house of God; to draw near to listen is better than to offer the sacrifice of fools; for they do not know that they are doing evil,"¹ is probably quietly by-passing the sacrificial system.

Behind the motives that produced the sacrificial system the life of the Rechabites, and the prophetic protests against the misuse of the sacrificial system, lay the idea of something that was to find its highest Old Testament expression in the Servant Songs of Deutero-Isaiah,² especially Isaiah 53 where the Servant suffers willingly on behalf of his fellow creatures. There the underlying conception of substitution³ has reached its spiritual height with the Servant offering himself voluntarily as an "offering for sin."⁴ Yahweh called the Servant to

¹Ecclesiastes 5:1.

²The style and thought of the Songs of the Servant are that of Deutero-Isaiah who seems to be the author, but many critics believe them to be the work of a separate author.

³See previous treatment.

⁴Isaiah 53:10.

carry the experiences of Ezekiel,¹ that of bearing the punishment and sins of Israel and Judah, to the fullest extent, death. It becomes clear that "Jeremiah unknowingly and the author of the songs consciously, were initiating vicarious suffering, the real background of self-sacrifice."²

Since the servant concept plays an important part in the Old Testament ideas of self-sacrifice and since Jesus' call to service is closely related to his teaching of self-sacrifice it will be helpful to give a brief analysis of the word roots which express service and the servant relationship.³ The primary root is תָּדַע. The verb תָּדַע has two general uses: the first carries the meaning to act, do, work, work upon, and use; the second, meaning to serve. Both meanings appear in the non-religious as well as religious references. The meaning "to serve" is the most common usage within and without the

¹Ezekiel 4:4ff.; see previous treatment.

²Hooke, op. cit., p. 106.

³See W. Zimmerli and J. Jeremias, The Servant of God (London: S.C.M. Press, 1957), pp. 9-23, E.T. of "Παῖς Θεοῦ," T.W.z.N.T., V, pp. 653-713, by Harold Knight and others. See also Curt Lindhagen, The Servant Motif in the Old Testament (Uppsala: Lundequistska Bokhandeln, 1950), pp. 41ff. I am indebted to these authorities for the following treatment.

religious sphere. The substantives from this root are הַתְּבִיעַ meaning action, deed and work or service; and תְּבִיעַ meaning servant (slave or free man). תְּבִיעַ and תְּבִיעַ occur twelve times as parts of names which describe an individual as the servant of some god.

Two component ideas are expressed in the use of תְּבִיעַ as service, action and obedience, forming a balanced conception of the term. One or the other may dominate. The word תְּבִיעַ itself does not show any evaluation of the relationship, only the context determines this.

When used in the religious realm as an expression of service, תְּבִיעַ designates a covenant type relationship between Yahweh and Israel. In the non-religious usage the relationship may or may not be based on equality but in the religious usage the covenant between Yahweh and Israel is clearly based on inequality. There Yahweh initiated the covenant¹ in which Israel was elected to serve Him in both the ethical and cultic areas

¹See G. Ernest Wright, Biblical Archaeology (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1957), pp. 99f., who lists the elements of the suzerainty treaties of the second millennium B.C. affecting the covenant of Israel.

of life. In the covenant relationship Israel must abstain from serving other gods while on the positive side she must subject the whole of her activity to the will of Yahweh who became Israel's saviour.

Sacrifice and service are related in the Old Testament. In a number of passages in Exodus we see that the purpose of Israel's wanting to leave Egypt was to "sacrifice (קָרַב) to the Lord our God,"¹ but originally Yahweh had told Moses the purpose was to "serve (עָבַד) Yahweh."² The parallel is illustrated in Moses' statement to Pharaoh that they need the animals to "sacrifice (קָרַב) to Yahweh"³ and in the following verse where the animals are taken "to serve (עָבַד) Yahweh, our god."⁴ In many cases the word עָבַד could be replaced by the word קָרַב.⁵

The Septuagint translates עָבַד usually

¹Exodus 3:18. See also Exodus 5:3, 8; 8:8, 25, 26; and 3:12.

²Exodus 3:12.

³Exodus 10:25.

⁴Exodus 10:26. See Lindhagen, op. cit., pp. 93f.

⁵That is in Exodus 3:12. See Lindhagen, op. cit., p. 96.

with παῖς (340 times) and often with σοῦδος (327 times). δοῦλος is used primarily to designate involuntary slavery. When ἡδῖς is used to translate תַּלְוָה it describes a more voluntary type relationship.¹ Παῖς is used from Judges to II Chronicles to denote only the category of free servants of the king who place themselves at his disposal by their own decision (soldiers, ministers, officials).² The Suffering Servant of The Lord designation is translated in the Septuagint with παῖς fourteen out of the twenty religious usages.³

In agreement with the Old Testament "collective view of life," the servant attribute is normally applied to Israel as a whole. In some instances the servant concept is limited to the righteous within Israel.⁴ The Servant Songs of the Old Testament testify to the rise of a new moral conception in Jewish religious thought, the idea of willing representative suffering. The songs are generally

¹Karl Heinrich Rengstorff, " δοῦλος ," T.W.z.N.T., II, pp. 268f.

²Zimmerli and Jeremias, op. cit., p. 37.

³Ibid., p. 39.

⁴I Kings 8:31, II Kings 97b, 10:23, Psalm 34:23 and Isaiah 65:8ff.

considered to include: Isaiah 42:1-4; 49:1-6; 50:4-9; and 52:13-53:12.¹

For the purpose here it is only a secondary matter as to whether the servant should receive an individual or collective interpretation, or a combination of these.²

The primary concern is to see clearly the characteristics of self-sacrifice. Without question the songs of the servant describe service rendered through suffering.

In the first song there is no real anticipation of the suffering or death of the servant, unless an emendation is made in verse three to make the servant the bruised reed: "The crushed reed one shall not break; the smouldering wick one shall not quench."³

In the second song the patient servant of justice

¹Some scholars include verses 5-7 in the first song, verses 7-9 in the second song and verses 10 and 11 in the third song.

²On the traditional view see C. R. North, The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah (London: Oxford University Press, 1948), p. 208. On the common Jewish view see H. H. Rowley, The Servant of the Lord and Other Essays on the Old Testament (London: The Lutterworth Press, 1952), p. 4. On the concept of corporate personality see H. Wheeler Robinson, The Cross in The Old Testament (London: S.C.M. Press, Ltd., 1955), p. 111. On the Servant as Israel in Captivity see Joh. Lindblom, The Servant Songs in Deutero-Isaiah (Lund: G. W. K. Gleerup, 1951), p. 48. Concerning the whole problem see H. H. Rowley, op. cit., p. 52.

³North, op. cit., p. 91n.

is shown a world wide task of delivering the salvation of Yahweh to the ends of the earth. The dispersion becomes more than a mere punishment of Israel for her sins. It is rather a part of the plan of God whereby in contrast to the past efforts at a restoration of national greatness, the new destiny of Israel lies in its carrying the knowledge of Yahweh to the ends of the earth by means of the dispersion. The reaction of the servant to his apparent failure is shown. He had toiled in vain but reasserts his faith in Yahweh, for the cause and recompense were with Him.

In the third song the servant explains again that Yahweh his teacher enables him to be sustained by continual fellowship. Recognising his call he did not rebel but gave evidence of real self-giving:

"And I was not rebellious, I turned
not backward,
I gave my back to the smiters, and
my cheeks to those who pulled out
the beard;
I hid not my face from shame and
spitting.
. . . I have set my face like a
flint."¹

In this song the servant recognises the cost of his task.

The servant is persistent in his task and in the

¹Isaiah 50:5-7.

fourth song the climax is reached as his suffering makes possible the accomplishment of his purpose. The other nations had interpreted the suffering as punishment for Israel's sins but are astonished to find the servant vindicated:

"Behold, my servant shall prosper, he shall be exalted and lifted up and shall be very high.

As many were astonished at him--his appearance was so marred,¹ beyond human semblance, and his form beyond that of the sons of men--"²

They are surprised that the suffering is a punishment for their own sins. The nations aware of their own sins confess in the words of Isaiah 53:4-10.

Concerning the suffering found in this passage, J. A. Sanders taking the collective interpretation of the servant points out that suffering has a "double purpose and intent: (1) it expresses purposeful suffering . . . but (2) it is a suffering which is observed by the kings, though experienced by the servant, that the kings

¹The Massoretic text translated literally reads, "Marred more than a man was his appearance." The St. Mark's Scroll apparently says, "I have anointed him so that his appearance surpasses that of a man." See this in Millar Burrows, The Dead Sea Scrolls (London: Secker and Warburg, 1956), pp. 313f.

²Isaiah 52:13f.

'understand' and learn therefrom."¹ He elsewhere concludes that "out of the idea of divine discipline grew the belief in atonement through sufferings and the concept of vicarious atonement."²

Yahweh confirms the confessions:

"Therefore I will divide him a portion with the great, and he shall divide the spoil with the strong; because he poured out his soul in death, and was numbered with the transgressors; yet he bore the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors."³

The author of Deutero-Isaiah has used the figure of the servant to outline Israel's ministry to the world, a new ministry to replace the old nationalism. The servant's task is to mediate welfare to the pagan nations. He does this in two ways: first, by acting as a witness to faith in Yahweh and secondly, by taking upon himself the punishment due the Gentiles. Thus by witnessing and suffering voluntarily rather than by violence Israel brings salvation to the nations.

¹Jim Alvan Sanders, Suffering as Divine Discipline in the Old Testament and Post-Biblical Judaism in a special issue of Colgate Rochester Divinity School Bulletin, Vol. XXVIII, November 1955, p. 15.

²Ibid.

³Isaiah 53:12.

The idea of expiation is the background principle in Isaiah 53. Sin must be expiated with life. The servant is therefore compared to a lamb chosen for slaughtering and his life is called an offering for sin. The expiation, however, is not a cultic act for the blood plays no part. The expiation is an "ethical and juridical act"¹ which is effected by the willing acceptance of punishment and death due another. The fact that the sufferings are called an offering for sin indicates the value of the suffering for God. A part of the offering lies in the acceptance of involuntary conditions.² The service of Yahweh brings about redemption.

A real transformation has taken place in the whole concept of sacrifice. In the place of meeting a legalistic ritual requirement in order to gain fellowship, favour and protection from God there is now a situation in which the offering, the Servant of Yahweh, responds in obedience to the initiative of Yahweh in such a way that it is conscious of the righteous requirement of Yahweh and the needs of those for whose guilt he suffers. Thus in this self-offering of the servant a purely moral character has been

¹Vriezen, op. cit., p. 298.

²Robinson, op. cit., p. 83.

given to the expiatory task as the servant fulfills the call of Yahweh.

Apparently the Servant of Yahweh held only a minor appeal to Israel for there is very little to remind us of this figure in older Judaism.¹ It is Jesus' use of the figure that demands a thorough treatment.

There is no real evidence that the Suffering Servant and the Messiah were identified with each other before the Christian age.² Some scholars of the Dead Sea Manuscripts see in the numerous references to the Teacher of Righteousness evidence that the two concepts of suffering and kingship had been united in Judaism at least in the first century B.C.³

It is difficult to hold to the idea that the writer of the Servant Songs had in mind a Messianic figure,⁴ for

¹Vriezen, op. cit., p. 66.

²Rowley, op. cit., p. 85, and also p. 13.

³See J. T. Milik, Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judea ("Studies in Biblical Theology," No. 26; London: SCM Press, 1959), pp. 95f. where he asserts, "But now that there is positive information about the actual historical existence of a Messiah who suffered and died under Aristobulus II, thanks to the Habakkuk Commentary, . . . it is now certain--and this is one of the most important revelations of the Dead Sea discoveries--that Judaism in the first century B.C. saw a whole theology of the suffering Messiah developing around the person of the Master of Justice."

⁴Hooke, op. cit., pp. 93f.

the servant is clearly described as a sufferer not a king. Even the references to the humility of the Messianic figure seen in Zechariah 9:9 fail to point to any suffering. The Targum and both Talmuds find the Messiah in Isaiah 53; but the concept of a suffering Messiah is absent.¹ The author of the Targum of Jonathan on Isaiah 53 (3rd or 4th century) meticulously transferred all of the passages mentioning suffering so that they described characteristics of Israel or her adversaries, leaving the passages of triumph descriptive of the Messiah. The Targum says, instead of "we esteemed him stricken, smitten by God, and afflicted,"² "we were stricken, smitten by God, and afflicted."³

In the Suffering Servant of Deutero-Isaiah we have seen impressive characteristics: The Servant undertakes a mission of service for others, the service is rendered through innocent suffering, the service involves willing obedience and self-giving, and firmly in the background stands representation and expiation. Any discussion of the Servant of Deutero-Isaiah is incomplete until it is related to Jesus of Nazareth. It is to this important

¹Rowley, op. cit., pp. 65f.

²Isaiah 53:3.

³See Robinson, op. cit., p. 90; also Rowley, op. cit., pp. 65f. and Hooke, op. cit., pp. 93f. and 121.

matter that we shall turn in a later section.

In summary then, the Old Testament describes three general aspects of sacrifice: gift, communion, and expiation. The underlying purpose of sacrifice was the offering of life to God. The background of sacrificial form is expressed in the various principles of substitution, representation, commutation of sacrifice, human sacrifice, and the practice of vowing persons to God. These influenced the form of offering one's self to God. The prophetic denunciation of improper sacrificial activity led to an emphasis on spiritual self-sacrifice. Specific examples of this come to light in the lives of various Old Testament individuals but the highest expression of self-sacrifice is found in the character of the Suffering Servant of Deutero-Isaiah.

The Extra-Canonical Writings

The influence of the ethical criticisms of the prophets and later priests is clear in Ecclesiasticus. The sacrificial system is not condemned but the morality of the worshipper is stressed. "He that sacrificeth of a thing wrongfully gotten, his offering is made a mockery; and the mockeries of wicked men are not well-pleasing. The Most High hath no pleasure in the offerings of the

ungodly; neither is he pacified for sins by the multitude of sacrifices."¹

On the positive side Ecclesiasticus presents, "He who provides for his father atones for his sins,"² . . . (and) "Charity given to a father will not be forgotten, and will build you up a further atonement for your sins."³ "As water will quench a blazing fire, so charity will atone for sin."⁴

In emphasising the importance of spirituality accompanying the sacrifices, Ben Sirach seems to give prayer and almsgiving a parallel position with sacrifice. Here may be the beginnings of the later Rabbinic theory that prayer, charity and fasting could take the place of the actual sacrifices.⁵ A movement in the direction of spiritualising the actual sacrifices forced the concrete

¹Ecclesiasticus 34:18f.

²Ecclesiasticus 3:3.

³Ecclesiasticus 3:14.

⁴Ecclesiasticus 3:30.

⁵In a legend of Abraham, Abraham asks: "What will happen if they will no longer be able to bring such sacrifices?" and God's answer was: "Let them recite it before me and it will be for me like unto the sacrifice." See Hicks, *op. cit.*, p. 108. In reality prayers etc. rather than substituting for sacrifice are a means of preserving the ritual by an inner and spiritual experience.

acts of temple worship into a liturgical setting of prayer and praise. Where sacrifice itself, in the technical sense, became impossible, it came to be felt that the worshipper could identify himself with the moral meaning of the sacrifice by the spiritual acts corresponding to it.

This was not to suggest that sacrifice should be abandoned but did show directions for worship when the sacrificial service was not available. The existence of synagogues alongside the Temple furnished a perfect situation in which liturgy might displace sacrifice. In Ecclesiasticus, certainly good character is clearly established as acceptable sacrifice. "He who gives heed to the commandments will offer a thanksgiving sacrifice, the man who returns a kindness will offer a meal offering, and the man who gives to charity will offer the sacrifice of praise. Avoiding wickedness wins the Lord's approval, and avoiding wrongdoing is an atonement."¹

The conception of self-denial is expressed in the words: "And take heed to your own lips. Do not exalt yourself, or you may fall."² This attitude is shown also

¹Ecclesiasticus 35:1-3.

²Ecclesiasticus 1:29b-30a.

in the statements: "My child, if you come to serve the Lord, prepare yourself to be tried. Set your heart right and be firm, and do not be hasty when things go against you;"¹ and "accept whatever happens to you and be patient in humiliating vicissitudes."²

The glory of life for the Maccabean martyrs was their principle of substitution³ in which they suffered freely for others. For them it was not a formal transaction or an acceptance of a dreaded responsibility because of the sin of others.

This principle was something that sprang forth naturally from the solidarity of the nation. In one sense, this characteristic takes something away from the sacrificial aspect of their deaths. "They suffer for the people . . . because they too are Jews. There is wanting the most important element, viz. that the pious man voluntarily takes the sin of others into his consciousness, and experiences it as his own through love--that he becomes one with the guilty on moral lines, and not on the ground of physical association."⁴ Even so, it should be

¹Ecclesiasticus 2:1f.

²Ecclesiasticus 2:4.

³See treatment of the term, substitution, above.

⁴See Robinson, op. cit., p. 96.

remembered that the suffering of the Maccabean martyrs is one of the most notable links between the Songs of the Servant and the New Testament interpretation of them.

The first response to the brutal persecutions of Antiochus Epiphanes was the "passive endurance of suffering" by such individuals as the elderly Eleazar and the seven brothers.¹ Even though they were unjustly attacked they consciously accepted their persecution as a due punishment for the sins of their nation. The aged Eleazar, advancing of his own accord to the torture nobly and virtuously refusing polluted food said, "Wherefore, by manfully parting with my life now, I will . . . die willingly and nobly on behalf of our reverend and holy laws . . . I endure cruel pains in my body from scourging and suffer this gladly in my soul, because I fear him."² The last of the seven brothers says, "For we are suffering because of our own sins. And though our living Lord is angry for a little while, to rebuke and discipline us, he will be reconciled with his own slaves again. . . . I like my brothers give up body and soul for the laws of my

¹Robinson, op. cit., p. 94.

²II Maccabees 6:27f. and 30. The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of The Old Testament in English, edited by R. H. Charles (Oxford: At The Clarendon Press, 1913), p. 140.

forefather, calling upon God speedily to show mercy to our nation, . . . and to stay through me and my brothers the wrath of the Almighty which has justly fallen on our whole nation."¹

Eleazar prays, "Be gracious to thy people, being satisfied with our penalty on their behalf. Make my blood their purification, and take my life as the substitute for (ἀντιψυχον) theirs."²

The Wisdom of Solomon likewise speaks of the sacrificial death of the righteous. God has "accepted them like the sacrifice of a whole burnt offering."³

Azariah prayed, "Neither is there at this time prince, or prophet, or leader, or burnt offering, or sacrifice, or oblation, or incense, or place to offer before thee and to find mercy. But in a contrite heart and a humble spirit let us be accepted, like as in the burnt offerings of rams and bullocks, and like as in ten thousands of fat lambs; so let our sacrifice be in thy sight this day, and grant that we may wholly go after

¹II Maccabees 7:32f., 37f.

²IV Maccabees 6:27ff; See 17:21f.

³The Wisdom of Solomon 3:1-6.

thee,¹ for they shall not be ashamed that put their trust in thee."

"In the 'law section' of the Letter of Aristeas the High Priest explains the restrictions of the burnt offerings to tame animals: 'for he who offers a sacrifice makes an offering also of his own soul in all its moods.'² This conception linked with the preceding quotations tends to support Harnack's explanation that, "For generations there had been a gradual neutralising of the sacrificial system proceeding apace within the inner life of Judaism even among the Pharisees." He goes further to explain that "this coincided with an historical situation which obliged by far the greater number of the adherents of the religion to live among conditions which had made them strangers for a long period to the sacrificial system. In this way they were rendered accessible on every side of their spiritual nature to foreign cults and philosophies, and thus there originated Persian and Graeco-Jewish religious alloys.

. . ."³

¹The LXX reading ἑσχατῶν "make thou atonement," is a correction to improve the sense. "Prayer of Azariah" 15-17, see R. H. Charles, op. cit., pp. 633f.

²Hicks, op. cit., p. 105.

³A. Harnack, Mission and Expansion of Christianity (London: Williams and Norgate, 1908), Vol. I, pp. 10f.

In the Extra-canonical writings then, sacrifices are not condemned, but the morality of the worshipper is stressed in the repeated declaration that numerous sacrificial offerings of the ungodly are of no avail. The individual who presented an acceptable sacrifice to Yahweh made an offering of his own soul. The historical situation made many strangers to the sacrificial system. The spiritualising of the sacrifices is seen in the teaching that charity and good works atone for sins. The Maccabean martyrs willingly accepted death considering it an opportunity for them to die as substitutes for the nation due punishment for sin. Their lives are accepted by Yahweh as a burnt offering.

The Dead Sea Scrolls

The Qumran discoveries enable us to trace the gradual crystallisation of the concept of spiritual sacrifice among Jews in its pre-Christian form. They describe the community as disapproving of the worship held in the Jerusalem Temple and consequently making substitutes for animal sacrifice. This led to an appropriation of the Temple liturgy, language and symbols in the observance of their own ritual. In this way the sect considered itself a spiritual temple and assumed the belief that the two services, that of the

Temple and their own, were equal.

The purpose of the order was "to lay a foundation of truth for Israel for the community of an eternal covenant, to atone for all who devote themselves for a sanctuary (וּתִיב) in Aaron and for a house (בַּיִת) of truth in Israel, and those who joined with them for community."¹ The parallel relationship between וּתִיב and בַּיִת and the fact that the concept being put forth is the idea of a "spiritual temple" suggest that וּתִיב not be translated "holiness" with M. Burrows and A. Dupont-Sommer but as "sanctuary" with P. Wernberg-Møller and J. Milik.²

The Qumran Covenanters stated quite clearly that the sect as a spiritual Temple was to function as an agency of atonement.³ The community was understood to "atone for the guilt of transgression and the iniquity of sin and to

¹The Manual of Discipline, V, 5-6. See VIII, 5-10. For translation see Millar Burrows, The Dead Sea Scrolls (London: Secker and Warberg, 1956). Unless otherwise noted this translation is used in this chapter though the more uniform method of identifying the plates and lines has been applied.

²P. Wernberg-Møller, The Manual of Discipline ("Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah," Vol. I., Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1957), p. 16.

³See The Manual of Discipline, V, 5f., quoted previously.

attain Divine goodwill for the land. . . ."1

In its work of atonement or expiation the community was to offer "a pleasant savour."² The question may be asked, "What was meant by the 'pleasant savour'?" David Flusser³ treats this by comparing the pleasant savour with the spiritual (Δοξικῆν) offering of the Testament of Levi which, in picturing the fourth heaven says, "The angels of the presence of the Lord . . . (offer) a pleasant savour, a spiritual (Δοξικῆν) and bloodless offering."⁴ This is not distant from the early service of Qumran especially since the sect claimed the presence of angels.⁵

If the "pleasant savour" meant a "spiritual and bloodless" sacrifice offered by the angels, this indicates

¹The Manual of Discipline, IX, 3f. Flusser's translation, op. cit., p. 230. Cf. The Manual of Discipline, VIII, 5-10.

²The Manual of Discipline, VIII, 5-10, Cf. Damascus Document, IX, 5 and III, 11.

³David Flusser, "The Dead Sea Sect and Pre-Pauline Christianity," Scripta Hierosolymitana edited by Chaim Rabin and Yigael (Jerusalem: The Hebrew University, 1958), Vol. IV, pp. 232ff.

⁴Testament of Levi 3:5f. See R. H. Charles, The Testaments of The Twelve Patriarchs (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1908), p. 34.

⁵The Thanksgiving Hymns, VI, 13 says they are in one company with the angels of the presence.

that the "pleasant savour" presented by the cult was also a "spiritual and bloodless" sacrifice since the sect regarded the earthly and heavenly services as parallel and since they did not offer animal sacrifices.

Various spiritual sacrifices were offered in the place of animal sacrifice.¹ The perfect lives and conduct of the members;² the "oblation of the lips"³ in prayer,⁴ praise and thanksgiving; and restraint, along with various purities,⁵ formed these spiritual sacrifices.

The idea that forgiveness of sins might be obtained

¹The Manual of Discipline, IX, 5, following translation of David Flusser, op. cit., p. 230.

²Ibid., VIII, 1-4. See translation of Wernberg-Møller, op. cit., p. 33.

³Ibid., IX, 5; X, 6, 8 and 14.

⁴The Damascus Document, XI, 18-21 states that "the sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination while the prayer of the righteous is like an acceptable oblation." See J. M. Baumgarten, "Sacrifice and Worship Among the Jewish Sectarians of the Dead Sea (Qumran) Scrolls," The Harvard Theological Review, Vol. XLVI, No. 3, July 1953, p. 145, showing that this law is based on a Midrashic interpretation of Proverbs 15:8, "the prayer of the righteous is His delight." Prayer is acceptable as a burnt offering by the Jews even today. See Israel Abrahams, S. Singer's Authorised Daily Prayer Book (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, Ltd., 1912), p. 238a.

⁵There was a "common purity" which imparted holiness to all members of the covenant to such an extent that it, the "common purity," may not be touched by outsiders. The Damascus Document, VIII, 17.

by means of the "perfect lives"¹ of the members is also shown in the words, ". . . there must be twelve men and three priests, perfect in all that has been revealed . . . to pay off sin by doing justice and suffering affliction."²

The Old Testament ideas concerning the righteous remnant and the new covenant weakened for the sect the Hebrew conception of the whole nation as God's elect, and gave rise to an emphasis on individual spirituality and individual election. This individualism is expressed in the fact that individuals joined the sect by choice; they were not born into it.

Upon entering the community the novice was expected to separate himself from previous associations, renounce personal desire and offering his "knowledge, strength and wealth"³ determine that every activity of life would fall within the frame of the covenant community. The reference to knowledge⁴ indicates the central place of the

¹The Manual of Discipline, IX, 5. See also III, 8-12.

²The Manual of Discipline, VIII, 1-4, translation of P. Wernberg-Møller, op. cit., p. 16.

³Ibid., I, 11ff. In the Habakkuk Commentary, II, 5, the reading is "wealth" instead of "wine" as in Habakkuk.

⁴W. D. Davies, "Knowledge in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Matthew 11:25-30," The Harvard Theological Review, Vol. XLXI, No. 3 (July, 1953), pp. 118f. where ΠΥΤ means "intelligent discernment."

law¹ in the community. Knowledge was offered that it might be purified "in the truths of God's ordinances."

Becoming a member demanded strong self-control for the individual was to be concerned with nothing but the will of God.² Intimate relations with outsiders were forbidden and the members were instructed to express hatred toward them according "to their guilt."³ To those within the community self-denial was to permeate the whole of experience; "to answer humbly before the haughty of spirit, and with a broken spirit to men of injustice; who point the finger and speak wickedly and are envious of wealth."⁴

The Qumran sect is generally identified with the Essenes. The characteristics of the Essenes,⁵ their sanctity, humility, renunciation, strict self-discipline and concept of covenant community are similar to the standards of the Qumran Covenanters.

¹It is to be noted that in II Maccabees men offer themselves for the law.

²The Manual of Discipline, IX, 25.

³Ibid., I, 10; see II, 5f.

⁴Ibid., XI, 1f.

⁵See Philo, Quod Omnis Probus Liber Sit, 75 and 77, Colson, op. cit., p. 55, and Josephus' Antiquities, XVIII, 19.



Whether the Essenes¹ and the Qumran sect are to be considered identical is not yet clear; but it is accurate to declare that there existed alongside the ritual of the Jerusalem Temple, the worship of a group or groups, Jewish in nature, who placed strong emphasis on spiritual sacrifices and strict self-denial.

There are words and ideas found in the literature of the Covenanters comparable to those in the Gospels. The persecution of the Teacher of Righteousness who suffered "vengeance in his body of flesh" may indicate a connexion with Messianic ideas.

The mission of the Servant of the Lord in Isaiah 50:4 is to "sustain with a word him that is weary." The Hymn Scroll VIII, 35f. says that there was "none to encourage him who was weary, with a word." W. H. Brownlee, accepting 7127 as the proper variant, points out that this is a Rabbinic word for divine revelation, especially the Torah and that the translation should be "weary for a word" and not "weary, with a word." He declares that this mission taken up by the sect is likewise taken up by Jesus in Matthew 11:28 where he invites

¹See K. Kohler, "The Essenes and the Apocalyptic Literature," The Jewish Quarterly Review, Vol. XI, No. 2 (October, 1920), pp. 160ff. for possible connexions between the Essenes and the Rechabites.

the heavy laden to take his yoke (the new Torah)¹ and find rest.²

One final point of interest is brought out in the peculiar emphasis of one of the Messianic hymns in its use of the word crucible or refining furnace in describing the womb of a mother for the purpose of teaching that a man must pass through the ordeal of suffering in order to become the Messiah: "there bursts forth from the crucible of the pregnant one, a Wonderful Counsellor."³ This refining can be compared with John 17:17-19 in which Jesus' passion is a sanctification. The point is thus made that if the sinless Jesus was nevertheless to be perfected through suffering, the idea and its adaptation may well have been influenced by current Essenic ideas.⁴

It is difficult, in spite of any similarities, to reconcile the teachings of Jesus and the Qumran sect, for

¹Cf. Qumran Isaiah Scroll 51:4f. on the personification of the Torah. In this variant the third person masculine suffix replaces the first person. See W. H. Brownlee, "Messianic Motifs of Qumran and The New Testament," New Testament Studies, III, 1956-57, p. 195.

²Davies, op. cit., p. 138 who points out similarities between The Manual of Discipline 10:20f. and Matthew 11:27-30. Cf. Brownlee, op. cit., pp. 19f. See Sirach 20:19 and 51:3.

³The Thanksgiving Hymn, III. Cf. John 16:21f.

⁴Brownlee, op. cit., pp. 25 and 30.

Jesus insisted upon love for enemies, while the sect, on the other hand, demanded hatred towards the sons of darkness. The vocabulary of the community will help in an understanding of what the words of Jesus meant to their hearers at the time; but the teaching of Jesus rather than being influenced by the sect, was an independent presentation which in some instances moved in the same direction.¹

The closing Psalm of The Manual of Discipline presents the idea that the pious of the community by day and night and seasons through prayer, praise, thanksgiving, restraint, and various purities were constantly offering spiritual sacrifices to God. Since the entire life of the writer was occupied with this effort, he offered nothing less than himself. Indeed it is so stated in the previous plate, "Then everything which is done, by that he will be accepted as a free-will offering."² This was emphasised in the demand for strict self-denial.

In summary then we see that the Qumran discoveries throw light on the sacrificial cultus of the Old Testament

¹See Burrows, op. cit., p. 328.

²The Manual of Discipline, IX, 24. See Wernberg-Møller, op. cit., p. 65 defending this translation on the assumption that the phraseology of this passage is modelled after Ezekiel 20:41, "As a pleasing odour I will accept you."

and on possible contacts with the concepts of self-denial and self-sacrifice as practised and taught by Jesus. They enable us to trace the gradual crystallisation of the concept of "spiritual sacrifice" among Jews before the time of Jesus.

The sect considered its community a sanctuary. This spiritual Temple was to function as an agency of atonement for guilt and iniquity. In its work of atonement the sect was to offer a "pleasant savour," "a spiritual and bloodless sacrifice" of perfection of life, prayer, praise, restraint and various purities. Self-denial was to permeate all relationships within the community.

The points of interest with regard to self-denial in the life and teaching of Jesus include the comparison of the self-renouncing mission of the community with the invitation of Jesus to take his yoke (the new Torah), the emphasis of the Covenanters on sanctification through suffering, and the actual statement that everything that is done by the Covenanters should be accepted as a free-will offering.

Rabbinic Judaism

In dealing with the Rabbinical literature as a source for material which may have bearing upon self-denial

and self-sacrifice in the life and teaching of Jesus, one is immediately faced with a mass of material the dates of which are highly questionable because of the post-Jesus completion of the Mishnah. Much of this literature, however, may be earlier than Jesus. Lest the conclusion be drawn that distinctive ideas which may have had their inception in Judaism be attributed to Jesus, the reflection of the Jewish Rabbis must be given consideration. Much care must be taken not to read back into Jesus' times strict regulations of the later Rabbis with reference to certain areas. The results of the comparison may of necessity seem speculative and incomplete.

With a national acceptance of the fact that sacrifices were the media between man's sin and God's forgiveness, Judaism of the first century A.D. had no place for anyone to question this as the verified method of communion with God.

Whatever the cultic practice had been in the Biblical Period, it was carried over into Rabbinic Judaism as accepted procedure;¹ but "A recognition of the joy

¹See Numbers Rabbah 19:1 (Chukkath), Midrash Rabbah edited by Rabbi Dr. H. Freedman and Maurice Simon (London: Socino Press, 1939), Vol. VI, 2, p. 745. See also "Sacrifice," The Jewish Encyclopedia, edited by J. Singer (London: Funk and Wagnall, Co., 1901), Vol. X, pp. 615f.

experienced by the Rabbinic Jew in being commanded to fulfil the Law and the enthusiasm which he felt at accomplishing that which he considered to be the will of God,"¹ is essential for gaining an understanding of that Law and the background of self-denial and self-sacrifice in the life and teaching of Jesus.

The religious demands of the Hebrews were integrated into the whole of individual and corporate life in such a way that the cultic worship, the morality, the piety, repentance, and the means of expiation were not autonomous areas.²

In their solidarity the whole people were responsible for all evils, individual and collective, and must expect God's judgment. In crushing Israel's nationalism, the exile had brought with it, of necessity, the individualism of responsibility for sin and repentance as expressed by Ezekiel.³ This is of extreme importance, for the outstanding progress of Judaism was that of clarifying religion as a personal relation between the individual and God, not in

¹S. Schechter, Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1909), p. 148.

²See George Foot Moore, Judaism in The First Centuries of The Christian Era (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927), Vol. II, pp. 3ff.

³Ezekiel 18.

isolation but in the fellowship of the community.¹ The distinguishing feature of the individualisation was repentance.²

The sacrificial practice was not adequately meeting the spiritual needs of Pharisaic Judaism for the rites were concerned only with sins committed unintentionally; sins of ignorance and error. Since sin was "a religious, not primarily a moral conception," the sin-offering was not "an offering for sin in our sense at all,"³ but was a prescribed means of expiation for inadvertent transgressions of cultic regulations. There was no real provision for premeditated sin. The deliberate offender was excluded from the community⁴ with no means of expiation. The early Rabbis were conscious of this situation and they discussed the relation of repentance and the sin-offering to wilful sinning.

¹See Moore, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 121; also pp. 113f. According to the paschal liturgy every man should consider himself as if he had left Egypt. See Hermann L. Strack und Paul Billerbeck, Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch (München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung Oskar Beck, 1924), IV, p. 68 on Pesikta 10:5.

²Yoma 8:8, 9 in Herbert Danby, The Mishnah (Oxford: At The Clarendon Press, 1933), p. 172. References to the Mishnah unless otherwise noted are from this source.

³Moore, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 461.

⁴Numbers 15:30.

Since there was no real distinction between moral sins and ceremonial transgressions different views were taken as to whether sacrifice might be effective for both.

For a real understanding of sacrifice by the individual worshipper "much depended on the conversation between him and the priest in front of the altar" where he may well be reminded that restitution must precede his offering.¹ It seems that this basic question, the lack of atonement for deliberate sin, found no authoritative answer and the problem remained.² This probably explains the prevalence of the Nazarite vow which offered a special opportunity for bringing a sin-offering.³

Down to the time of Christ the Rabbis increasingly emphasised the ethical aspects of sacrifice. As a result of this, Judaism of the first century A.D. "reveals clearly

¹A. Büchler, Studies in Sin and Atonement in The Rabbinic Literature of The First Century (London: Oxford University Press, 1928), p. 410; Cf. Matthew 5:3.

²Adam C. Welch, Post-Exilic Judaism (Edinburgh: Wm. Blackwood and Sons, 1935), p. 304, says: "I must conclude that the men of the Return left the fundamental contradiction unresolved and handed it to their successors."

³See Büchler, op. cit., p. 429. In Kerithoth 6:3, Baba b. Buta is described as bringing a free will guilt-offering of the pious every day except the day following the day of Atonement and wanted to bring one then.

that in its thought on sin and atonement it was not sacrifice that was central but certain moral and spiritual realities."¹

It has been shown that Israel accepted the covenant initiated by Yahweh and willingly became his servant expecting his protection in return. The exodus was understood as God's recovery² of an enslaved son. This recovery placed the Israelites in the complete power of God so that they were his subjects or slaves. In explaining why the exodus is mentioned in connection with many of the commandments, the Rabbis³ declared that it was like God, the king, ransoming the enslaved son of a friend, Abraham, to make him his own slave.

The acceptance by Israel of the one-sided covenant at Sinai was the basis for subjection to the Torah. This covenant bound Israel in the yoke of God. This yoke, sometimes called the yoke of the Torah,⁴ had been voluntarily

¹W. D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism (London: SPCK, 1948), p. 256, treating this whole subject.

²This and the following ideas about redemption are taken from David Daube, The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism (London: The Athlone Press, 1956), pp. 276ff.

³Sifre on Leviticus 15:41. See Daube, op. cit., p. 276.

⁴Aboth 3:5 (first century A.D.), Cf. 6:2. See Sifre on Leviticus 11:45 and 25:38.

accepted by Israel and any deviation from the yoke was considered a denial of Yahweh. For the rabbis freedom in the highest sense was slavery to God.

It is clear then that the covenant of God imposed the obligation to serve Him, but, unlike serving a conqueror or a human king, with joy and love.¹

During the exile the learned had found in the study of the sacrificial ritual a substitute for the actual cultus and at the same time a method of preserving the system in the minds and feelings of the worshippers for the time when the suspension should be removed. Thus when the Temple was annihilated in 70 A.D. and another suspension was in force, repentance, already established as the determining factor in the acceptance of any sacrifice to Yahweh, became the "sole condition for forgiveness."²

The ease with which the rabbis adapted themselves to this loss of the Temple illustrates that sacrifices even during the time of Jesus were not indispensable but that certain moral and spiritual realities were; repentance,³

¹Büchler, op. cit., pp. 456f.

²Moore, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 505f.

³See Tosefta, Yoma V:9; Yoma 8; see also Yoma 9. Sifra 102a. C. G. Montefiore, A Rabbinic Anthology (London: Macmillan and Company, 1938), pp. 230 and 238.

for example. The firm establishment of religion in the domestic life and the emphasis on individual responsibility provided the area for a spiritualisation of the sacrificial cultus.

Atoning effects could be accomplished by prayer,¹ justice,² charity,³ suffering,⁴ death,⁵ and service. The Rabbinic treatment of the narrative about Isaac bound at the altar offers good examples of their conceptions of self-sacrifice and atonement. R. Meir cites his master Akiba, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with . . . all thy soul (life) (Genesis 18:19) like Isaac, who bound himself upon the altar."⁶ The striking element here is the idea that Isaac "bound himself" to express his love for God, willingly surrendering his life to the divine command.

¹Pesikta, Shubah. Cf. Baumgartner, op. cit., p. 150.

²Aboth de R. Nathan 4. Strack-Billerbeck, op. cit., I, p. 500. Cf. Berakhoth I:1.

³Berakhoth 55a. Strack-Billerbeck, op. cit., I, p. 500.

⁴Berakhoth 5a and Kiddushin 316. Strack-Billerbeck, op. cit., I, p. 484, and II, p. 277, and IV, p. 1045.

⁵Berakhoth 60a. Strack-Billerbeck, op. cit., I, pp. 636f. Cf. 417f.

⁶Sifre Deuteronomy 6:5, 32nd Chapter. See Moore, op. cit., I, p. 536.

In the Old Testament, of course, Isaac is purely passive, but the Rabbinical writings emphasise his voluntary self-offering. According to Rabbinical chronology he was thirty-seven years old¹ and thus Abraham could not have bound him without his consent.

Certain ideas that appear in the teaching of Jesus had their inception in Judaism. Though these will be treated in detail later it is well at this point to notice the possible influence of the rabbis. A major idea is suggested by the word "yoke." The yoke of Torah² was a common Rabbinic expression. Obedience to the Torah such as would lead one to martyrdom³ was not uncommon in the first century A.D. Judaism. This obedience⁴ was being thought of in terms of death.⁵ In Matthew 11:29f. Jesus says, "Take my yoke (Yukós) upon you . . ."

¹Seder 'Olam R., c. 1.

²See treatment of Matthew 11:29f. in Chapter V of this thesis.

³Strack-Billerbeck, op. cit., I, pp. 224ff.

⁴R. Mach, Der Zaddik in Talmud und Midrasch (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1957), pp. 14f. showing that the righteous is characterised above all else by obedience to the will of God which manifested itself in the Torah.

⁵Berakhoth 61b.

probably contrasting his yoke with that of the Torah.¹

Jesus, lacking Rabbinic ordination, nevertheless spoke with authority.² Both he and his disciples obviously considered his authority superior to that of the rabbis. On the discussion between Jesus and his questioners concerning his authority it is easy to see how, "according to a person's assessment of Jesus' position, the notion of 'Rabbinic authority' might pass into that of 'divine authority' or 'almightiness.'"³ For Judaism the Torah was not mere legislation but the complete revelation of God, his purpose and his will for man.⁴ If Jesus to any extent intended to replace the Torah he did so not merely with his words, but with his person, calling for conformity

¹The commandments of Jesus are called ἑξῆς τοῦ Κυρίου, Didache 6:2. See Davies, op. cit., p. 150: "In Matthew clearly there is the substitution of Christ for the Torah; and Christ . . . is pictured after the image of the Torah."

²Matthew 7:28f., 21:23ff., Mark 1:22, 11:27ff. and Luke 20:1ff. See Mark 10:2ff. and Mark 7:15ff. which challenge Mosaic authority. Such questioning of Mosaic authority is without parallel in the teachings of the Rabbis. Günther Bornkamm, Jesus of Nazareth (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960), p. 99, E.T. of Jesus von Nazareth by Irene and Fraser McLuskey with James M. Robinson.

³Daube, op. cit., p. 217 and the whole chapter on Rabbinic authority.

⁴Moore, op. cit., I, p. 263.

to his teaching and his life. If the authenticity of Mark 10:45 be accepted the question is raised as to how one individual's act or obedience could avail for "many."

The clue¹ to this problem can be found in an understanding of the Rabbinical conception of merit² and imputed sin. The general thought was that the more commandments there were to be observed, the more opportunity there would be for Israel to acquire merit.³ According to the doctrine of the Merits of the Fathers, the righteousness of the Fathers produced merits charged to the account of Israel.⁴ Related to this is the idea that under certain circumstances one individual must suffer for the sins of another. The whole concept was closely related to the solidarity of the community in such a way that merit benefited not only the obedient member, but righteous persons living in the past, present, or future. The question was raised by R. Shemaiah and R. Abtalion (first century B.C.) as to what merit the Israelites possessed that Abraham's

¹See Davies, op. cit., pp. 268f. for the treatment that follows.

²Mach, op. cit., pp. 95ff.

³See Makkoth 3:16.

⁴Schechter, op. cit., p. 170.

faith was sufficient for them¹ but Abtalion said, "Worthy is the faith, they (the Israelites themselves) believed in me so that I shall divide the sea before them, as it is said: 'And the people believed.'"² The viewpoint of Shemaiah that one person's righteousness might produce merit for another prevailed.

There seems to be very little difference between the doctrine of reward as held by the rabbis and that by Jesus.³ Mark and Matthew present Jesus' statements about laying up treasures in heaven.⁴ The idea of the merits of the obedient atoning for the sins of men was accepted in pre-Christian Judaism. The priest, Eleazer prayed, "Be gracious to thy people, being satisfied with our penalty on their behalf. Make my blood their purification, and take my life as the substitute for theirs."⁵ The death of the righteous was commonly understood as a vicarious atonement.⁶

¹Mekilta, Beshallah 4. See Davies, op. cit., p. 268.

²Ibid.

³Montefiore, op. cit., p. 360.

⁴Matthew 6:19f.; 5:11f; Mark 10:21 and elsewhere.

⁵IV Maccabees 6:28f.

⁶Strack-Billerbeck, op. cit., pp. 278ff.

Jesus' teaching concerning self-denial and self-sacrifice¹ can be compared to the Rabbinical idea that one should not insist upon his own rights. R. Tanchumah ben Abba said, "If I exalt myself then they will lower my seat . . . and if I humble myself they will raise my seat."² R. Nehemiah (c. 150) said, "'Never in my life have I accepted presents, nor have I insisted on retribution (when wronged) and I have been generous with my money.'"³ R. Alexandri (end of second century A.D.) said, "He who hears himself cursed and has the opportunity to stop the man who curses him, and yet keeps silence, makes himself a partner with God, for God hears how the nations blaspheme him, and he is silent."⁴ God told Moses when he selected the seventy elders to explain to them, "on this condition you have been chosen, namely that you suffer them to curse and stone you; the condition I made with thee, I make with them."⁵

David Daube gives a clear treatment of retaliation.

¹Mark 8:34, Matthew 16:24 and Luke 9:23f.

²Strack-Billerbeck, op. cit., I, p. 249.

³Megillah 28a.

⁴Midrash Psalm on 86:1.

⁵Sifre on Numbers, Beha'aloteka, 92.

He explains that Jesus' teaching "do not resist one who is evil"¹ is a natural product of Jewish teaching. The maxim "eye for eye" does not refer to retaliation in the literal or physical sense, for at the time of Jesus, money payments took the place of the ancient concept of retaliations.² Jesus was not speaking of damage to one's person but a case of insult in which there was the legal right to receive payment. "An eye for an eye" characterises one who stands on his rights receiving a calculated compensation for an insult instead of humiliating himself before another. Thus the maxim advocates that one should not insist on his right for compensation when insulted but instead should practise a humility which cannot be wounded and a giving of oneself to his fellow man. This teaching is similar to that of Gamaliel II (end of first century A.D.) and Judah ben Elai, that if you are struck you must forgive the offender even though he does not ask your forgiveness:³ and "learn to receive suffering, and forgive those who insult you."⁴

¹Matthew 5:38f.; Cf. Luke 6:27ff.

²Baba Kamma 8:6, "If a man cuffed his fellow he must pay him a sela . . . if he slapped him he must pay him 200 zuz etc."

³Tosephta, Baba Kamma 9:29.

⁴Aboth de R. Nathan, I, xli, 67a.

The phrase "take up one's cross" as used by Jesus to mean submission to suffering is not found in the older Rabbinic literature.¹ The teaching that does appear is that one should take upon himself suffering or chastisement. R. Ammi (c. 300 A.D.) and R. Asi said: "The tradition relating to suffering is silence and prayer."² The phrase is used in the New Testament because one must carry his own cross to the place of crucifixion. The statement is made that "Abraham took the wood of the burnt-offering (and put it on the shoulders of Isaac) like one who carries his stake (cross) on his shoulder."³ If the New Testament teaching is that the cross must be borne in order to give Jesus precedence over one's self, the rabbis in a parallel manner had taught that any amount of suffering was to be endured to give the Torah and obedience to God preference.⁴ "Deliberate, voluntary, and complete renunciation is not put forward as an ideal by the rabbis."⁵ The highest

¹Strack-Billerbeck, op. cit., I, p. 587.

²Berakoth 62a.

³Genesis Rabbah 56, (Vayera).

⁴Berakoth 63b. See C. G. Montefiore, Rabbinic Literature and Gospel Teaching (London: Macmillan Company, 1930), pp. 231f.

⁵Ibid., p. 355.

possible ideal in Judaism was the unity of the family. To abandon loved ones and renounce all ties as Jesus demanded, in order to benefit Judaism or society ^{lies outside Rabbinic} teaching.

In the words, "If any one would be first, he must be last of all and servant of all,"¹ Jesus meant something more than that a person of greatness should give up his place of importance on some particular occasion as the following. At a banquet R. Eleazar (90 A.D.) refused to allow Gamaliel to pour wine for him while R. Joshua accepted the drink. Joshua explained that they should allow Gamaliel, the son of a rabbi, to pour for them because Abraham (Genesis 18:8) served angels who appeared as Arabs to him. R. Zadok then said, "How long will you disregard the honour of the omnipresent and occupy yourselves with the honour of men. The Holy one . . . causeth the wind to blow, the vapours to ascend, the rain to fall, the earth to yield and sets a table before everyone, and . . . shall not R. Gamaliel Berabbi stand over us and offer drink?"² Jesus meant a life dedicated to serving one's fellowman as

¹Mark 9:35; 10:43f; Matthew 20:26f; 23:11; Luke 22:26; 9:48b. Cf. R. Tanchuman ben Abba, Strack-Billerbeck, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 249f.

²Kiddushin 32b. See Strack-Billerbeck, *op. cit.*, I, p. 838.

partially expressed in the idea that "the one who shelters is greater than the one sheltered."¹ Rabbi Joshua ben Levi's speech concerning the future existence: "I have seen the world turned upside down, the highest were made lowest and the lowest highest."²

A closer parallel is seen in the story of R. Gamaliel calling for two rabbis intending to appoint them heads of congregations is similar. When they hesitated to accept the honour, apparently out of reserve, he said, "Do you imagine that I offer you rulership? It is servitude that I offer you." He then cited I Kings 12:7, "If thou wilt be a servant unto this people this day,"³ emphasising that leadership carried with it a bondage of service. A similar example explains Exodus 32:7: "'Get thee down.'" What does this mean? R. Eleazar said, "God spake to Moses, 'Descend from your greatness. Have I at all given to thee greatness save for the sake of Israel? And now that Israel

¹Genesis Rabbah 78; Strack-Billerbeck, op. cit., II, p. 257.

²Strack-Billerbeck, op. cit., I, pp. 249f.

³Horayoth 10a and 10b. On "Greatness flees from the one who seeks it," see Strack-Billerbeck, op. cit., I, p. 921. On "Do not do unto thy neighbor what is unpleasant to thyself as being the whole of the Torah," see Strack-Billerbeck, op. cit., I, p. 907.

has sinned, then why do I want thee?"¹

Closely related to greatness through service is humility.² The rabbis considered this one of the great virtues. R. Johanan said, "The words of the Torah abide only with him who regards himself as nothing."³ "He who humbles himself, God exalts; him who exalts himself, God humbles; from him who searches for greatness, greatness flies; him who flies from greatness, greatness searches out . . ."⁴ In their lifetime in the midst of sufferings the righteous are higher than the angels in God's sight.⁵ Hillel (c. 20 B.C.) was conspicuous for his humility. He said, "My abasement is my exaltation, and my exaltation is my abasement."⁶

The notion that humility rather than self-assertion leads to greatness antecedes Hillel and is universal.⁷

¹Berakoth 32a.

²Matthew 23:12; Cf. 18:4; Luke 14:11; 18:14; Cf. I Peter 5:6.

³Sotah 21b.

⁴Erubin 12b.

⁵Strack-Billerbeck, op. cit., III, p. 673.

⁶Leviticus Rabbah 1:5. Strack-Billerbeck, op. cit., I, p. 249.

⁷Daube, op. cit., p. 346 cites pagan references.

David Daube explains that there were probably traditional Jewish maxims about humility and accommodation. He bases this upon Hillel's method of dealing with proselytes¹ and the following examples from the Letter of Aristeas. The king's question as to how he may be favourably accepted when he travels abroad is answered with, "By becoming equal to all."² The Letter also explains that one can best persuade his opponent in an attitude of subjection³ and that one can avoid pride by bearing in mind the virtue of equality, since God puts down the proud and exalts the humble.⁴ David Daube's conclusion is drawn from the grammatical usage of Romans 12:16. The exhortation, "mind not high things but condescend to low ones" uses absolute participles, a curious and strange usage which is explained as an extremely literal translation from the probable Hebrew code: μη̄... φρονοῡντες ἰσθᾶ... συναπαγο̄μενος "not minding but condescending."⁵ It may be then that this

¹Tosefta, Berakoth 2:24. "Do not appear naked, do not appear dressed . . ."

²Letter of Aristeas 257.

³Ibid., 266.

⁴Ibid., 262f.

⁵Daube, op. cit., p. 348. See also E. G. Selwyn, The First Epistle of St. Peter (London: Macmillan and Company, 1946), appended note by D. Daube, pp. 467-488.

maxim, serve and be humble to win those far from you, had its influence upon the teachings of Jesus.¹

The baptismal instruction given in the Talmud asked the proselyte if he knows that "Israel at this time is broken down, pushed about, driven about, tossed about, and that sufferings befall them." If he replied, "I know and am not worthy," no further tests were needed. The important thing for a person becoming a Jew was that "he must recognise that even Israel's humiliation in this age means exaltation."²

R. Abba ben Yudan said: "All that God has declared to be unclean in animals he has pronounced desirable in men. In animals he has declared 'blind or broken or maimed or having a wen' to be unserviceable (leviticus 22:22), but in men he has declared the broken and crushed heart to be desirable. R. Alexandri said: "If a private person uses broken vessels, it is a disgrace to him, but God uses broken vessels as it is said, the Lord is nigh to the broken-hearted (Psalm 34:18)."³

We shall now consider the idea that one may find

¹Matthew 18:1ff., Mark 9:33 and Luke 9:46ff.

²Daube, op. cit., p. 114.

³Leviticus Rabbah Zaw, 7:2.

his life by losing it, and by losing it find it¹ in the light of Rabbinic literature. Alexander of Macedon asked the wise men of the south, "What shall a man do that he may live? They answered, let him kill himself (his lust). And what should a man do that he may die? They answered, let him keep himself (his lust) alive."² Rabbi Judah, the Prince, said: "If thou hast done his will as thy will, thou hast not done his will as his will; and if thou hast done his will as against thy will, then thou hast done his will as his will; if it be thy will that thou shouldst not die, die that thou mayest not die; if it be thy will that thou shouldst live, live not, so that thou mayest live; it is better for thee to die in this world against thy will, than to die in the world to come."³ The teaching in these instances is probably the same, that if one saves his life through treachery to the cause he really loses it, but if he sacrifices his life in service he really finds it.

R. Jonathan repeated Ecclesiastes 9:5, "The living

¹Matthew 10:39; 16:25; Luke 17:33; 9:24; Mark 8:35, and Cf. John 12:25.

²Tamid 32a. See Strack-Billerbeck, op. cit., I, pp. 587f.

³Aboth de R. Nathan 36a. See Strack-Billerbeck, op. cit., I, p. 588.

know that they will die, but the dead know not anything," to R. Kiyya. "My Son," said R. Kiyya, "you know the Scriptures, but not their interpretation. 'The living,' these are the righteous, for even after their death they are called living; 'The dead,' these are the wicked, for even in their lifetime they are called dead."¹ Elsewhere the statements are made, "He who preserves one word of the law preserves his soul," and "he who destroys one word of the law destroys his soul."²

In conclusion, we see that in Rabbinical Judaism Israel considered itself completely subject to Yahweh. This was a result of the release from Egypt which made them slaves or servants of Yahweh and brought with it the worship and social laws provided in the Torah. To the pious this submission was not considered a burden but was a relationship of love and joy.

The validity of the cultic sacrificial worship was dependent upon repentance which had become increasingly individualised, though not isolated from the community. This emphasised the weakness of the sacrificial system; namely, the lack of provision for sins committed

¹Ecclesiastes Rabbah 9:5. See Montefiore, Rabbinic Anthology, p. 494.

²Aboth de R. Nathan 39a.

intentionally. With the destruction of the temple in 70 A.D., sacrificial ritual of necessity became spiritualised. This was possible because even before the loss of the temple atoning efficacy was accomplished through repentance, study of the law, prayer, almsgiving, chastisements, death, and other means. The giving of oneself for the Torah and Israel was encouraged. Thus Jesus assuming in his person characteristics of a New Torah was able to inculcate such latent spiritualisation.

Certain attitudes and concepts with regard to self-denial and self-sacrifice in the life and teaching of Jesus bear the influence of Rabbinic Judaism. These include the yoke of Christ, obedience to death, the doctrine of merit, renunciation, finding greatness in service, humility and the losing of one's life to find it. Not least of these concepts is the image of redemption. The rabbis were familiar with the idea of losing one's life voluntarily or otherwise for the sake of others. The thought of death as atonement, as we have shown, was quite common. Of this David Daube has said, "If Jesus dealt with the world in charity and if both his deeds and his teaching impressed on his followers the need for taking the same course, this was only in line with the

traditional nature and role of redemptive activity in
Judaism."¹

¹Daube, op. cit., p. 272.

CHAPTER II

JESUS' ATTITUDE TOWARD SACRIFICIAL PRACTICES

In order to draw conclusions as to what Jesus meant by his own self-giving and his demand for self-denial and self-sacrifice on the part of his disciples, it is necessary to determine his attitude toward sacrifice.

Jesus, reared in and devoted to Judaism, accepted the sacrificial system and considered himself a loyal Jew. He wore the Κραοιτέδον¹ and showed great respect for the temple and the synagogue. Mark, who says, "He entered the synagogues and taught,"² summarised Jesus' Galilean ministry with the words, "And he went throughout

¹LXX on Deuteronomy 22:12 and Numbers 15:37 clarifies this usage. The wearing of the zizith was a legal requirement for distinguishing the Jew from the Gentile; Mark 6:56 and Matthew 14:36; 9:20; 23:5 and Luke 8:44. See B. H. Branscomb, Jesus and The Law of Moses (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1930), pp. 115f.

²Mark 1:21; 3:1; 6:2 and Cf. Luke 4:15. In treating Gospel narratives I follow the "Two-source Theory" which accepts the view that Matthew and Luke in addition to other material used the Gospel of Mark and the Q document. See M. Dibelius, From Tradition To Gospel (London: Ivor Nicholson and Watson, 1934), p. 233, E.T. of Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums by Bertram Lee Woolf.

all Galilee, preaching in their synagogues . . ."1 Towards the end of his ministry Jesus states, "Day after day I was with you in the temple teaching."2

Jesus paid the annual tax for the support of the Temple.³ As a worshipper he would hardly have refused such payment, but the later community including many Christians who considered themselves free from Jewish law would question this obligation.⁴ Thus even though the words are probably later tradition they indicate that the church paid the Temple tax and support the conclusion that Jesus did also.

Jesus' activity regarding the passover is sometimes taken as an example of his support of the sacrificial system.⁵ The matter of fact manner in which the disciples

¹Mark 1:39.

²Mark 14:49. See Mark 11:27 and 12:35. Cf. Luke 19:47 and 21:37.

³Matthew 17:24. The Sadducees said the payment should be voluntary. See Branscomb, *op. cit.*, p. 14. Even if this should not be an authentic word of Jesus, the fact that the church paid the temple tax indicates Jesus' support.

⁴S.E. Johnson on Matthew 17:24 in The Interpreter's Bible, VII (New York: Abington Press, 1951), p. 465 and R. Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament (London: S.C.M. Press, 1952), I, p. 17, E.T. of Theologie des Neuen Testaments by Kendrick Grobel.

⁵Matthew 26:1, 2; Mark 14:1, 2 and Luke 22:1, 2.

prepare for the passover suggests that this was no deviation from what might be expected.¹ Most scholars agree that whether the Last Supper was a Passover meal or not,² paschal thoughts and terminology dominate the occasion;³ and Jesus' activity indicates, at least, his acquiescence toward sacrifices.

Jesus encouraged others to support the sacrificial system. Mark describes the incident in which a leper begged Jesus for healing. Having performed the act, Jesus told him, "See that you say nothing to anyone; but go, show yourself to the priest, and offer for your cleansing what Moses commanded, for a proof to the people."⁴ The Levitical requirement included the sacrifice of lambs and a cereal offering.⁵ Thus Jesus commended the sacrificial ceremony laid out in the Torah. It has been suggested that the phrase ἐς μυστήριον αὐτοῦς indicates that Jesus wanted to prove to the priests that

¹Mark 14:12; cf. Luke 22:15.

²See John 13:8 and cf. Oesterley, op. cit., p. 276. See also G. B. Gray, op. cit., pp. 352 and 376.

³See J. Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955), pp. 1-57 and a treatment following later in this thesis.

⁴Mark 1:44. Cf. Matthew 8:4 and Luke 5:14.

⁵Leviticus 14:10.

he supported sacrificial practices. But Jesus would hardly have asked for secrecy if he had been trying to prove something about himself. The meaning is probably that "all may know in the official way that you are cleansed."¹

In the curing of the ten lepers² Jesus would hardly have insisted upon their supporting the sacrificial system if he had been repudiating it. Had he asked them to go to the priests simply because it was socially necessary in order to be declared clean, he would have made this quite clear.

Jesus' attitude toward sacrifices is shown in his teachings. He declared, "So if you are offering your gift at the altar, and remember that your brother has something against you, leave your gift there before the altar and go; first be reconciled to your brother, and then come and offer your gift."³ The gift, probably a special sacrifice as in 23:18f., is unacceptable as long as the offerer is improperly related to his brother. Jesus' attitude seems

¹Branscomb, op. cit., p. 117.

²Luke 17:14.

³Matthew 5:23.

to be that the sacrifice in itself is nothing;¹ spirituality is the essential thing. It seems that for Jesus participation in the sacrifices was taken for granted with no misgivings.²

In teaching that the temple made sacred the gold that adorned it and the altar the gift upon it,³ Jesus indicates his support of the Temple and its sacrifices. His interest in sacrificial activity is suggested by his adding the term "blood" to the teaching of Jeremiah with regard to the new covenant, calling it the "new covenant in my blood."⁴

The positive side of Jesus' attitude toward the Temple and sacrifice has been shown, but there are sayings expressing a more reserved attitude. To say the least, Jesus anticipated the replacement of the sacrificial cultus. In fact the cultus as practiced at the time of

¹This is in line with Rabbinical teaching. See Yoma 8:9: "The day of Atonement . . . does not atone for offenses against man's neighbor, till he reconciles his neighbor." Danby, op. cit., p. 172.

²Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, I, p. 17.

³Matthew 23:17 and 23:19 (The M source indicates a high regard for the Temple. See V. Taylor, op. cit., p. 71). Jesus may be simply adopting the shallow methods of the Pharisees to show the absurdity of the principle that sacredness is a quality which can be imparted by contact--the old taboo concept. See Oesterley, op. cit., p. 277.

⁴Mark 14:24, Luke 22:20 and Matthew 26:28.

I Cor. 11:25.

Jesus to a great extent had lost its original cultic meaning. What took place in the Temple was more of an observation of ritual carried out because of legal requirements than an act of cultic worship. However, at the great feasts real cultic piety was probably reanimated.¹

In interpreting the law for daily life the synagogue services had forced Temple sacrifices into the background and the Scribes had become the symbol of authority in the place of the priests.² Nowhere in the teaching of Jesus is there a direct attack on the sacrifices of the Temple.

There are passages which indicate that Jesus may have challenged the presuppositions of the sacrificial practices. A close examination of these is important. According to Matthew, Jesus uses words of Hosea to explain why he ate with sinners, "Go and learn what this means, I desire mercy, and not sacrifice;"³ but this is probably an insertion into the story of Mark.⁴ It hardly supports the opinion that Jesus repudiated the sacrificial system. The same quotation is used to explain the disciples'

¹Bultmann, op. cit., I, p. 17.

²Ibid.

³Matthew 9:13 citing Hosea 6:6.

⁴Mark 2:16f.

plucking ears of corn on the Sabbath: "And if you had known what this means, 'I desire mercy, and not sacrifice,' you would not have condemned the innocent."¹ This likewise is an insertion into the Markan narrative.² The texts of the Old Testament quotation agree with the Hebrew rather than the Greek of the Septuagint. If these two passages go back to Jesus, they probably stood originally in a different context. In using these words the prophet was attacking the offering of sacrifices in the wrong spirit rather than the cultus itself. If Jesus used the words he was following the prophet's emphasis of morality above sacrifice.

In the context of Matthew 12:7 Jesus declares that "something greater than the temple is here."³ This last phrase may have originated in a different context, but the fact that it is peculiar to Matthew is a strong argument in favour of its genuineness since the conservative Jewish background would not encourage the gathering of sayings of this kind.⁴ In any case, this illustrates that Jesus was

¹Matthew 12:7.

²Mark 2:23-28.

³Matthew 12:6.

⁴T.W. Manson, *The Sayings of Jesus* (London: S.C.M. Press, 1949), pp. 187f. See Branscomb, *op. cit.*, p. 221, who interprets the "greater something" as a Messianic claim and therefore declares the saying unauthentic.

understood to have considered something to be more important than the Temple and its services.

If Matthew 12:6 be interpreted as a fulfillment of the Temple sign in the person of Jesus then Jesus is making clear the "provisional and at the same time necessary value" of Temple sacrifices in the plan of God.¹ This provisional value of sacrifice becomes even more clear when we understand Jesus' statement about the greatest commandment. According to Matthew he says that the two great commandments are to love God and one's neighbour and that on "these two commandments depend all the law and the prophets."² The superiority of moral claims over cultic ones is announced.

Matthew is following the corresponding saying in Mark in which Jesus says, "There is no other commandment greater than these."³ The difference between the two is explained by the fact that the Matthean change, which makes the other commandments dependent upon these two rather than inferior as suggested by Mark, is caused by Jewish-Christian reverence for the Law, and this

¹Jacob, Theology of the Old Testament, p. 262. Cf. John 2:20.

²Matthew 12:6.

³Mark 12:28-34. Cf. Luke 10:27f.

interpretation would prevent any conflict between the two great commandments and the rest.¹ In the Marcan account Jesus commends the Scribe for his wisdom in understanding that this "is much more than all whole burnt offerings and sacrifices."²

In his principle that "what comes out of a man is what defiles a man,"³ Jesus was dealing with more than ritual cleanness such as appears in Leviticus 16. He not only questions the Scriptural interpretation of the regulatory practices, but in essence he contests the validity of the "presuppositions of the entire cultus of old with its practices of sacrifice and atonement."⁴ It is doubtful that Jesus meant his words to be interpreted as a direct attack on sacrificial practices for the words "fit into an era in which things originally meant in a cultic, ritualistic sense are being spiritualised and moralised."⁵ This spiritualisation lays the background for self-denial

¹T.W. Manson, op. cit., p. 227.

²Mark 12:33.

³Mark 7:18-23 and Matthew 15:17-20.

⁴Ernst Käsemann, "Das Problem des Historischen Jesus," Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche, Vol. 51, 1954, p. 146.

⁵Bornkamm, op. cit., p. 98.

and self-sacrifice as practiced and taught by Jesus.

The time of the cleansing of the Temple is earlier in John than in the Synoptics,¹ where it comes at the pass-over which ended Jesus' life. Similar wording indicates one cleansing. The Johannine arrangement is the result of theological interests and suggests a replacement of the sacrifices, while the Synoptic narrative shows concern for purification within Judaism.² The replacement is suggested in John 7:37f. which states that Jesus appeared at the famous water ceremony of the Feast of Tabernacles to say, "If anyone thirst, let him come to me and drink," and on the next day identified himself with the Festival of Lights in the words, "I am the Light of the world."³ Thus for John not only is the destruction of the temple involved but "with it the whole Jewish sacrificial system. Henceforth the sanctuary where men must come to worship is 'the temple of his body.'"⁴

¹Mark 11:15ff.; Matthew 21:12, 13; Luke 19:45. See A.E.J. Rawlinson, The Gospel According to Saint Mark (London: Methuen and Co., Ltd., 1925), p. 156.

²C.K. Barrett, The Gospel According to St. John (London: S.P.C.K., 1956), pp. 163f.

³Ethelbert Stauffer, Jesus and His Story (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1960), p. 90. E.T. of Jesus: Gestalt und Geschichte by Richard and Clara Winston.

⁴G.E.P. Cox, The Gospel According to Saint Matthew (London: S.C.M. Press, 1958), p. 131.

Jesus, then, supported the Temple and sacrifices by identifying himself with the Jews, paying the tax to support sacrificial practices, participating in the Passover, encouraging others to support the sacrificial system, expressing belief in the sanctity of the altar, and adding the term "blood" to the new covenant.

In challenging many presuppositions of the cultus, Jesus taught the superiority of morality. He made clear the "provisional and at the same time necessary value" of the Temple sacrifices in the plan of God. He commended a Scribe for understanding that to love God and one's neighbour is more than all sacrifices. In its logical conclusion, Jesus' teaching that man is defiled by what comes out of him questions the validity of the whole ritual. Actually sacrificial requirements are "lifted off (their) hinges by Jesus as he rises above Sabbath laws and external correctness."¹

It is doubtful that Jesus ever meant for his words to be interpreted as a direct attack on sacrificial practices. He did not make a sharp distinction between the moral and ceremonial law, but in his teaching the moral law was given emphasis. Jesus was speaking in an era when

¹Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, I, 1951, p. 17.

things originally meant in a cultic way were being moralised and spiritualised.

Jesus was aware of the value and the limitations of sacrifice. Had he attacked the sacrificial cult the parties represented by Paul and James in the early Christian community would not have been able to appeal to sayings of Jesus which apparently supported the opinions of each side.¹

Nowhere is it clearly stated that Jesus ever offered a sacrifice. This fact may indicate that Jesus assumed a position of detachment with acquiescence in regard to the sacrificial cult. This becomes even clearer when Jesus states, "Think not that I have come to abolish the law and the prophets; I have come not to abolish but to fulfill them."² It is this question to which we must later give our attention: How was sacrifice fulfilled by Jesus?

¹V. Taylor, Jesus and His Sacrifice, p. 73.

²Matthew 5:17.

CHAPTER III

SELF-DENIAL AND SELF-SACRIFICE IN THE LIFE OF JESUS AS PRESENTED IN THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS

According to the Markan Order

The background of the sacrificial cultus and Jesus' attitude toward the cult have been treated. According to the Gospels, Jesus uses sacrificial terminology with reference to his self-denial and self-sacrifice. It is now essential to determine Jesus' conception of his own life and death as it is related to sacrifice. This will entail a detailed analysis of various Synoptic references touching this area including the suffering Son of man sayings so essential to Chapter IV of this thesis.

1. Mark 2:19f. -- "And Jesus said to them, 'Can the wedding guests fast while the bridegroom is with them? As long as they have the bridegroom with them, they cannot fast. (20) The days will come, when the bridegroom is taken away from them, and then they will fast in that day.'"¹

¹Parallels: Matthew 9:15 and Luke 5:34f. Both omit Mark 2:19b.

This is the first hint of Jesus' death in the Markan narrative. Rudolf Bultmann says that 19a had its origin in a debate, but hardly the one mentioned in the context, which is so indefinite. He declares the words are the church's creation.¹ The authenticity of the verses is called into question for the very reason that they are spoken so early in the ministry of Jesus while the other passion sayings fall after the confession of Peter at Caesarea Philippi. It is contended that the attitude toward fasting in verse 20 is inconsistent with that in verse 19a. Thus 19b and 20 are explained as additions placed there by the Christian community to justify their practice of fasting. The reference in 19a, "while the bridegroom is with them," is not a reference to the Messiah but was probably originally a circumlocution for "during the wedding."²

¹Rudolf Bultmann, The History of the Synoptic Tradition (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1963), p. 19. E.T. of Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition, by John Marsh. See C. H. Dodd, Parables of the Kingdom (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1936), p. 116. See M. Dibelius, From Tradition to Gospel (London: Nicholson and Watson, 1934), p. 65. E.T. of Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums by Bertram Lee Woolf.

²Joachim Jeremias, The Parables of Jesus⁶ (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1963), p. 52. E.T. of Die Gleichnisse Jesu⁶ by S. H. Hooke. See also Jeremias, "Ἐν τῷ γάμῳ," T.W.z.N.T., IV, p. 1096.

On the other hand the parallelism in the two sections of Mark 2:19 is continued in Mark 2:20. It is also quite possible that Jesus adapted a common Semitic idiom or proverb to emphasise the contrast between the relationship of John to his disciples and that of Jesus to his.¹ A. E. J. Rawlinson suggesting that all this happened soon after the Baptist's death says, "It is difficult not to feel that we have here an entirely appropriate occasion for the first overt foreboding of coming death."²

When this is evaluated it seems that in Mark 2:19a Jesus put forth a question in response to a question. He said in essence, "'Can the wedding-guests fast during the wedding?'"³ Any allusion to Jesus' death is heavily veiled. Verses 19b and 20 are a secondary development of 19a, for 19b seems to contradict 19a in the declaration that disciples will fast and in verse 20 the bridegroom has become allegorical of the Messiah.⁴

¹Vincent Taylor, The Gospel According to St. Mark (London: Macmillan and Co., 1959), pp. 210f.

²Rawlinson, op. cit., p. 31.

³Jeremias, The Parables of Jesus, p. 52.

⁴Ibid. Cf. Ernst Lohmeyer, Das Evangelium des Markus (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1954), p. 60.

2. Mark 8:31 -- "And he began to teach them that the Son of man must suffer many things, and be rejected by the elders and the chief priests and the scribes, and be killed, and after three days rise again."¹ This is the first of three deliberate efforts on the part of Jesus to reveal to his disciples his thoughts concerning his death. The other two passages will be considered along with this one.

3. Mark 9:31 -- "for he was teaching his disciples, saying to them, 'The Son of man will be delivered into the hands of men, and they will kill him; and when he is killed, after three days he will rise.'"²

4. Mark 10:33f. -- ". . . Behold, we are going up to Jerusalem; and the Son of man will be delivered to the chief priests and scribes, and they will condemn him to death, and deliver him to the Gentiles; and they will mock him, and spit upon him, and scourge him, and kill him; and after three days he will rise."³

There is a variety of opinion about these verses.

¹Parallels: Matthew 16:21 and Luke 9:22, with only minor changes.

²Parallels: Matthew 17:22f., and Luke 9:44, with some omissions.

³Parallels: Matthew 20:18f., and Luke 18:31-3 with omissions.

Some scholars agree with R. Bultmann, "To be sure, the predictions of the passion foretell his execution as divinely foreordained. But can there be any doubt that they are vaticinia ex eventu?"¹ It is the strong correspondence of the details of Jesus' delivery to the religious leaders, his condemnation, delivery to the Gentiles, the mocking, spitting, scourging, killing, and the rising after three days, with the actual events described in Mark 14:16 that gives cause for questioning.² There is undoubtedly some colouring of Jesus' words due to knowledge of the event. Mark 10:33f. is so detailed that it must be a vaticinium ex eventu with the exception of the passion prophecy. Mark 8:31 though less detailed names the elders, chief priests and scribes. Mark 9:31 seems closer than 8:31 or 10:33f. to the words of Jesus though the "after three days" phrase (but not the fact of his exaltation) is an addition.³ This is by no means to deny that in substance the meaning of Jesus' prediction of suffering and exaltation remains intact.

¹R. Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, Vol. I, 1952, p. 29.

²Cf. Matthew 20:19 and its reference to "crucifixion."

³See the relation of the three narratives to the passion narrative charted by Vincent Taylor, op. cit., pp. 436f.

R. Otto and other scholars have taken this position that Jesus foresaw his suffering: "He possessed the charisma of prophecy and exercised it with reference to himself."¹ The conclusion is drawn that only expressions like the opening words of Mark 9:31, "The Son of man will be delivered into the hands of man,² and they will kill him . . ." are original, and that the latter part of the verse is the work of the community. But if Jesus sees himself as the Servant³ and foretells his suffering, why

¹Rudolph Otto, The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man (London: The Lutterworth Press, 1938), p. 363. E.T. of Reich Gottes und Menschensohn, by Floyd V. Filson and Betram Lee Woolf. See also V. Taylor, Jesus and His Sacrifice, p. 87. See especially in this connexion Ernst Fuchs, "Die Frage nach dem historischen Jesus," Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche, LIII, 1956, p. 222, who says that at his baptism, Jesus had acknowledged that act as a declaration of his intended humiliation and suffering. Then at the news of the cruel death of John the Baptist, Jesus was forced to decide what this death meant to Him. Recognizing the fate of the Baptist he must have reckoned with the possibility of his own violent end, for after the beheading, Jesus intensified the work which pointed toward Jerusalem. On Jesus' Baptism as an acceptance of humiliation see Oscar Cullmann, Baptism in The New Testament (London: S.C.M. Press, 1952), pp. 16-18. E.T. of Die Tauflehre des Neuen Testaments by J. K. S. Reid.

²Cf. E. Lohmeyer, op. cit., p. 192, says this has a deeper meaning than a mere reference to Judas. It includes all that happens in the passion in that the world is against the Son of man.

³Otto, op. cit., p. 244, says Jesus clothed "Messiah" with the suffering of Isaiah 53. On the view that "Servant of the Lord" had no influence see Morna Hooker, Jesus and the Servant (London: S.P.C.K., 1959) and C. K. Barrett, "The Background of Mark 10:45," in New Testament Essays edited by A. J. B. Higgins (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1959), pp. 1ff.

could he not also foresee the exaltation, an implied resurrection?¹ And even if the position of Morna Hooker be taken, that the Suffering Servant had no special influence on Jesus, the conclusion remains that as Son of man he represents those who have experienced suffering and who will in exaltation become the glorified Son of man.²

These sayings in Mark 8:31, 9:31, and 10:33f. have certain elements in common. All three use the designation, Son of man.³ Each points to the suffering, rejection and death of the Son of man. And they all stress the necessity of the future events. R. H. Fuller has made an interesting study of these sayings, adding to the group Mark 9:12 and Mark 10:45.⁴ He sees in the stress on necessity the influence of the Suffering Servant of Deutero-Isaiah on Jesus' consciousness of his impending

¹Isaiah 53:11-12a.

²Hooker, *op. cit.*, p. 96 and 160, simply shifts the suffering aspect from the Servant to the Son of man. See a review of Miss Hooker's book by Joachim Jeremias, Journal of Theological Studies, n.s. 11, 1960, p. 142. See also remarks opposing her position by A. J. B. Higgins, Jesus and The Son of Man (London: Lutterworth Press, 1964), pp. 47 and 204, and R. H. Fuller, The New Testament in Current Study (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1962), p. 141 N.8.

³See Chapter IV of this thesis.

⁴These are discussed separately in this thesis.

death. Fuller selects from these sayings the portions which do not "refer to concrete details from the passion narrative, and which are, therefore, quite clearly not the result of reflection on subsequent events."¹ When placed together these isolated portions form a description of the Suffering Servant of Isaiah 53: "(The Son of man) must suffer many things, and be rejected and set at nought, and delivered up into the hands of men and they shall kill him. (For he came) not to be ministered unto, but to minister (= be the servant of Yahweh), and to give his life a ransom for many."² Some of these phrases are direct reproductions of the Hebrew text of Isaiah 53³ and others are generalisations of obvious characteristics of the Servant. The fact that the Hebrew text is used rather than the LXX indicates that at least these sections cannot be dismissed as

¹R. H. Fuller, The Mission and Achievement of Jesus (London: S.C.M. Press, 1956), p. 56, states that it is with hesitation that he omits allusions to the resurrection from predictions which to him are clearly not the result of reflection on subsequent events. He does omit them because, to his mind, they are not necessary since the Son of man is himself a triumphant vindicated figure.

²Ibid.

³For example, in Mark 9:12 ἐξουσεύωσθαι (to be treated with contempt) compares with Isaiah 53:3 הִשְׁמָו (despised). LXX has ἀτιμωσθαι (dishonoured). See further treatment in Fuller, op. cit., pp. 56, 7 and Zimmerli and Jeremias, op. cit., pp. 98f.

constructions of the Hellenistic community. Tödt who believes Old Testament references are the work of the community declares that Mark 8:31 and 9:12 are parallel and based on Psalm 118:22. He says that the "must" of 8:31 means the same as "it is written" of Mark 9:12 and therefore there can be no "eschatological must-form in the suffering prophecies." For Tödt the "divine must" is not involved.¹ Morna Hooker argues that even though the verses correspond broadly with the picture of Isaiah 53 there is little linguistic evidence that the references echo the fourth Servant Song for they do not refer to the significant feature of the fourth song, a theme emphasizing the work of redemption by Yahweh, not the Servant.² But J. Jeremias points out that the connexion between Jesus and Isaiah 53 is obscured because Miss Hooker throughout her book takes the linguistic evidence from the LXX neglecting the Aramaic background³ even in pre-Hellenistic passages. Jesus acquainted with the Old

¹H. E. Tödt, Der Menschensohn in der synoptischen Überlieferung (Gütersloh: Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1959), p. 177.

²Hooker, op. cit., pp. 94f. and 77.

³J. Jeremias, Review of Miss Morna Hooker's Jesus and The Servant in Journal of Theological Studies, n.s. 11, 1960, p. 143.

Testament speaks of the work of the Suffering Servant which he understands himself to be fulfilling. He sees this work as a necessary prelude to the exaltation of the Son of man and therefore uses this designation.

The necessity of Jesus' suffering is indicated in the three sections of Mark 8:31, 9:31 and 10:33. This teaching of Jesus that he "must" suffer is expressed in Mark 8:31 and parallels (Matthew 16:21 and Luke 9:22), with Σεὶ. This can be taken to mean that Jesus saw his death as inevitable and therefore the necessity was one of outward constraint. He saw that the forces working against him were irreconcilable and that only time separated him from death. There is also the interpretation that death was something he was bound to accept if he expected to fulfil his vocation; that is, his death was indispensable, the "must" being one of inward constraint. The two views are not incompatible and the second can be made to depend on the first. On the other hand these interpretations do not do justice to the scriptural facts. The inward necessity, the Σεὶ, is identical with the will of God¹ which Jesus saw

¹See Walter Grundmann, "Δεὶ," T.W.Z.N.T., II, pp. 21-25 referring to necessity grounded in will of God and Luke's special emphasis.

operative in the Suffering Servant.¹ The suffering is part of his mission, not a calamity.

We have then in these three sayings, Mark 8:31, 9:31 and 10:33 and 34 authentic evidence that Jesus foresaw his death in terms of the suffering and rejection of the Servant of Deutero-Isaiah. Furthermore, he willingly accepted the necessity of the future events as being in the will of God and leading to the exaltation of the Son of man.

5. Mark 9:12b -- "And how is it written of the Son of man, that he should suffer many things and be treated with contempt?"² R. Bultmann declares this is an "interpolation modelled after Matthew 17:12b."³ Tödt declares that Mark 9:12b cannot be an interpolation from Matthew 17:12b but should be considered an independent assertion resulting from the struggle between the Christians and Jews about the fulfilment of Scripture. He says the community wants to establish that Jesus, who has announced the nearness of the kingdom of God and must

¹James Denney, The Death of Christ (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1935), pp. 29-31.

²Parallel: Matthew 17:12b.

³Bultmann, op. cit., p. 30.

suffer much and be held in contempt, truly preaches in authority.¹

At first appearance the words certainly do not seem to be related to the context since they separate the two references to Elijah in verses 12 and 13: but the saying is too vague to be a vaticinium ex eventu. It could be supposed that "the sequence is 11, 12b, 12a; that is, that καὶ πῶς γέγραπται... ἔξουθενήθη forms part of the disciples' question," but this is unlikely.² It is possible that Jesus uses the sentence as a counter-question about the suffering which for him is the decisive issue on which the coming of the kingdom waits, not upon Elijah.

It is pointed out that Mark 9:12b "has the rugged and irreducible form of an original oracle."³ F. C. Burkitt declares "The passage . . . so abrupt, so unliterary, so obscure in detail, however clear may be the general meaning, reads to me like reminiscences of a real

¹Tödt, op. cit., pp. 181-183.

²Cf. H. B. Swete, The Gospel According to St. Mark (London: Macmillan and Co., 1913), p. 194. See also Otto, op. cit., pp. 249f.

³William Manson, Jesus the Messiah (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1944), p. 129.

conversation."¹ In Mark 8:31, 9:31 and 10:33 there was no mention of Scripture, but here it is clear that something about the mission of suffering has been written. We have then, a genuine saying of Jesus showing from his own mind and from quotations² that he understood his mission as one of suffering, that of the Servant of the Lord, which he must accomplish to become the Son of man, exalted.

6. Mark 10:38 -- ". . . You do not know what you are asking. Are you able to drink the cup that I drink, or to be baptised with the baptism with which I am baptised?"³ C. R. North declares that even if one discarded all Jesus' sayings about suffering that begin with "It is written," one is still left with the sayings about the "cup" and the "baptism" which Jesus says are a part of his destiny.⁴

The expression concerning the cup is common to the Old Testament.⁵ The underlying truth in the metaphor of

¹F. C. Burkitt, Christian Beginnings (London: University of London Press, 1924), pp. 33f.

²See above on Mark 10:33f.

³Cf. Matthew 20:22 and Luke 12:50.

⁴C. R. North, op. cit., p. 24.

⁵Psalms 11:6, 75:8, Isaiah 51:17ff.; Jeremiah 25:15, 49:17; and others.

the baptism is also found there.¹

In Maccabean and post-Maccabean Judaism it is quite likely that the conceptions of martyr and prophet had been united into one. It is perhaps from this vantage point that an approach to Jesus' calling and that of his followers opens up. "If the Messianic consciousness of Jesus bears signs of representing the prophetic consciousness of Israel at its highest or absolute tension, then the claim to drink the 'cup' of suffering and to undergo a 'baptism' of blood . . . can in no way be regarded as contrary to the internal probabilities of his situation."² He is referring to his suffering and death in metaphorical language.³

Jesus' declaration that James and John shall drink of his cup and receive a like baptism makes it clear that Jesus does not think of his passion apart from the sufferings of his disciples.

It should be pointed out that Mark 10:32-45 is an interesting parallel to 9:30-37 for in both instances there

¹Psalms 42:7; 69:2, 15 and 124:4, 5. See IV Macc. 6:28f. and 17:22. See O. Michel, Prophet and Märtyrer (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1932), p. 37. Cf. Ernst Lohmeyer, Das Evangelium des Markus, p. 223, who says the sacraments may have been in the mind of Mark, in the cup and baptism reference.

²William Manson, op. cit., p. 126.

³Higgins, Jesus and The Son of Man, p. 48.

is a prediction of suffering to come, followed by a dispute as to precedence among the disciples, and finally Jesus' teaching about true greatness.

The verse in Mark 10:38 provided the Scriptural basis for the later view of the Church concerning the baptism of blood by which the martyrdom of a catechumen was accepted as valid baptism.

We have then a saying of Jesus in the first person which bears authenticity and shows that he referred to his suffering.¹

7. Mark 10:45 -- "For the Son of man also came not to be served but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for many."² Mark 10:45 is the most obscure of all the suffering Son of man sayings. It stands alone and is difficult to explain.³ This passage is important for it differs from other passion sayings in that it states plainly the purpose of the Son of man's existence. Because of a similar saying in Luke and the theological implications that may be drawn from the Markan verse there has been no

¹Higgins, op. cit., p. 197.

²Parallel: Matthew 20:28. Cf. Luke 22:27.

³Werner Georg Kümmel, Promise and Fulfilment (Naperville, Ill.: R. Allenson, 1957), p. 73. E.T. of Verheissung und Erfüllung, 1953, by D. M. Barton.

small critical examination of it.¹

Luke 22:27, ". . . But I am among you as one who serves," is often quoted to support the assumption that the last clause of Mark 10:45 is foreign to the context and not authentic.² Mark and Matthew have the identical clause but Luke omits the "ransom" saying, and places the whole saying in the context of the Last Supper. The Lukan saying is then accepted by some critics as the closest to the words of Jesus because of its simplicity and exclusion of the λύτρον³ saying. H. Rashdall in his treatment, declares that the strongest objection is the irrelevance to the context.⁴

In support of the authenticity of the Markan version,⁵ it is declared that in Luke 22:26 the two words

¹See thorough treatment of the stages of growth of Mark 10:45 by Higgins, op. cit., pp. 36-50.

²R. Bultmann, Jesus and The Word (London: Ivor Nicholson and Watson, 1935), p. 24.

³F. Büchsel, "λύτρον," T.W.Z.N.T., IV, p. 343.

⁴Hastings Rashdall, The Idea of Atonement in Christian Theology (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1919), p. 51. See further pp. 29ff. and 49ff.

⁵J. Jeremias, "Das Losegeld für Viele," Judaica, iii 1948, pp. 258-262, says that Luke 22:24-7 shows strong Hellenistic influence.

νεώτερος (youngest)¹ and ἡγούμενος (leader)² suggest a later and secondary form for the Lukan verse. The words express the concern of the Hellenistic Community with differentiation of members in the local Church. Luke probably found the words in his special source as a modified rule for church order in which the "ransom" had been omitted as irrelevant.³ There is, of course, the possibility of Luke 22:27 being an independent saying. On the one occasion Jesus may have emphasised the atoning aspect of his character and at the Supper have cited the Servant as the example of humility.⁴

In answer to the objection that the words are Pauline, it should be noted that Paul derives his theology from primitive Christianity and does not use the word

υἱοσύν⁵ nor the phrase "Son of man."⁶ These

¹Cf. I Tim, 5:1, 2, 11, 14 and I Peter 5:5.

²Cf. Hebrews 13:7, 17, 24.

³Fuller, op. cit., p. 57. Cf. Higgins, Jesus and the Son of Man, p. 38.

⁴William Manson, op. cit., p. 132.

⁵He uses ἡπολυτρωσις in I Cor. 1:30 and Romans 3:24.

⁶See Julius Schniewind, "Das Evangelium nach Markus⁸," Das Neue Testament Deutsch, I (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1958), p. 110.

points support the conclusion that Mark 10:45 is an authentic word of Jesus.

The characteristics of the Suffering Servant can be detected in the phrases about service, the giving of life as a ransom, and the many for whom the ransom is given. The word δρακονεύω is used to express service. It is not used in the Septuagint. In the New Testament its proper meaning has to do with personal service to another human being.¹ The LXX uses δοῦλος and δουλεύω along with λατρεύω to translate the Hebrew root לָוַן. The Servant of Yahweh in Deutero-Isaiah is usually translated by παῖς Δοῦλος is used in Mark 10:44. The use of the two words δουλεύοντα πολλοῖς together by the Septuagint in Isaiah 53:11 supports the claim that the Suffering Servant concept lies behind Mark 10:45 where δρακονεύσας (= לָוַן of Old Testament) and πολλῶν (= וְלַרְבֵּי of Isaiah) appear. It should be noted, however, that the reference in Mark 10:45 probably goes back directly to the Hebrew text of Isaiah 53 rather than the Septuagint as will be clarified in the discussion

¹Hermann W. Beyer, "Δρακονεύω," T.W.Z.N.T., II, p. 82.

of ἀντί παρά to follow later. The purpose of Jesus was to minister (διακονῆσαι). Though he was ministered to by angels¹ and women,² this was incidental to his purpose.

The phrase to give his life as a ransom δοῦναι
τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον
represents Isaiah 53:10, "make his soul an offering for sin." The words, gave himself, appear in I Maccabees 6:44 where Eleazar Avaran dies risking his life for his people: "and he gave himself to deliver his people and to acquire an everlasting name."³ Δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν meant for the Jews, the death of martyrs, and for the Greeks, the death of soldiers.⁴ Λύτρον is an appropriate rendering for ψῆχ,⁵ a

¹Mark 1:13.

²Mark 15:41.

³See Charles, op. cit., p. 89.

⁴F. Büchsel, "Δίδωμι," in T.W.z.N.T., II, p. 168.

⁵Zimmerli and Jeremias, op. cit., p. 99, say, "λύτρον must be a free translation of ψῆχ (in the common meaning of 'compensation.')" See F. Büchsel, T.W.z.N.T., IV, p. 34, who declares that it is wrong to look for any connection between λύτρον and Isaiah 53. "The variety of the attempts to render in Greek the Hebrew ψῆχ shows the early and strong influence of Isaiah 53 upon the christology of the early church." λύτρον, in Mark 10:45 and Matthew 20:28

sacrifice for sin accompanied by repayment. This important word occurs also in the parallel, Matthew 20:28, but nowhere else in the New Testament.¹ In the LXX the word means money paid for a crime,² the purchase money for a life about to be forfeited,³ the ransom of a slave,⁴ the equivalent accepted in the place of the sacrifice of the first-born,⁵ and the Levites who were accepted as an equivalent for the tribes of Israel as a whole.⁶

In the LXX λύτρον nearly always represents רָפְדוּ, בְּרִי or פְּדוּ.

In Psalm 49:7-9 a usage of ransom appears which may well have been influential in the words of Jesus. The Poet says, "Truly no man can ransom (פְּדוּ) himself (his brother), or give to God the price of his life, for

is changed to ἀντίλυτρον in I Timothy 2:6 and περὶ ἀμαρτίας in Romans 8:3 (same as LXX). Zimmerli and Jeremias, op. cit., p. 96.

¹ Ἀντίλυτρον occurs in I Timothy 2:6 and ἀπολύτρωσις in I Cor. 1:30 and Romans 3:24. Cf. I Peter 1:18 and Hebrews 9:12.

²Numbers 35:31, 32; Proverbs 6:35, 13:80.

³Exodus 21:30.

⁴Leviticus 25:51, 52 and Isaiah 45:13.

⁵Numbers 18:15.

⁶Numbers 3:12. See Rawlinson, op. cit., p. 147, for this and further treatment.

the ransom of his life is costly, and can never suffice"

The ransom terminology is also used in IV Maccabees 6:29: "Make my blood a purification for them and take my life as a ransom for their life" and in IV Maccabees 17:20-22: ". . . for their sakes our foes did not overcome our people . . . They became as it were a ransom for our nation's sin."¹ The word used in these examples is

ἀντίρωπον and not λύτρον.

The ransom made ἀντί πολλῶν

in Mark 10:45 is more likely comparable with the

ד' ערש of Isaiah 53:11, than with the

πολλοῦς and πολλῶν of the Septuagint translation of verses 11 and 12. The preposition ἀντί

here has its common meaning, "for" as "in the place of" or "instead of."² Ἀντί πολλῶν is not dependent

on σοῦνα but λύτρον.³

In Greek the word "many" is an exclusive term

¹The Third and Fourth Books of Maccabees, by C. W. Emmet (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1918), pp. 28 and 71.

²J. H. Moulton and G. Milligan, The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1949), p. 46.

³Büchsel, " Ἀντί ," T.W.z.N.T., I, p. 373.

meaning "not all." In Hebrew, however, כָּל may be an inclusive word meaning "the whole" comprising many individuals. This is due to the fact that in Aramaic and Hebrew there is no plural for the word "all."¹ Thus ὅς πολλοί in Greek usage meaning "the masses, the multitude, the people"² is very close to the Hebrew usage. Πολλῶν in Mark 10:45 is thus a Semitism. "The many" is found three times in Isaiah 53:11 and 12, and it is reasonable to believe that in the light of Jesus' understanding of his mission the "many" for whom Jesus' life is a ransom points to the many whose sins the Suffering Servant was to have borne.

An understanding of the Rabbinical literature of the first century A.D. makes it clear that it was quite in line with Jewish thought that Jesus should have thought of his death as an atonement.³ Any death offered atonement to some extent but the voluntary death of an innocent party could atone for others. As we have also seen, the Old Testament contained in its teachings the idea that a soul could be forfeited and that a man was unable to ransom

¹J. Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, p. 123.

²II Maccabees 1:36.

³See Chapter I on this subject.

it himself.¹ The picture of the Servant of Deutero-Isaiah was of one who should offer himself for the sins of many.² If then Jesus, as Son of man, thought of his suffering in terms of the ΔΥΝ, we are justified in calling his self-surrender, a sacrifice of atonement³ for many.⁴

The word ransom "brings all the thoughts of Christ which are concerned with the Cross under the general rule of obedience. He did not ask or explain why a ransom should be necessary, why God should demand it. He gives his life to God, and God gives the new community to him. He does not look beyond the necessity springing from the will of God, that his mission involves death, and this he humbly yet proudly accepts."⁵ The terminology is not foreign to his environment but it should be remembered

¹Psalm 49:7-9.

²Isaiah 53:10f.

³H. Rashdall in his interpretation of "ransom for many" says that if the words are correctly reported they should be taken quite literally and the deliverance was an actual physical one, not an atonement. That is to say, since Jesus was surrendering his life it would not be necessary for them to lay down theirs. Just as his life had been a service for others, so would his death. Op. cit., pp. 31f.

⁴Wm. Manson, op. cit., p. 132.

⁵Robinson, op. cit., p. 102.

that the word ransom is used as a metaphor¹ and Jesus somehow sees the lives of men forfeited and offers himself in such a way as to bring a recovery of life. It is not a legal act, for his innocence, love, patience and forgiveness makes this sacrifice effective at the very point where the Old Testament sacrifices were ineffective.

J. Jeremias says, "Because he goes to his death innocently, voluntarily, patiently and in accordance with the will of God his dying has boundless atoning virtue. It is life flowing from God, and life in God which he outpours."²

8. We now look at the Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen, Mark 12:1-11.³ In this allegory God is the owner of the vineyard, Jesus is the son, the vineyard is Israel, the husbandmen are Israel's leaders, and the messengers are the prophets.⁴ Some critics say this parable is the work of the community because the Messianic claim is too emphatic and it presupposes Christ's death.⁵ It is

¹Taylor, op. cit., p. 104.

²Zimmerli and Jeremias, op. cit., p. 104.

³Parallels: Matthew 21:33-44 and Luke 20:9-18. Cf. Isaiah 5:1-7.

⁴Cf. Tödt, op. cit., p. 152.

⁵See Bultmann, The History of the Synoptic Tradition, pp. 177, 205. See also p. 415.

to be noticed that in Matthew and Luke there are obvious additions made by the community. Both of them say the son was killed outside the vineyard to conform with Jesus' death outside the walls of Jerusalem (John 19:17), while Mark says they slew him within the vineyard. Jeremias makes a thorough treatment of this parable comparing it with the Gospel of Thomas where the allusions to the hedge, wine-press, and the tower derived from Isaiah 5:1f. are omitted as they are by Luke (20:9). The connection with Isaiah 5 must be secondary since the LXX has obviously been used as the source, for "he dug it up" of Isaiah 5 was mistranslated by the LXX as "I fenced it round."¹ The point being made here is that the allegorical features are secondary. In Mark, however, the fact that the son is murdered as described in the Gospel of Thomas and the fact that no mention of the resurrection occurs make it difficult to believe this part of the narrative an invention. In the sending of the son Jesus undoubtedly had reference to himself.² Rawlinson sees the parable as an appeal to the conscience of Jesus' opponents.³ J. Jeremias points out that because the

¹Jeremias, The Parables of Jesus, pp. 70f.

²Ibid., p. 72.

³See Rawlinson, op. cit., p. 162.

allegory has obscured the original picture the parable was not originally an allegory.¹

The quotation in Mark 12:10 from Psalm 118:22 is declared to be an addition of the community, a "favourite proof-text for the resurrection and exaltation of the rejected Christ."² If this be so the words were added at a very early pre-Markan stage.³ It is, of course, possible that Jesus applied these words to himself on another occasion. In view of references to the temple as in John 2:19, "Destroy this temple and I will raise it up;" Mark 13:2, "There will not be left here one stone upon another;" and Mark 14:58, "I will build another (Temple) not made with hands," there is a possibility that here Jesus foresaw his destiny and as in the preceding parable willingly accepted his rejection and death, which would include vindication, as the will of God.

In conclusion it is best to see in the parable an

¹J. Jeremias, op. cit., p. 71.

²Ibid., p. 73.

³See B. T. D. Smith, The Parables of the Synoptic Gospels (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1937), p. 224, "the absence of proof-texts is characteristic of Mark; in the few cases where he does use them, he is following an earlier tradition."

authentic reference¹ to himself on the part of Jesus in mentioning the sending of the son who is murdered but there is no evidence that his audience would necessarily find any significance in this. As for the quotation from Psalm 118:22, this expression is most likely the result of an apologetic tendency begun before Mark representing a stage in the Christological interpretation.²

9. Mark 14:8 -- "She has anointed my body beforehand for burying."³ Jeremias says this story is an example of the process of the growth of tradition. It is an accretion for it disrupts the connection between Mark 14:1ff. and 14:10ff. and its place is not fixed. In Mark it follows the triumphal entry while in John it precedes it.⁴ Since it belongs to the Passion material common to Mark and John it must be quite early.⁵ The

¹E. Lohmeyer, op. cit., p. 249, says there is nothing in the main idea of the parable that is contradictory to the teaching of Jesus.

²Lindars, Barnabas, New Testament Apologetic (London: S.C.M. Press, 1961), p. 174.

³Cf. Matthew 26:12 and John 12:7.

⁴Cf. C. H. Dodd, The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1953), p. 370 and note 1 on p. 370.

⁵J. Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, p. 65, note 5.

historical facts of Jesus' life must have made him conscious of the possibility of death.¹ The verse points up this fact. J. Jeremias says that in view of the general recognition that prophets might well expect martyrdom, it is quite likely that Jesus expected to be buried as a criminal and without anointing, and therefore spoke the words of Mark 14:8.² The words are genuine words of Jesus. This is particularly true in view of the general terms used and the lack of reference to the resurrection.³ This section is further evidence that Jesus prophesied his death which seemed to hold a central place in his thought and actions.

10. Mark 14:18-21 -- "One of you shall betray me . . . "for the Son of man goes as it is written of him . . ." ⁴ Verse 18 presents an authentic insight on the part of Jesus that he will be betrayed.⁵ It is quite likely that the group of verses 18-21 is a special oral

¹Lohmeyer, op. cit., p. 295, says that it cannot be denied that Jesus could have interpreted the woman's action as an anointing of his body.

²Zimmerli and Jeremias, op. cit., p. 101.

³Ibid., p. 103.

⁴Parallels: Matthew 26:21-25 and Luke 21, 23.

⁵Higgins, Jesus and The Son of Man, p. 53.

tradition inserted by Mark in his narrative. Luke's version (22:21-23) is probably independent of Mark. John's version (13:21-30) may also be a development of an independent tradition. This independence of the texts supports the historicity of the prophecy. In the later narratives more details appear. In Matthew 26:25 Judas asks if he is the one. In Luke 22:22 the author has "The Son of man goes as it has been determined" rather than the Markan expression, "as it is written." This may possibly be due to his awareness that it is not thus written of the Son of man. In John 13:25-29 the Apostle is told by Jesus the identity of the betrayer. These details emphasise the simplicity of Mark.¹

This saying is linked with Mark 9:12 by its reference to scripture, ΥΕΥΡΑΠΤΑΙ. Here again is another reference to Isaiah 53.² It supports the idea that Jesus saw in the Servant his mission understood to be preliminary to the exaltation of the Son of man, and that one of the twelve was the instrument for the fulfilment of his willing death.

¹V. Taylor, Jesus and His Sacrifice, pp. 11, 112.

²See M. Hooker, op. cit., pp. 98 and 99, who denies there is any relation to the Servant of Deutero-Isaiah. Her arguments are unconvincing.

11. Mark 14:22-25¹ -- "And as they were eating he took bread, and blessed, and broke it, and gave it to them, and said, 'Take; this is my body.' (23) And he took a cup, and when he had given thanks he gave it to them, and they all drank of it. (24) And he said to them, 'This is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many. (25) Truly I say to you, I shall not drink again of the fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God.'"

Certain general statements about the Last Supper should be made. The Markan version forms the oldest tradition for it is linguistically and materially nearer the Aramaic original.² There is much to be said in favour of the opinion that the Last Supper was actually a passover meal³ rather than a meal that preceded the Passover,⁴

¹Parallels: Matthew 26:26-29, Luke 22:14-20; and I Corinthians 11:23-25.

²Jeremias, *op. cit.*, pp. 118-126, lists twenty Semitisms in support of the authenticity of the Markan tradition. He further points out that Paul's independent development had Greek speaking congregations in mind.

³*Ibid.*, pp. 14ff. gives evidence to support this. I am indebted to him for much of the treatment that follows. See A. J. B. Higgins, The Lord's Supper in the New Testament (London: S.C.M. Press, Ltd., 1960), p. 50.

⁴See R. Otto, *op. cit.*, Part III, pp. 265ff., for the opinion that the supper preceded the Passover.

though the matter has not been settled by any means. At any rate, Paschal thoughts were certainly in the mind of Jesus. The words, "This is my body," were spoken over the bread at the time of distribution rather than at the time of breaking. The use of λάβετε just before the words is proof of this. Τοῦτο is the subject and refers to the bread and not to the action of breaking the bread nor to Christ himself.¹ The word ἔσθιτε is probably correctly rendered by Moffatt: "Take this, it means my body." The same applies to the wine. That is, Jesus interprets the bread and the wine themselves and not the action of breaking or pouring.

Body and blood are sacrificial terms, being the two elements separated when the victim was killed.² Thus Jesus speaks of himself in sacrificial terminology. It is quite likely that Jesus had prepared the disciples for this comparison of himself with sacrifice in the Passover liturgy that preceded it. In this liturgy, the Passa-Haggadha, he would have explained the history and interpretation of the paschal lamb. It is possible that here he may have made a

¹v. Taylor, Jesus and His Sacrifice, p. 120.

²Genesis 9:4, Leviticus 17:11, 14 and Deuteronomy 12:23.

further comparison with himself.¹ (I Corinthians 5:7, 8 takes for granted the description of Jesus as the paschal victim.) The fact that this bread and wine were comparisons rather than identifications is evident, for the Jewish horror of consuming blood was not aroused.

It seems quite clear then that the bread broken was a parable of the fate of Jesus' body and the red wine a parable of his poured out blood. Jesus, omitting details, was telling the apostles that his death would take place. At least the fact of his death was foreseen. The redemptive element of his self-giving is made clear if we can accept the comparison with the paschal lamb. The Passover was an ordinary sacrifice and not expiatory;² on the other hand the paschal lambs offered at the exodus from Egypt had a redemptive effect upon the offerer.³ Jesus therefore compared his death with sacrifice. The Markan phrase "this

¹The sacrificial language of Mark 14:24, "poured out for many" also supports this opinion.

²See G. Dalman, Jesus-Jeshua (New York: Macmillan Co., 1929), pp. 114-115, 152. E.T. by P. O. Levertoff.

³Cf. G. Dalman, op. cit., p. 151, on Targum of Zechariah 9:11 ("you too, for whom a covenant was decided upon over blood have I redeemed from the servitude in Egypt.") "This must refer to the blood of the paschal lambs . . ." This is pointed out by J. Jeremias, op. cit., p. 149. V. Taylor, op. cit., p. 139, says the same conclusion can be drawn from Jesus' words in Mark 14:24 compared with Exodus 24:8. He prefers this interpretation.

is my blood of the covenant" raises difficulties because it differs with I Corinthians 11:25 which says, "This cup is the New Covenant in my blood." It is possible that both forms are authentic; or both represent a lost original, or possibly the Pauline form has arisen in an effort to clarify the difficulties of the Markan narrative.¹ On the other hand, there are difficulties which may point to the conclusion that τῆς διαθήκης is an exegetical gloss,² though the word "covenant" represents Jesus' idea. At any rate, Jesus is here stepping into "the place of the ancient sacrifices of Israel. He represents the fullness, the consummation of sacrifice, by which the new covenant is inaugurated."³

The comparison of Jesus' death with sacrifice is continued in the words, τὸ ἐκχυνόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν. Ἐκχυνόμενον, the present participle, has a future sense. It in combination with ὑπὲρ πολλῶν

¹Taylor, op. cit., pp. 132f.

²Jeremias points out that "blood of the covenant" in late Judaism meant "the blood of circumcision," and the phrase is impossible in Aramaic - a pronominal suffix cannot govern the genitive. However, it may be an apposition. See Fuller op. cit., pp. 72, 73, who argues that διαθήκης is not a gloss.

³William Manson, op. cit., p. 145.

is connected with Isaiah 53:12, ". . . because he poured
out his soul to death . . . yet he bore the sins of many."

"Among Christological formulae connected with Isaiah 53

the ὑπὲρ formula stands first by reason of
its numerical preponderance."¹ The word πολλῶν

offers the link that brings to mind Mark 10:45, "to give

his life as a ransom ἕνεκεν πολλῶν."²

The word πολλῶν as we have seen does not neces-
sitate an exclusion of the meaning "all," and in this sup-
per saying Jesus was not limiting the efficiency of his
offering.

For our purpose it is important to notice the
element of participation on the part of the disciples. It
is after Jesus has blessed (εὐδοκῆσας) the
bread and given thanks (εὐχαριστήσας)
over the cup that he offers them to the disciples.³ It was
customary during every common meal to establish the fellow-
ship of the table by the rite of breaking the bread.⁴ The

¹Zimmerli and Jeremias, op. cit., p. 95.

²Cf. I Timothy 2:6.

³Mark's arrangement is changed by Matthew (26:27) so that the original order is restored. Jesus interprets the cup as he gives it to them in the same way he had interpreted the broken bread as he distributed it.

⁴Dalman, op. cit., p. 126.

passing of the cup after the meal was in order that all might share in the benediction, the blessing that had been placed upon it.¹ Oriental customs at the table bound the individuals in fellowship, and since the Passover was a religious meal the eating and drinking brought the leader and followers in close communion. I Corinthians 10:18 shows this to be a fact: ". . . are not those who eat the sacrifices partners in the altar?"

Jesus "not only pronounced the blessing over the bread and wine, but also added the words which connected the broken bread and the red wine with his atoning death for 'many.' When immediately afterwards he gives this same bread and wine to his disciples to eat and drink, the meaning is that by eating and drinking he gives them a share in the atoning power of his death."² R. Otto explains that in breaking the bread and speaking words Jesus was doing more than a mere parabolic act that was predictive. He compares this with the acted prediction of Jeremiah (19:10) in which the prophet breaks a jar before the people predicting their fate. Jesus, as prophet, though, did still more than act a prediction for

¹Dalman, op. cit., p. 140.

²Jeremias, op. cit., p. 154.

he distributed the bread for immediate consumption. This gave to those present "a participation in the thing anticipated, and that by effective representation." This is compared with the idea that "the altar sanctifies the gift." Thus Jesus was offering them a share in the atoning power of his death.¹

We look now at Mark 14:25: "Truly, I say to you, I shall not drink again of the fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God." To some scholars the negative statement seems to indicate a vow of abstinence.² These vows³ were quite common in later Judaism. Jeremias says that the vow was Jesus' way of making it clear that his intention to open a way to the kingdom of God by his suffering was irrevocable. The vow made it plain that his life was detached from this world, fully dedicated to God and belonged to the coming kingdom, a fulfilment of the Passover.⁴ On the other hand, G.

¹Otto, op. cit., pp. 300, 302, 304.

²See Danby, op. cit., p. 264, note 1, ". . . Vows of abstention . . . render forbidden things or acts ordinarily permissible." See C. E. B. Cranfield, I and II Peter and Jude (London: S.C.M. Press, 1960), p. 428.

³See Danby, Ibid., on "Nedarim," pp. 264ff. and "Nazir," pp. 280ff.

⁴Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, p. 171. Cf. pp. 165-181.

Dalman feels the evidence for Jesus taking a vow is insufficient and asks, "Can we attribute to Jesus such a renunciation?"¹

The idea of a Messianic banquet was evidently part of popular Jewish expectation.² It was well grounded in Old Testament thought.³ The eschatological element comes to the foreground here. If the drinking of the cup offered the disciples a share in the power of Jesus' sacrifice, the reference to his drinking again in the kingdom of God was meant to emphasise that not only would the Son of man suffer but he would bring about a Messianic Feast. This clear expression of Jesus shows that he was quite aware of what was taking place, that his suffering and death was a necessary prelude to the kingdom, a kingdom of God about which he gives no details.

In conclusion, these sayings at the Last Supper reveal quite clearly that Jesus was giving himself. As Goguel says, "If he had not felt called to be the Son of man, and if he had not willed to remain faithful to the end to the mission which he had received from God, he

¹G. Dalman, Jesus-Jeshua, p. 142.

²Moore, Judaism, II, p. 365. Cf. Matthew 8:11 and Luke 13:29.

³Isaiah 25:6, and others.

might have escaped from death. All he needed to do was to remain in retirement in Peraea, or, after he had discovered that the people would not support him, it might have been sufficient if he had simply left Jerusalem. Thus his death was something quite different from an inevitable disaster. He accepted it and it became a voluntary sacrifice. By consenting to die, Jesus gave himself up for his own, and for all those to whom he had preached the Gospel of the Kingdom of God, just as he had already given himself for them in all the renunciations and sufferings which he had accepted from the beginning of his ministry."¹ This is what he was expressing at the Last Supper, and whether the Supper took place on the Passover or prior to it, the sacrificial language, thoughts and acts of Jesus are well in the foreground expressing atonement.

12. Mark 14:27 -- "And Jesus said to them, 'You will all fall away; for it is written, "I will strike the shepherd, and the sheep will be scattered.'"² The quotation is from Zechariah 13:7: "Strike the shepherd, that the sheep may be scattered." Mark uses the future

¹Maurice Goguel, The Life of Jesus (London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1933), p. 451.

²Parallel: Matthew 26:31 has "the sheep of the flock will be scattered."

indicative. The Septuagint and Hebrew texts use the imperative. There is no real difference in meaning.

Criticism of this passage arises from the fact that Jesus is speaking about his death beforehand and prophesies the falling away of his disciples as fulfilment of Old Testament prophecy. The words have therefore been explained as the result of reflection on the part of the early Church. If we accept the position that Jesus saw in the Suffering Servant his mission, he could well foresee his fate. If then Jesus did foresee his fate, his use of the shepherd¹ and sheep terminology is quite appropriate. The quotation is well related to the immediate situation and if it is a later insertion by the community it has been well adapted to the language of Jesus' interests.² The quotation is most likely authentic, and we thus have further evidence that Jesus foresaw his death and the attitude of the disciples. He accepted his part in willing obedience to the will of God.

13. Mark 14:34 -- "And he said to them, 'My soul is very sorrowful, even to death; remain here, and

¹J. Jeremias, The Parables of Jesus, p. 97, n. 36, says "The Shepherd was already a symbol of the redeemer in the ancient East."

²Taylor, op. cit., p. 147.

watch."¹ Here the influence of the Old Testament appears again; Psalm 42:5, 11 and 43:5. Jesus tells the disciples plainly how deeply - ΕΨ ΔΑΥΔΪΤΟΥ - he was distressed.² Concerning the Gethsemane scene Goguel says, "It is impossible to discuss the historicity of a scene whose only witnesses were men who were at some distance and were asleep . . . (As) an admirable allegory it expresses what took place in the soul of Jesus."³ On the question of testimony, however, it should be noted that in spite of the sleeping, the evangelists' interest in this is shown quite clearly in ΠΡΟΣΕΛΘΩΝ ΜΙΚΡΟΝ (Mark 14:35 and Matthew 26:39) and ΑΠΕΣΠΙΔΩΘΗ ΑΠ' ΑΥΤΩΝ ΩΣΕΙ ΛΙΘΟΥ ΒΟΛΗΝ (Luke 22:41). Rawlinson declares, "The basis of the story is certainly historical and beyond the reach of invention."⁴ The incident seems authentic for one who considered himself the Suffering Servant.

¹Parallels: Matthew 26:38 and Luke 22:40. Matthew says, "Watch with me." Luke simply says, "Pray that ye may not enter into temptation."

²See Rawlinson, op. cit., p. 211 and Swete op. cit., pp. 324ff.

³Goguel, op. cit., p. 494.

⁴Rawlinson, op. cit., p. 210.

Vincent Taylor¹ gives an important explanation for Jesus' command, "Remain here, and watch." It means more than that Jesus desires their sympathy. Their vigil is within the same cycle of ideas that were present when the disciples participated by means of bread and wine in the sacrifice of Jesus. Jesus' request is in keeping with the early belief that there was "no offering apart from men who draw near." Believing that his offering will be effective ὕπὲρ πολλῶν he demands the association of his most intimate followers to make his sacrifice meaningful. They are to watch and not yield to temptation; even as he had told them, they are to share in the fellowship of his sufferings by their presence, love, and sympathy.

14. Mark 14:36 -- "And he said, 'Abba, Father, all things are possible to thee; remove this cup from me; yet not what I will, but what thou wilt.'"² The difficulties arise because it is claimed there were no witnesses and therefore the Gethsemane scene as a whole has been constructed by the community from the unquestionably authentic

¹Taylor, op. cit., p. 150, admits it is an interpretation which reads a meaning into the words of Jesus.

²Parallels: Matthew 26:39, 42 and Luke 22:42.

teaching of Jesus in the Lord's Prayer.¹ But it may well be asked how reconstruction could have produced such words of resignation. If the words are not authentic they undoubtedly represent the feeling of Jesus. The word ʾAbba in addressing God is unparalleled in Jewish literature.² The Aramaic-speaking Jew would have used this term only of his earthly father.³ It was the everyday language used by children in addressing their male parent. The familiarity thus expressed would have been out of place in the relationship between the ordinary Jew and his God. That Jesus used it at this great moment of tension brings into relief the fact of his self-abasement, his intimate childlike⁴ trust in the will of God. This use of ʾAbba surely represents an original utterance of Jesus.

The use of the word "cup" is similar to that in Mark 10:38 which has been described as the cup of

¹R. H. Fuller, *op. cit.*, p. 82 and note 2 suggesting that "Abba" of Mark 14:36 be compared with "Father," Luke 11:2; "not what I will, but thou wilt" with "thy will be done," Matthew 6:10; and "temptation" in Mark 14:38.

²Jeremias, *op. cit.*, p. 134.

³G. Kittel, "Abba," *T.W.z.N.T.*, I, 4ff.

⁴J. Jeremias, *op. cit.*, p. 134, points out that this is probably the key to Matthew 18:3, "If you do not learn to say Abba, you cannot enter the Kingdom of God."

suffering.¹ R. H. Fuller says that here is a possible explanation for Jesus' abstention from wine announced at the Last Supper. The declaration was a resolve to drink that other cup, ποτόριον, of suffering in consecration to the will of God and thus inaugurate the coming of the Kingdom.²

In this saying we have another example of Jesus' submission to the will of the Father and his willing gift of himself in spite of an apparent human desire to do otherwise.

15. Mark 14:37 -- "And he came and found them sleeping, and he said to Peter, "Simon, are you asleep? Could you not watch one hour?"³ Here Jesus is concerned that the disciples are sleeping. Peter is called by his Aramaic name.⁴ Jesus rebukes them for not keeping vigil and is concerned about them - especially Peter⁵ - and their faithfulness. They all mean well, Jesus admits, but

¹See treatment of Mark 10:38 above.

²R. H. Fuller, op. cit., p. 76.

³Parallels: Matthew 26:40f. and Luke 22:45f. Both reduce details of the saying.

⁴See Swete, op. cit., p. 345 who thinks this significant.

⁵Cf. Luke 22:31 showing Jesus special concern about Peter.

he wants to prepare them for the temptation to desert him.¹

On the other hand the temptation may well be their desire to sleep and lack of desire to show genuine concern in the midst of such intense agony. It is thus pointed out that these words emphasise the importance Jesus placed upon the disciples' participating in his suffering by their presence and sympathy.²

16. Mark 14:41 and 42 -- "And he came a third time, and said to them, 'Are you still sleeping and taking your rest? It is enough; the hour has come; the Son of man is betrayed into the hands of sinners. Rise, let us be going; see, my betrayer is at hand.'"³ Again the suffering is predicted, but if Jesus was expecting suffering, this verse stands right in line with the others. The real question concerns the use of "Son of man." If Jesus expected to fulfil the role of the Servant and become the glorified Son of man this saying bears authenticity. "The Son of man expression is not so much a title as a description of

¹Allan Menzies, The Earliest Gospel (London: Macmillan and Company, 1901), p. 259.

²Taylor, op. cit., p. 153.

³Cf. Matthew 26:45 and 46.

the nature of Jesus"¹ for here he chooses suffering as he speaks of it.

If the Danielic source be accepted as a strong influence upon the thinking of Jesus, then his use of the term in the suffering sayings becomes quite intelligible. For in Daniel the Son of man is first "oppressed, humiliated and all but destroyed by the enemies of God and then delivered and raised to great glory by his power and mercy."² Jesus then recognising himself as the one to become the exalted Son of man realises that he must first fulfil the suffering and humiliation which are pre-conditions to glorification.

The criticism here arises from the element of prediction.³ If this feature is accepted, here again is a saying which supports the thesis that Jesus found a special meaning in the presence and sympathy of his disciples, a meaning related to his self-offering.⁴ They have failed him right at the moment of intensity. He

¹Gerhard Gloege, The Day of His Coming (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1963), p. 232, E.T. of Aller Tage Tag by Stanley Rudman.

²C. H. Dodd, According to The Scriptures (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1953), p. 117.

³See Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, I, p. 29.

⁴Taylor, op. cit., pp. 155f.

then calls them to rise and advance for the Son of man fulfils his role as Servant.

17. Mark 14:48 and 49 -- "And Jesus said to them, 'Have you come out as against a robber, with swords and clubs to capture me? Day after day I was with you in the temple teaching, and you did not seize me. But let the scriptures be fulfilled.'"¹ The criticism of this passage is concerned with the statement about fulfilling Scripture, which is described as a gloss.² But if Jesus interpreted his mission in terms of the Old Testament, he may have made such an exclamation here. The expression, however, uncommon to Mark suggests the work of a scribe.

18. Mark 15:34 -- "And at the ninth hour Jesus cried with a loud voice, 'Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachthani?' which means, 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?'"³ A. Menzies explains that since the words of the last cry in Mark are Aramaic, the soldiers would not have understood them. This form could not give rise to the

¹Parallels: Matthew 26:55f. and Luke 22:52f. Both have minor variations.

²R. Bultmann, The History of The Synoptic Tradition, pp. 262f. and 282 rejects 14:48 and 49.

³Parallel: Matthew 27:46 using the Hebrew form of address, "Eli." See Psalm 22:1.

misunderstanding of some that Jesus was calling on Elijah. He accepts the Hebrew¹ form of Matthew as the original with the statement that Mark's Aramaic is due to a corrector.² J. Jeremias, likewise, accepts Matthew's form as the original.³

M. Goguel declares that the saying is authentic, for Jesus' mind was steeped with Psalms and it was natural for him to quote this one. He further states that the fact that both Luke and John felt the difficulty involved in this saying - they both alter Jesus' words - offers a strong reason for accepting the cry as authentic.⁴

A. Menzies points out that the Psalm (22) which opens with a note of despair is a psalm of help and salvation, and that Jesus had the whole psalm in mind. To him the final cry is a great affirmation of faith.⁵ R. Bultmann declares that the loud cry of 15:34 (Psalm 22) provided a secondary interpretation of the loud cry

¹Cf. G. Dalman, The Words of Jesus (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1902), pp. 53 and 54.

²Menzies, op. cit., p. 280.

³J. Jeremias, T.W.z.N.T., II, p. 937. Cf. Zimmerli and J. Jeremias, op. cit., p. 81, n. 349.

⁴M. Goguel, op. cit., p. 541.

⁵Menzies, op. cit., p. 280.

mentioned in Mark 15:37.¹

In spite of various explanations the wording makes it quite clear that Jesus experienced in some way the abandonment of God. His being forsaken by God is related to the fact that he identified himself completely with sinful men and at the same time fully experienced the terrible result of sin. Thus his intimate relationship with his Father was severed and from his point of view, at least, he felt "left helpless,"² forsaken. It is at this point that Jesus has fully offered his life "for many" in self-sacrifice.

Sayings Peculiar to Luke

1. Luke 12:49 and 50 -- "I come to cast fire upon the earth; and would that it were already kindled! I have a baptism to be baptised with; and how I am constrained until it is accomplished!" The genuineness of this saying has been questioned. R. Bultmann holds that possibly verse 50 is a prophecy after the event, being a secondary expansion of verse 49.³ It is said that the martyr

¹Bultmann, op. cit., p. 313.

²Cf. Taylor, op. cit., p. 162, saying that the verb does not mean "leave alone" but "leave helpless."

³Bultmann, op. cit., p. 153.

terminology reflects that of the early church.¹ Further it has been suggested that the gnostic redemption myths form the background for the connection of baptism as a metaphor of death² by way of Paul's doctrine of baptism as a dying with Christ. In reply to these opinions, "the extreme indirectness of the reference to the passion is almost positive evidence of originality."³ Jesus' death was not understood to be a martyrdom by the early church but was pointed out as a special work. The community would hardly have reduced the meaning to martyrdom. And further, it is evident that Paul (Romans 6:3) appeals to common tradition which probably goes right back to Jesus in uniting the idea of baptism with death.⁴

It is possible that the arrangement of the material is editorial and it may not stand in its original context, but the unity of the saying is supported by the parallel structure.⁵

¹Oepke, T.W.z.N.T., I, p. 534. See Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, I, p. 44.

²Bultmann, The History of The Synoptic Tradition, p. 153. See also Theology of the New Testament, I, p. 140; that "Baptism imparts participation in the death and resurrection of Christ . . . originated in the Hellenistic Church."

³Fuller, op. cit., p. 59. Cf. E. Stauffer, Jesus and His Story, pp. 139f.

⁴Fuller, op. cit., p. 60.

⁵Taylor, op. cit., p. 165.

What then is the meaning of this saying? The meaning of "fire" and "baptism" lies in the baptism of Jesus by John. Mark 11:28-30 suggests that Jesus saw the authority for his ministry related to his baptism.¹ This same baptism had given him the authority to fulfil the mission of the Isaianic Servant. Therefore in speaking of his death as a baptism he means a fulfilment of his baptism by John which initiated his vocation as Suffering Servant. The meaning of "fire" is likewise related to the baptism by John. John announced to the people concerning Christ, "He will baptise you . . . with fire."² The fire that Jesus was to kindle was the fire of the "eschatological judgment, the negative aspect of the coming of the Kingdom,"³ for the expressions of verses 49 and 50 are intended to be contrasted rather than considered parallel.⁴ Wm. Manson says that the words do not "necessarily imply that a light had not already been

¹See W. Manson, op. cit., p. 40.

²Luke 3:16. Parallel: Matthew 3:11. Fuller says the original of Mark 1:8 probably included this. The substitution of πνεύματος is by the community, op. cit., p. 62.

³Fuller, op. cit., pp. 61, 62.

⁴Hans Conzelmann, The Theology of St. Luke (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960), p. 109. E.T. from the German by Geoffrey Buswell.

set to the fire in question. The purifying process of repentance might have already begun, and Jesus still desires to see it thoroughly going, just as the kingdom of God is declared to be already in the midst, and yet Jesus looks forward to its coming one day with power."¹

The double metaphor of fire and water is a clear expression of the tragic conflict between Jesus' natural restraint up against a terrifying necessity and his determination willingly to accomplish a specific task. The absolute demands of this mission take precedence over personal claims and affections.

Here is a metaphorical reference to suffering and death which Jesus expects to experience. It also points up the fact that the tension within Jesus was real and that he was conscious in his decisive self-offering of fulfilling a suffering that was extreme and not merely incidental.

2. Luke 13:32 and 33 -- "And he said to them, 'Go and tell that fox, "Behold, I cast out demons and perform cures today and tomorrow, and the third day I finish my course. Nevertheless I must go on my way today and tomorrow and the day following; for it cannot be that a

¹Manson, op. cit., p. 70.

prophet should perish away from Jerusalem."'"

The fact that this passion prediction is couched in such general terms, suggests that it could not very well have been shaped *ex eventu*.¹ It does not seem to be a work of the community. The use of δε̅ι̅ in combination with verse 32 shows that Jesus felt a compulsion to accomplish his mission which would include something more than the mere healings which had been taking place. He was offering himself. The reference to prophetic martyrdom should not be interpreted to mean that Jesus intended to die as a prophet and nothing more. He was rather "bringing his death into organic relation with his prophetic proclamation and its accompanying healings and exorcisms" which were already considered by him and those "in the know" as characteristic of the Servant.² We have then in this statement further evidence of Jesus' resolute intention of denying personal safety in order to fully surrender himself to the will of God which he could see would take his life.

3. Luke 17:25 -- "But first he must suffer many things and be rejected of this generation." This verse is

¹J. Jeremias, T.W.z.N.T., V, p. 712.

²Fuller, op. cit., p. 63.

regarded by many¹ as an interpolation. The reason given is that it has a strange position, being placed in the middle of an apocalyptic discourse. It was placed there, however, to emphasise the necessity of suffering before the coming of the Son of man.² T. W. Manson accepts the words as a genuine utterance of Jesus taken from Q.³ R. Otto points out that here is a saying without detailed conceptions simply repeating Old Testament words, a "piece of prophetic anticipation."⁴ M. Goguel declares that the lack of references to death or resurrection supports the opinion that it could not have been invented by tradition.⁵ W. Kümmel says the saying is reliable tradition.⁶ If the view that the saying is from the L tradition be accepted it gives added strength to the assertion that Jesus was confident that he should suffer in fulfilling his mission.

¹E.g. Montefiore, The Synoptic Gospels, II, pp. 550ff. See Taylor, op. cit., pp. 172 and 173, who traces the saying to the L tradition.

²H. Conzelmann, op. cit., p. 153 n. 3 says that "although the context is eschatological, the word δεῖ is used not in connexion with the future but with the passion."

³T. W. Manson, The Sayings of Jesus, pp. 142 and 143.

⁴R. Otto, op. cit., pp. 360, 361.

⁵M. Goguel, op. cit., p. 390.

⁶Kümmel, Promise and Fulfilment, p. 71.

It should be noticed that in its context this saying associated the two concepts of suffering and exaltation. The two concepts appear also in connection with Mark 8:31, 9:12 and 10:33. This points up the fact that these concepts are closely related in the life and teaching of Jesus.

4. Luke 22:15-20 -- "And he said to them 'I have earnestly desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer; for I tell you I shall not eat it until it is fulfilled in the kingdom of God. And he took a cup, and when he had given thanks he said, "Take this, and divide it among yourselves; for I tell you that from now on I shall not drink of the fruit of the vine until the kingdom of God comes." And he took the bread, and when he had given thanks he broke it and gave it to them, saying, "This is my body which is given for you. Do this in remembrance of me." And likewise the cup after supper, saying, "This cup which is poured out for you is the new covenant in my blood."'"

The Markan version (Mark 14:22-25) is earlier¹ than the Lukan and than the Pauline (I Corinthians 11:24f.).

¹See treatment of this verse above.

The shorter Lukan text¹ which omits 22:19b and 20 is not generally considered earlier than the Markan. J. Jeremias supports the longer text² as original to Luke. His theory is that the shorter text was put forth in the second century and appeared in part of the Western texts. The purpose of the suppression was to avoid profanation, to keep the heathen from gaining knowledge of the sacred words. G. D. Kilpatrick supports the shorter text and says that Luke deliberately suppressed parts of the bread and cup for the same purpose suggested by J. Jeremias, profanation.³ If the shorter text be accepted as authentic to Luke the reasoning behind Luke's suppression was the fact that he was writing for those outside the church.⁴ The suppression of the cup-word and its association with blood would thus not be misunderstood or offensive to the catechumen.⁵

From the words of Luke 22:15 and 16 it seems clear

¹Luke 22:19b and 20 are excluded by D, a, b, d, e, ff², k, and l.

²J. Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, op. cit., pp. 87-106.

³G. D. Kilpatrick, "Luke 22:19b-20," Journal of Theological Studies, XLVII, pp. 49-56.

⁴Luke 1:1ff.

⁵See Dalman, Jesus-Jeshua, p. 156 and Fuller, op. cit., p. 68.

that the supper was identified with the Passover Meal. Even if the words are interpreted as evidence against the supper being celebrated on the day of the Passover Meal, paschal terminology is evident. Jesus' strong desire to celebrate this Passover shows that it has special meaning for him and offers support for the opinion that Jesus related his suffering to the Passover Lamb offered at the Exodus.¹ This feast was celebrated in anticipation of the Messianic Feast. Thus his death was all that separated them from the consummation.

Opinions vary as to whether Jesus partook of the cup. Jeremias² says that Jesus' statement about refraining from the cup is an explanation as to why he is not drinking at the present supper. That is, he has taken a vow that he will not drink until his work is accomplished. It is pointed out on the other hand that it would have been a breach of ethics for him to have broken the fellowship by not drinking. The antithesis is between the present feast and the Kingdom Banquet; the one a farewell feast anticipates the other.³ These supper sayings

¹See Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, p. 144.

²Jeremias, op. cit., p. 166.

³V. Taylor, op. cit., p. 183.

express the urgency Jesus felt toward his voluntary suffering¹ and approaching death and the vital part the disciples must share in his suffering. Again the two elements of suffering and exaltation are closely related.

5. Luke 22:27 -- "For which is the greater, one who sets at the table, or one who serves? Is it not the one who sits at the table? But I am among you as one who serves." This saying is important because of its reference to service. The differences between Luke 22:27 and Mark 10:45 are of such a nature that Luke can be assumed to be following a definite tradition.² In contrast to the Palestinian character of the language in Mark 10:42-45, Luke 22:24-27 shows strong Hellenistic influence.³

The idea of service seems to be related to the Johannine narrative of footwashing.⁴ This is an example of the fact that though Jesus does not call himself the

¹H. Conzelmann, *op. cit.*, p. 200, asks, after noting that Luke 22:15 suggests the thought that Jesus' suffering is voluntary, if there is a tradition which originally was in opposition to the Gethsemane tradition. But he goes on to say that the Gethsemane scene does not contradict the interpretation of a voluntary suffering, though he sees it as an interpretation of the church.

²See treatment of Mark 10:45 above.

³See J. Jeremias, "Das Loesegeld für Viele," *Judaica*, III, 1948, pp. 258-262.

⁴See John 13:3-17.

Servant, he offers the example or standard for the task the Servant is to accomplish. The Servant "supplies the predicate."¹ The idea of service played a dominant part in the thought of Jesus on the night of the Last Supper.

6. Luke 22:28-30 -- "You are those who have continued with me in my trials; as my Father appointed a kingdom for me so do I appoint for you that you may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel." The trials mentioned in verse 28 are the difficulties and sufferings they have experienced as a result of being associated with Jesus and his ministry. He announces to them that they shall share now in his coming kingdom. R. Otto, who accepts the shorter Lukan text of the Last Supper, Luke 22:14-19a, says verse 29f. should follow 19b.² This makes the saying closely related to the supper.

The διατίθεσθε of verse 29 could well refer to a covenant. In speaking thus of a covenant in comparison with the covenant the Father had made to him, Jesus was interpreting his death as an event in which God himself was acting. God was to give his Servant

¹Wm. Manson, Jesus the Messiah, p. 111.

²R. Otto, op. cit., p. 269.

for a covenant of the people in Isaiah 42:6. In speaking of his death as the inauguration of a covenant Jesus was clearly identifying his death as a decisive act of God.¹

Verse 30 describes the exaltation and authority that the disciples themselves shall receive. Bultmann considers this a formation of the Primitive Church,² with the resurrected Christ as speaker. The objection is to the mention of twelve. But here as in the entire saying, the fact that Jesus in view of his death can speak with such authority and confidence of exaltation illustrates the conviction of Jesus that his suffering and death were necessary and the result would be exaltation and kingdom.

7. Luke 22:37 -- "For I tell you that this scripture must be fulfilled in me, 'And he was reckoned with transgressors;' for what is written about me has its fulfilment." Those authorities who do not believe that Jesus derived the conviction that he must suffer from a study of the Suffering Servant of Isaiah 53, base their arguments on the fact that they cannot find a clear reference to the Suffering Servant in the early strata of the

¹Fuller, op. cit., pp. 74f. Cf. Taylor, op. cit., p. 188 and Otto, op. cit., p. 268.

²Bultmann, The History of The Synoptic Tradition, p. 158.

Gospels.¹ It is pointed out that for the first and only time in the Synoptic Gospels, a clear reference to Isaiah 53 in the words of Jesus² is found in Luke 22:37.³ It is further declared that when the context is considered the Messianic element is certainly not specifically present in the mind of Jesus.⁴

Unless we recognise that in the context Jesus does not refer to actual purses, bags, and swords, but is speaking in metaphors, the assumption that verse 37 is an insertion is supported. But if we take the position that Jesus was aware of the cruciality of the events of that last night and the consequences they would have for the disciples, this was his way of letting them know that they may well expect opposition even to death. The fact that Jesus says, "This Scripture must be fulfilled in me" rather than what an interpolator might have had him say, "This which is written of me must be fulfilled," also indicates

¹Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake, The Beginnings of Christianity (London: Macmillan Company, 1920), I, p. 383.

²Bultmann, Theology of The New Testament, I, p. 31, considers the discovery of Messianic interpretations of Isaiah 53 to have taken place in the Christian Church. Luke 22:37 is the first influence from Isaiah 53.

³Morna Hooker, op. cit., p. 86.

⁴F. C. Burkitt, op. cit., p. 37.

that the words are genuine.¹ The statement of the disciples about the swords is the result of a misunderstanding and Jesus must then declare, "It is enough."

The quotation from Isaiah 53:12, καὶ μετὰ ἁνομίων ἐδοξιάθη is not identical with the LXX version, καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἁνομίαις ἐδοξιάθη.² The presence of this quotation in the L tradition emphasises the fact that Jesus was conscious of fulfilling the suffering of the Servant and the choice of this passage indicates that his thoughts at that time were centered on the fact that he was to be "reckoned with transgressors." He may well have had in mind the remainder of the verse he quoted from Isaiah 53, "yet he bore the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors."³ Here again is evidence of Jesus' determination to give himself by identifying himself μετὰ ἁνομίων.

8. Luke 22:53b -- "But this is your hour, and the power of darkness." The origin of this passage is best explained as an editorial adaptation of Mark 14:49b and

¹v. Taylor, op. cit., pp. 192 and 193.

²Cf. Higgins, Jesus and The Son of Man, pp. 31 and 39, who says the allusion is too direct when compared with the indirectness of other passion references.

³Taylor, op. cit., p. 194.

its reference to scriptures being fulfilled. The allusion to "hour" probably originates with the "hour" reference of Mark 14:41. The thought here is that this is "your hour," but "my hour" is coming. The reference to the power of darkness¹ indicates the conflict between the efforts of evil and those of Jesus himself. This saying emphasises the fact that Jesus realised his death was inevitable if he was to accomplish his mission.

In Luke 22:66-71 Jesus' response to the question as to whether he was the Christ, "You say that I am," reveals a great difference between Jesus' conception of Messiahship and that of the priests,² but it cannot be taken to mean a denial.

9. Luke 23:34 -- "And Jesus said, 'Father forgive them; for they know not what they do.'" This verse is omitted by important manuscripts, B, D, W, (H), a, d, sy^s, sa, and boP^t, and therefore it is often rejected. Some of those who reject it (Hort and Montefiore) consider it a genuine saying of Jesus.³

¹H. Conzelmann, op. cit., p. 181, n. 6, in comparing ἐξουσία and δύναμις points out Luke's distinctive use in ascribing ἐξουσία as well as δύναμις to Satan, a usage "which Mark and Matthew avoid doing on principle."

²Taylor, op. cit., p. 194.

³See Taylor, op. cit., p. 198.

J. Jeremias lists this verse with those passages in which Jesus applies the Servant passages of Deutero-Isaiah to himself. He says that Jesus is here "making intercession" for unwitting sins comparable with that of Isaiah 53:12 where the דוֹשָׁן is the sacrifice for unwitting sins. He further points out that Luke 23:34a is omitted in some of the manuscripts and might well be a very old addition resting upon authoritative tradition.¹ As proof of the pre-Hellenistic tradition behind this saying it is noted that Palestinian circumstances are presupposed. In late Judaism, it was part of a criminal execution that the guilty party make the vow, "May my death expiate all my sins."² Jeremias says that Jesus reverses the expiatory vow so as to transfer the expiatory virtue of his death to his offenders.³ Other scholars support the genuineness of the passage by explaining that the passage was deleted because some second-century Christian could not believe that God could or had forgiven the Jews.⁴

¹Zimmerli and Jeremias, op. cit., p. 99.

²See Chapter I, section on Rabbinical literature, in this thesis. See also A. Büchler, op. cit., p. 102.

³See Zimmerli and Jeremias, op. cit., p. 102. Cf. IV Maccabees 6:29 and II Maccabees 7:37f.

⁴Taylor, op. cit., p. 197.

The two other sayings from the cross peculiar to Luke are: "Verily I say unto thee, today shalt thou be with me in Paradise" (Luke 23:42), and "Father, into thy hands I commit my spirit" (Luke 23:46). We cannot be sure about either of these but they are probably Luke's addition from his special passion source. It is not necessary or probable that Luke 23:46 was inserted to replace Mark 15:34. The two can be harmonised for the death of Christ is not immediately recorded after his cry about being forsaken by God.¹

The Servant of the Lord

Before summarizing this chapter some remarks concerning the Servant of the Lord are appropriate and should be read in the light of the research on related passages² treated in detail above.

In its interpretation of the mission and work of Jesus, tradition does not use to the fullest extent Messianic terminology, but rather emphasises the Son of God, Son of man, or Servant of the Lord, at given times.

William Manson has rightly observed that Isaiah 53 says either too much or too little to cause the Christians

¹Taylor, op. cit., pp. 199f.

²Only Luke 22:37 directly quotes Isaiah 53. Other passages with apparent allusions are Mark 1:11, 8:31, 9:12, 9:31, 10:33f., 10:45, and 14:21; Luke 24:26f.; and Matthew 8:17 and 12:18-21.

to identify Jesus with the Suffering Servant if Jesus had not explained the meaning of his mission in terms of the Servant.¹

It is the mind of Jesus² which accounts for the Synoptic presentation. The passage where Jesus clearly identifies himself with the Suffering Servant is Luke 22:37, "For I tell you that this Scripture must be fulfilled in me, 'And he was reckoned with transgressors'; for what is written about me has its fulfilment."³ The central theme of the Servant Songs appears in Mark 10:45.⁴

The relation of Jesus to the Suffering Servant is expressed at his baptism. This act of baptism is rightly

¹William Manson, op. cit., pp. 22f.

²Cf. F. C. Grant, An Introduction to New Testament Thought (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1950), p. 23.

³Cf. Mark 15:28. Included by Θ, f1, f13, a1, lat, sy^P, bo^{PC}, S, and Rm. See W.O.E. Oesterley, Sacrifices in Ancient Israel, p. 286. See treatment of Luke 22:37 above.

⁴See Oscar Cullmann, The Christology of The New Testament (London: S.C.M. Press, 1959), p. 65, and the treatment of this verse above in Chapter III. See Albrecht Oepke, "Βάπτω," T.W.z.N.T., I, 536. See also Tödt, op. cit., p. 193, who says that this is the work of the church and explains the seeming correspondence with Isaiah 53 by pointing out that in the N.T. to serve is limited to table service. See also Hooker, op. cit., pp. 74ff.

understood to be an act of self-humiliation on the part of Jesus. It may very well be responsible for an increasing emphasis of the early church on the exaltation of Jesus with a decreasing emphasis on his humility.

If the baptismal account of Mark 1:10f. in which the heavenly voice proclaims the blessing of God in the citation from Isaiah 42:1 is an accurate account, Jesus was conscious of fulfilling the Servant ideal. This reference is essential for clarifying Jesus' understanding of his baptism. In reply to John's question, "I need to be baptized by you and do you come to me?", Jesus says, "Let it be so now; for thus it is fitting for us to fulfill all righteousness."¹ The heavenly reply indicates that in his baptism² Jesus has accepted the call to complete the work of the Suffering Servant on whom Yahweh places the sins of his people. The answer to John that he must fulfil

πᾶσαν δικαιοσύνην thus has a precise meaning. Jesus' being baptized is related not only to his own righteousness but the righteousness of the

¹Matthew 3:14f. This is genuine for the community would hardly have invented the submission of Jesus to a baptism for the forgiveness of sins. See Fuller, The Mission and Achievement of Jesus, p. 52.

²See Cullmann, op. cit., p. 67, who declares, "For Jesus, 'to be baptized' is the same as 'to die.'"

people with whom Jesus has united himself in solidarity.¹

Jesus' own statements² make clear that the obedience and self-renunciation of the Servant held real significance for him. Yet it is noticeable that while in his teachings about himself Jesus describes himself as serving, he never speaks directly as the Servant nor claims the title for himself.

Jesus saw in the Servant his task of humiliation, self-sacrifice and representative suffering, a middle position, as we shall see, in relation to his ultimate status as the glorified Son of man. As Jesus probably understood it, this glory could only come about through the experience predicted of the Servant in Isaiah 53.

The essential element in the Suffering Servant which Jesus recognises is that unlike the suffering of Jeremiah and others who suffer in the course of duty, the suffering, self-sacrifice, of the Servant is a means whereby a mission is accomplished and brought to an exalted end. In this mission Jesus seems to have been conscious of being called "first of all to live, not to

¹Oscar Cullmann, Baptism in The New Testament, pp. 16ff.

²Mark 10:38; 10:45; 14:21; Luke 12:50; and 13:32f.

teach, the work of atonement."¹ He thus could teach the father's forgiveness of sins, and in healing the sick could actually forgive sins.²

As we have seen the self-offering implied in the words about the ransom and the covenant in the Synoptic tradition is sacrificial in character. This sacrificial nature also appears in the four descriptions of the Lord's Supper, Mark 14:24, Matthew 26:28, Luke 22:20 and I Corinthians 11:24, where there is agreement on the important point that at the Supper Jesus announced that he would

shed his blood for many, using either ὑπὲρ

πολλῶν (Mark), περὶ

πολλῶν (Matthew) or ὑπὲρ

ἑμῶν (I Corinthians and Luke). The

fact that the reports agree on this point while differing in other ways emphasises the importance of the representative work of Jesus. The other point of agreement among these four Supper sayings is the use of διαθήκη.

Thus it becomes clear that the two main characteristics of the work which the Servant of Deutero-Isaiah was to accomplish, those of representation and covenant, are the

¹Cullmann, op. cit., p. 61.

²Ibid.

identical characteristics which Jesus predicts with a sacramental act of his own self-offering.¹

The self-offering of Jesus implied in his words about the ransom and covenant as presented in the synoptic tradition is clearly sacrificial in character. Jesus identifies himself with sinners and makes himself an

ΔΥΧ for them.

In his use of the Servant conception, Jesus "does not take the idea of Messianic suffering directly from Isaiah 53 as a modern commentator might, but rather from his own experience and insight he formulates this teaching and finds in the idea of the Suffering Servant the medium for its expression."² The connection of Jesus with the Servant is expressed all through his ministry from his baptism, when words applied to the Servant of Yahweh in Isaiah 42 were used, to the last night when he used the saying, "He was numbered with the transgressors."³

¹Cullmann, op. cit., p. 64.

²Vincent Taylor, The Life and Ministry of Jesus (London: Macmillan and Company, 1954), p. 143.

³Luke 22:37. See James Denney, The Death of Christ, p. 81.

Summary of Self-denial and Self-sacrifice
in the Life of Jesus as Expressed
in the Synoptic Gospels

From the detailed analysis of verses in the Synoptic Gospels related to the self-denial and self-sacrifice of Jesus certain general observations can now be made. Much of the material contained in references such as Mark 8:31, 9:31 and 10:33f., especially that dealing with concrete details from the passion narrative, has been affected by knowledge of the event; but, in substance, Jesus' prediction of suffering and exaltation remains intact. The two concepts of suffering and exaltation are closely related in the life of Jesus.

When isolated portions of Mark 8:31, 9:31 and 10:33f. which do not refer to details of the passion narrative are placed together they form a description of the work of the Suffering Servant. Though Jesus does not call himself the Servant, he sees his work defined in the Suffering Servant of Deutero-Isaiah and offers the example or standard for the task the Servant is to accomplish. His own statements make clear that the obedience and self-renunciation of the Servant held real significance for him, and that he considered his mission preliminary to the exaltation of the Son of man.

In Mark 10:45 Jesus' mission of serving and

surrendering life is set forth. Keeping in mind that the word "ransom" is used as a metaphor and the fact that Jesus somehow sees the lives of men forfeited and offers himself in such a way as to bring about a recovery of life, we are justified in calling his self-surrender a sacrifice and particularly so if he thought of his suffering in terms of the ΔΨΝ.

That Jesus foresaw his suffering is indicated in the parable of the Wicked Husbandmen but his audience would not have seen any special significance in this. The same foresight appears in Mark 14:8 where Jesus, recognising that prophets might well anticipate martyrdom, expected to be buried as a criminal without anointing. Mark 14:18-21 presents an authentic insight on the part of Jesus that he would be betrayed.

Jesus' death was quite different from an inevitable disaster for he could have remained in retirement, but in accepting death he presented a voluntary self-sacrifice. In using the phrase "Abba Father" and the prayer for the renewal of the cup, Jesus was submitting to the will of the Father in spite of an apparent human desire to do otherwise. The double metaphor of fire and water of Luke 12:49f. points up the real tension within Jesus and shows that he was conscious in his decisive self-offering of

fulfilling a suffering that was extreme and not merely incidental. In Luke 13:32f. Jesus' resolute intention of denying personal safety in order to fully surrender himself becomes apparent.

Jesus' declaration that James and John shall drink of his cup and receive a like baptism make it clear that Jesus does not think of his passion apart from the sufferings of his disciples. The request for vigilance in Mark 14:34 indicates that the validity of his sacrifice depended upon the disciples sharing in the fellowship of his sufferings and death.

The important conclusion which this study has brought to light is the sacrificial character of the offering Jesus presented. The sacrificial terminology appears repeatedly, especially in the use of the word "blood" which underlies the principle of life through death. "The bond which unites his thoughts and makes them a consistent whole is the sacrificial principle implicit in the Old Testament sacrifices."¹

The character of the Last Supper emphasised the covenantal and sacrificial nature of Jesus' self-offering and it points up the importance of men participating in

¹Taylor, The Atonement in N.T. Teaching, p. 21.

the self-giving of Jesus. At the Supper they symbolically take part in what will in reality become a share in the surrendered life as they partake of the bread and wine. Just as Jesus' sacrifice is more than a symbol, the participation of men in the sufferings of Jesus is to be more than a symbol; it involves their own self-sacrifice.

CHAPTER IV

THE SON OF MAN AS PRESENTED IN THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS

Having treated those Scriptures dealing with self-denial and self-sacrifice in the life of Jesus, it is now essential to look at what he, the historical Jesus, thought of his identity and destiny. The whole subject of the historic Jesus is so bound up with the kerygma that the question of authenticity arises at every turn. In dealing with the self-denial and self-sacrifice in the life of Jesus, it has become clear that most of the suffering sayings are Son of man sayings. For this reason the title must be thoroughly treated to determine its relationship to the work of Jesus.

The purpose of this study is to show that it is not the humiliation and suffering as such which are so important in connection with the Son of man passages but the fact that the sacrificial service is willingly undertaken and the suffering is voluntarily accepted.

According to the Gospel writers, Jesus, in the

description of his work, his suffering and humiliation, and his exaltation, uses the designation, Son of man. These Son of man sayings are generally classified into three groups:¹ Those related to his present work, those referring to suffering, and those describing a future exaltation.

Those related to his present ministry and work comprise: Mark 2:10; 2:28; 10:45; Luke 6:22; 7:34 (Parallel: Matthew 11:19); 9:58 (Parallel: Matthew 8:20); 12:10 (Parallel: Matthew 12:32); 19:10; Matthew 13:37 and 16:13.

Those dealing with suffering include Mark 8:31; 9:12; 9:31; 10:33; 10:45; 14:21; and 14:41. See also Luke 17:25; 22:22; 24:7; and Matthew 26:2. Luke 9:58 (Parallel: Matthew 8:20) may possibly be included in this group.

Those describing the future exaltation include Mark 8:38; 9:9; 13:2; and 14:62. See also Luke 11:30 (Parallel: Matthew 12:40); 12:40 (Parallel: Matthew

¹This classification is given by Rudolph Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, I, p. 30; by William Manson, Jesus The Messiah, p. 116; and R. H. Fuller, The Mission and Achievement of Jesus, pp. 96f. I am following the order of the last source. See also a treatment in Peter C. Hodgson, "The Son of Man and the Problem of Historical Knowledge," The Journal of Religion, 41, Jan., 1961, pp. 104ff.

24:44); 12:8; 17:22; 17:24 (Parallel: Matthew 24:27); 17:26 (Parallel: Matthew 24:37); 17:30; and 18:8. See also Matthew 10:23; 13:41; 16:28; 19:28; 24:30; 24:39; and 25:31.

Before dealing with these sayings individually certain points should be noted. According to the Gospels, the title Son of man is the only term Jesus applied to himself. It appears some eighty times, all of which are attributed to Jesus.¹ The Gospel writers do not employ the title when speaking of their own faith but allow it to be used only by Jesus, showing that, at least by the time of their writing, tradition had it that Jesus used this designation.² The title never appears in the numerous confessions of faith of the primitive community, either in the New Testament or later theological formulations.³

R. Bultmann declares that the sufferings group, since the sayings are not in Q and refer to the resurrection, is made up of sayings invented by the community

¹Notice, however, the usage of Acts 7:56 and Revelation 1:13ff. See E. Schweizer, Lordship and Discipleship, p. 40.

²Cullmann, op. cit., p. 137.

³See Ethelbert Stauffer, Jesus and His Story, p. 163.

after the events. He excludes Luke 9:58 and Matthew 8:20 from this group. He says the present usage of the Son of man is the result of a misunderstanding in the translation into Greek, for in Aramaic the term was not a Messianic title but meant only "man" or "I."¹ He concludes that it is the third group of references, that concerning the coming Son of man, which contains the oldest tradition.² In opposition to this view, it has been said that even if it could be proved that the community appropriated the Son of man title,³ it is not likely it would have invented sayings like Mark 8:38 or 14:62 where Son of man is distinguished from "I."⁴ Jesus made the distinction because he saw himself not as the Son of man, but as the one designated to become the Son of man.

¹See Philipp Vielhauer, "Gottesreich und Menschensohn in der Verkündigung Jesu," in Festschrift für Günther Dehn, edited by Wilhelm Schneemelcher (Neukirchen: Kreis Moers, 1957), p. 56, who says the expression Son of man does not appear to be a transcription of "man" or "I" but is rather titular.

²R. Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, I, pp. 30f. See also Günther Bornkamm, op. cit., pp. 174 and 230, and Vielhauer, op. cit., p. 53.

³This position is taken by E. Käsemann, "Das Problem des historischen Jesus," Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche, pp. 149f.; P. Vielhauer, op. cit., pp. 51-97; and H. Conzelmann, "Jesus Christus," in Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart³, III, 1958, pp. 630f.

⁴See Hodgson, op. cit., p. 91.

As noted above the suffering sayings are with few exceptions confined to Mark,¹ where their appearance is limited to prophecies of the passion and resurrection, and to the passion narratives themselves. But as we have seen in the detailed treatment of the passion sayings in Mark, the suffering references, rather than being created after the event, prove that Jesus had thought of his ministry in terms of suffering and triumph. He must suffer before he can be the glorified Son of man of the future. The fact that these sayings are not in Q is only natural since Q did not contain a passion narrative. The sayings in Luke 9:58 and Matthew 8:20 about the Son of man having no place to lay his head are an indirect prediction of suffering in Q. These sayings are a figurative expression for Jesus' rejection and are similar to the sayings on the cost of discipleship, cross-bearing and losing one's life to find it.²

¹Exceptions are secondary and influenced by Mark. Matthew 26:2, Luke 22:22 and Luke 24:7 are editorial. It is possible that Luke found his usage in his special source. Eduard Schweizer considers Luke 17:25 a very primitive form in which Jesus consciously and emphatically spoke of his being rejected, *op. cit.*, p. 19. The saying is probably editorial though. See Kümmel, *Promise and Fulfilment*, pp. 70f., who says this is reliable tradition which declares that Jesus awaits suffering and rejection but also considers the glorification. Luke 9:58 (Parallel: Matthew 8:20) may possibly be included in the suffering group.

²Fuller, *op. cit.*, p. 105. See Mark 8:34-37 and Matthew 19:38,39 and parallels.

The fact that the parousia sayings make no mention of a suffering Son of man¹ does not necessitate invention. Jesus in emphasising the suffering assumes knowledge of the parousia, just as he assumes knowledge of suffering when he speaks of the parousia.² The two groups of Son of man sayings belong to different circumstances in his ministry.

In the suffering usages it is probable that some of the details of the sayings such as Mark 9:31, 10:33f., and 14:21 have been conformed to the events of the passion; but the basic thought of death and exaltation is authentic.³ In his "eschatological forgiveness of sin and in dispensing with the Sabbath"⁴ Jesus was exercising the future function of the Son of man in the present.

In employing the term Son of man Jesus seems to stand apart or distinguish himself, by use of the third person, from the Son of man. For example, "Whoever is ashamed of me . . . of him will the Son of man be ashamed,

¹Luke 9:58 and its parallel, Matthew 8:20 present an indirect prediction of suffering by the Q tradition. See Fuller, op. cit., p. 104 and also p. 97.

²Fuller, op. cit., p. 106.

³William Manson, op. cit., p. 116.

⁴Mark 2:10 and 2:28. See Fuller, op. cit., p. 106.

when he comes in the glory of his Father . . ."1 R. Bultmann² has pointed out concerning future Son of man sayings which he believes come from Jesus himself, that the distinction between the earthly Jesus and the coming Son of man is clearly delineated. This distinction can be accepted as our analysis will show; but it is not necessary to carry the conclusion so far as to say that other sayings not referring specifically to the future are necessarily unauthentic.

A. J. B. Higgins is of the opinion that none of the positions stating that Jesus thought of himself as the Son of man or as the one destined to be the Son of man or as the one to be identified with him in the future can be upheld. He declares that "Jesus called himself the Son of man neither in his earthly ministry nor in predictions of his death and resurrection, but only alluded to the Son of man as if to a heavenly advocate, witness, or judge."³

Alan Richardson denying that Jesus made any distinction between himself and the third person Son of

¹Mark 8:38. Cf. Matthew 19:28.

²R. Bultmann, op. cit., p. 29.

³Higgins, Jesus and the Son of Man, p. 200. See also p. 193.

man sayings declares that since the term Son of man did not produce a clear conception at the time of Jesus, the term "must have meant whatever Jesus taught his disciples that it meant."¹ But this does not disprove the validity of the distinction for such a distinction is the very fact which can clarify Jesus' understanding of his mission. Jesus understood his earthly mission in terms of the Servant and only introduces the Son of man title in the third person to confirm the work of salvation he was carrying on. One's decision with regard to Jesus would determine his eschatological status at the time of the Son of man.² Jesus did not speak directly of himself as the Son of man³ but used it of a figure whom he did not specifically identify with himself and did so with an

¹Alan Richardson, An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament (New York: Harper and Row, 1958), p. 134.

²Cf. Mark 8:38, Luke 12:8f. and Matthew 10:32f. See Fuller, "The Clue to Jesus Self-understanding," Studia Evangelica, III, edited by F. L. Cross, 1964, p. 63.

³See the view of Günther Bornkamm, op. cit., pp. 174 and 230, and others, who say that in all probability the titles, Messiah, Son of God, Son of David and Son of man which are met in the testimonies of Jesus to himself received their form from the faith of the church which the resurrection awakened. The earthly Jesus did not claim any of the titles for himself. They were only secondary. This view is weakened by Peter's confession, Mark 8:27ff. and parallels, and by Jesus' reply to the Sanhedrin that he was the Christ, Mark 14:61f.

implicit Christological intention.¹

At times Jesus was completely objective. In his many futuristic usages of the term, as we shall see, it becomes clear that he is not yet fully the Son of man, but is the Son of man "to be." Rudolf Otto explains, "The kingdom (of God) throws its shadows forward into the present; it is not yet here in power, but is already here secretly. Likewise: the Son of man is not yet here in his power, but is already here before his power . . . as the one who some day will be the Son of man in his power."²

In regard to the Son of man as an "I"³ reference only, it has been pointed out that in Old Syriac a distinction was made between the generic and the titular sense of the Son of man designation.⁴ The substitution of Son of man for other titles shows the designation to

¹R. H. Fuller, op. cit., p. 60.

²R. Otto, The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man, p. 161.

³See H. E. Tödt, op. cit., pp. 105f. and 249, who agrees with Bultmann that Jesus did not identify himself as the Son of man, but who denies the validity of translating the present Son of man sayings with "I."

⁴See A. M. Hunter, The Work and Words of Jesus (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1950), p. 85. See also Vielhauer, op. cit., p. 56.

be more than a mere "I."¹

This leads to the question: How is suffering related to the Son of man, a title of glory? And why does the Son of man exhibit characteristics which are obviously those of the Servant of Deutero-Isaiah? In Mark 9:12 Jesus says, "And how is it written of the Son of man that he should suffer many things" and in Mark 14:21 he says, "For the Son of man goes as it is written of him . . .". Behind these statements lies some sort of association of the Son of man with the work of the Suffering Servant; "it is so firmly established in his thought that he can say of the Son of man what, so far as the text of Scripture is concerned, is true only of the Servant."²

What is the source of the term, Son of man? Why does the Scripture state that the Son of man must suffer "as it is written"³ when nowhere is there explicit writing that the Son of man must suffer, and when on the contrary, Old Testament references to the Son of

¹Mark 8:29f.

²Taylor, Jesus and His Sacrifice, p. 113. See also p. 256. See E. Lohse, Martyrer und Gottesknecht (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck, 1955), pp. 116-129.

³Mark 14:21. Cf. Mark 9:12.

man emphasise exaltation?¹

There are several possible sources of the Son of man.² In the Old Testament Son of man is used sometimes as a literary expression meaning simply "man." This usage appears more than ninety times in Ezekiel where it describes the prophet as a weak, earthly creature in the eyes of God.³ This "man" usage appears also in the Psalms.⁴ A second, apocalyptic, usage is found in Daniel 7:13, 14, where the prophet has a vision in which he sees "with the clouds of heaven . . . one like a Son of man, and he came to the Ancient of Days . . . And to him was given dominion

¹Cf. Fuller, *op. cit.*, p. 103, "Jesus suffers not as the one who is already the Son of man but as the one destined to be the Son of man, as the Son of man designated." This idea he gets from Daniel where "Before Israel is glorified as the Son of Man, the Saints of the Most High suffer oppression."

²See a treatment of various views in the article "Son of Man" by A. J. B. Higgins, in New Testament Essays edited by A. J. B. Higgins (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1959), pp. 119-121. He says it is possible to take a wider view than (T. W.) Manson's which said Jesus knew no other source of Son of man than Daniel. It is possible, he declares that Jesus was influenced by current Jewish ideas of Son of man which retained, though in a modified form, the marks of their foreign origin. See C. H. Dodd, According to the Scriptures (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1953), p. 117.

³See Ezekiel 2:1ff. See also A. M. Hunter, *op. cit.*, p. 85.

⁴Psalms 8:4 and 80:17.

and glory and kingdom . . .". In the interpretation that follows¹ the one like a Son of man is identified as the "Saints of the Most high." There is a third possible source in the Similitudes of Enoch. "This is the Son of man who hath righteousness, with whom dwelleth righteousness, and treasures of that which is hidden, because the Lord of Spirits hath chosen him."²

Ezekiel's use of the Son of man designation may have had special meaning for Jesus. In Ezekiel's description of God lifting the Son of man up from the ground,³ revealing to him his will,⁴ presenting him with his Spirit,⁵ and commissioning him to judge⁶ and serve in establishing his universal kingdom,⁷ an influence upon the thoughts of Jesus may be seen.⁸ The two references to the

¹Daniel 7:18.

²Enoch 46:3. See Johannes Weiss, Earliest Christianity, A History of the Period A.D. 30-150 (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1959), Vol. I, p. 128, E.T. of Das Urchristentum, edited by F. C. Grant.

³Ezekiel 2:2 and 4:24.

⁴Ezekiel 2:3-4 and 4:25ff.

⁵Ezekiel 2:2 and 3:24.

⁶Ezekiel 22:2 and 23:36.

⁷Ezekiel 27:15-28.

⁸Cf. George S. Duncan, Jesus Son of Man (London: Nisbet and Company, 1947), p. 146, and W. A. Curtis, Jesus Christ the Teacher (London: Oxford University Press, 1945), pp. 137f.

Son of man in Mark¹ which precede the confession at Caesarea Philippi may be interpreted as pointing up the humanity of the Son of man as does Ezekiel and thus emphasise the importance of Peter's confession.

In the apocalyptic literature the title is developed.² The Danielic Son of man referring to "The people of the saints of the Most High, forms a basis for the suggestions that the passion predictions were concerned with a corporate body,³ to which the disciples belonged."⁴ The origin of The Similitudes, I Enoch 37-71, is uncertain and they may possibly be a Christian interpolation. There is no definite evidence that Jesus used them; though, of course, he may have. There the figure of the Son of man has become a person. On the other hand,

¹Mark 2:10 and 28.

²IV Esdras 13.

³Morna Hooker, op. cit., p. 142, points out that one text "of the Aramaic together with the LXX, Theodotion, and the Vulgate, reads 'kingdom' (instead of 'kings') in Daniel 7:17 showing the oscillation between the corporate and individual in Hebrew thought and the fact that it was possible at an early stage for the figure of the Son of man to be transformed into an individual." See T. W. Manson, The Teaching of Jesus (Cambridge: At University Press, 1931), pp. 211sq.

⁴T. W. Manson, "Realised Eschatology and the Messianic Secret," in Studies in the Gospels, edited by D. E. Nineham (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1957), pp. 215 and 218. See also Higgins, op. cit., p. 127.

Jesus was certainly acquainted with Daniel 7.¹ But no matter what the decision is concerning the influence of the Son of man in Enoch it is ultimately associated with Daniel 7.

Jesus, at some time, came to understand himself as the representative of the "saints of the Most High" and as such would receive "dominion and glory and kingdom." Thus, just as the Servant of Deutero-Isaiah oscillates between the individual and the corporate, so Jesus individualises the "Son of man" in the same way. "In reality, the Son of man is never the community alone and he is never only a person. The two conceptions, the communal and the personal, co-exist, just as the kingdom is present and future. . . . Nothing could be more mistaken than to suppose that the application of the parousia sayings to the community rules out their relevance to Jesus himself, or that their application to Jesus excludes their relevancy for the community."²

William Manson was of the opinion that there probably existed among the Jews at the time of Jesus a general belief

¹See Mark 4:32; 13:26; 14:62; and Luke 12:32. Cf. Daniel 7:13.

²Vincent Taylor, Life and Ministry of Jesus, pp. 176f.

that the Son of God, the Servant of the Lord, and the Son of man by their similar characteristics of righteousness, election, and exaltation signified "only variant phases of the one Messianic idea;"¹ and, assuming the book of Enoch to be pre-Christian, he said "approaches to an actual synthesis of the feature" of all three could be discerned there.²

On the other hand the only evidence that the Son of man was already a current Messianic title in the time of Jesus is highly questionable.³ If the title was not Messianic in character we can understand why Jesus refuses the title Messiah, forbids that he should be proclaimed Messiah, and deliberately speaks of the Son of man distinct from himself. The hearers⁴ would read into it as much as they understood of Jesus.⁵

¹William Manson, Jesus the Messiah, pp. 98f.

²Ibid.

³C. H. Dodd, According to the Scriptures, p. 116, and Fuller, op. cit., p. 196. See also p. 98.

⁴Cf. Fuller, "The Clue to Jesus' Self-understanding," p. 63, who points out that the Son of man logia were addressed to those already following Jesus.

⁵Erik Sjöberg, Der verborgene Menschensohn in den Evangelien (Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1955), p. 230, who says that Jesus did not make known the mystery of his Messianic character through special instruction, but his Messianic character was implicit in his teaching.

With regard then to the source of the Son of man we can conclude that Jesus individualised the Danielic figure in a way similar to that of the Similitudes of Enoch but even more so than the author of this writing, keeping in mind that the Similitudes of Enoch is by no means certainly earlier than the preaching of Jesus.¹ It is quite likely that Jesus was influenced by current Jewish ideas of the Son of man which retained, though in a modified form, the marks of their foreign origin.² This is the position of A. J. B. Higgins who states that Jesus may have taken his use of the term Son of man from both the current belief that the Son of man was an individual and from Daniel where the usage seems to be collective. This explains the variation between personal and collective interpretations of the Son of man. In any case, it is probably a mistake to regard Daniel 7 as the sole source of the title in the Gospels.³

It is, however, in reference to Daniel that the most effective answer to the presentation of Philipp

¹Joseph Coppens and Luc DeQueker, "Le Fils de l'homme et les Saints du Très-Haut en Daniel, VII, dans les Apocryphes et dans le Nouveau Testament," Analecta Lovaniensia Biblica et Orientalia, Ser. III. Fasc. 23, p. 91.

²A. J. B. Higgins, "Son of Man," pp. 119-131.

³Ibid., p. 127.

Vielhauer¹ can be found. Vielhauer asserts that in the old tradition there is no real connection between the statements on the Son of man and those on the kingdom of God.² The teaching of Jesus was concerned primarily with the kingdom, he says, and then proceeds to note that the texts dealing with the Son of man are all foreign to the kingdom announcement, and therefore cannot come from the mouth of Jesus. He concludes that Son of man has no kingdom, and the kingdom has no Son of man.

But if Jesus used the title, as supported in this thesis, he must have been in some way influenced by Daniel even if the current individual interpretation³ had its influence. It is clear in Daniel 7:1-18 that the Son of man is the recipient of the kingdom; the two, the Son of man and the kingdom, are closely related. This union has been preserved in the teaching of Jesus with the concept

¹Philipp Vielhauer, "Gottesreich und Menschensohn in der Verkündigung Jesu," pp. 51-97. Vielhauer says that Jesus never used the term with reference to himself or another.

²E. Schweizer, Lordship and Discipleship, p. 40 n. 2 says that Son of man is not connected with Jesus' preaching on the kingdom of God because Jesus' eschatological role as Son of man is not that of one bringing the kingdom but that of a witness in the last judgment. Cf. however, H. E. Tödt, op. cit., p. 254, and Cullmann, op. cit., p. 127.

³A. J. B. Higgins, op. cit., p. 127.

of God the Father added. "Conscious of being called to announce and to establish the kingdom, Jesus quite naturally appealed to the figure of the Son of man to indicate both the coming of the kingdom and the role that he himself had to play."¹ In using the title of one distinct from himself questions were raised in the minds of the hearers without being answered,² and Jesus was indicating implicitly his relationship to the coming Son of man.

Each of the sayings will be treated separately in an effort to clarify which of them are authentic and thus relevant to Jesus' self-denial and self-sacrifice.

The Present Usage of Son of Man Sayings According to the Markan Order

1. Mark 2:10 -- "'But that you may know that the Son of man has authority on earth to forgive sins' . . . he said to the paralytic. . . ."³ It is understandable that this saying is often considered a product of the Christian community since it, along with all of the Son of man sayings related to the present activity of Jesus, took place in his public discourses and is not spoken in

¹Joseph Coppens and Luc DeQueker, op. cit., p. 91.

²William A. Curtis, Jesus Christ the Teacher (London: Oxford University Press, 1945), p. 142.

³Parallels: Matthew 9:6 and Luke 5:24.

conversation with his disciples, and from the fact that Jesus right in the face of his enemies assumes authority reserved for God. R. Bultmann¹ says "Son of man" is a misunderstanding of the "I" expression on the part of Jesus; that is, Jesus felt himself intimately related to, but distinct from, the Son of man. But the difficulty is more clearly explained if it is understood that "Son of man" was not a current Messianic title² and that Jesus from his viewpoint, assuming more than a prophetic role, understood that he was exercising eschatologically the powers of the Son of man to be.

From the viewpoint of Jesus' audience and especially his antagonists he was believed to be using the title with reference to mankind or man in general and this may well have been his intention.

¹R. Bultmann, The History of the Synoptic Tradition, p. 150.

²O. Cullmann, The Christology of the New Testament, pp. 140ff. assumes the "Son of man" to have been a Messianic title in pre-Christian Judaism as does R. Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, I, pp. 52f. But see especially Fuller, op. cit., pp. 98 and 106 giving strong evidence for his position that the Son of man was not a current Messianic title based upon the fact that the only evidence that the term might have been Messianic in nature is supported by the Similitudes of Enoch whose authenticity is highly questionable; and if it is authentic, there is no reason to suppose Jesus to be familiar with it. See Higgins, "Son of Man," pp. 125ff. showing the assumptions of various writers.

The saying then is probably an authentic word of Jesus understood by his hearers to mean that man in general has authority on earth to forgive sins.¹ Jesus in his own self-consciousness understood himself to be "proleptically exercising the functions of the coming Son of man, just as in his proclamation and healings the powers of the Kingdom were already proleptically at work."² He thus retained for the time being the secret of his person.

2. Mark 2:28 -- ". . . the Son of man is Lord even of the Sabbath."³ In verse 27 the statement is made to the Pharisees that "The sabbath was made for man, not man for the sabbath." The word, κύριος, there quite clearly refers to men in general and the logical implication is that all men are lords of the sabbath;⁴ but in the following verse the conclusion is drawn that the "Son of man" is therefore the Lord of the sabbath. This indicates that Mark understood Jesus to have used the

¹See, however, Taylor, The Gospel According to Saint Mark, p. 199.

²R. H. Fuller, op. cit., pp. 106f.

³Parallels: Matthew 12:8 and Luke 6:5.

⁴See I. Abrahams, Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels, First Series (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1917), p. 9, who points out that the Pharisees also believed and acted as if the sabbath were made for man.

term to show his lordship over the sabbath; otherwise he would have eliminated the designation, Son.¹ Since the Aramaic original may be translated "Son of man" or man in general, it is quite probable that Jesus himself did not use the Son of man expression in verse 28 but made reference to mankind in general. Lohmeyer points out that nowhere else has Jesus designated himself as Lord of sacred Jewish rites. He declares that the early church knew and recognized Jesus as Lord of the people and therefore Lord of the sabbath.²

T. W. Manson has pointed out that instead of the Son of man in verse 28 being a misunderstanding of man in general, the barnasha of verse 27 should be Son of man. He would translate verse 27, "The sabbath was made for the Son of man, and not the Son of man for the sabbath." This theory is based upon the instruction of the rabbis that the sabbath was made for Israel only and this falls in line with the collective interpretation.³ It is quite doubtful, though, that Jesus took the limited position that the

¹See Cullmann, Christology of the New Testament, pp. 152f. for this opinion.

²Lohmeyer, op. cit., p. 66.

³T. W. Manson, "Mark 2:27f." in Coniectanea Neotestamentica in honorem A. Fridrichsen, xi, 1947, pp. 138-46.

sabbath was for Israel alone.

There is also the interesting conjecture of Théo Preiss that Jesus played upon the double meaning of barnasha. Emphasising the eschatological thought of Jesus, T. Preiss says that if the purpose of the sabbath is to benefit man in general, how much more the Man who came to save men will be master of the sabbath. Those who are with him, and through him the new collective man of the end of the age, share in the liberty of this sovereignty.¹

R. H. Fuller² asks concerning the interpretation that Son of man in verse 28 means merely man, ". . . is it conceivable that Jesus would have taught that any man could do as he pleased with the Mosaic law?", and then proceeds to explain the validity of the verse as it stands by explaining that Jesus only dispenses with the Mosaic law of the sabbath when the claims of the kingdom create an emergency situation, the emergency being the eschatological proclamation. He admits the plausibility of the "Son of man" as man in general for those sayings in Jesus' present active ministry, but he quite rightly points out

¹Théo Preiss, "Le Fils de l'Homme," (Études Théologiques et Religieuses, Vol. 26, 1951), p. 29.

²Fuller, op. cit., p. 100.

the difficulties of applying it to the suffering and future usages. This interpretation of Son of man as man in general seems appropriate and in line with Mark 2:10.¹

3. Mark 10:45 -- "For the Son of man also came not to be served but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for many."² Eduard Schweizer declares that this verse because of the idea of vicarious suffering can hardly be regarded as a word of Jesus since the idea of atonement is absent from the parallel in Luke; but he admits that it may be very old.³ However, it should be pointed out that all four versions of the Lord's Supper⁴ though differing in details agree that it was at this meal that he announced that he would shed his blood "for many."

As we have seen in the analysis of this verse above in Chapter III, the use of "to serve" and the reference to giving life as a ransom bring to mind the Servant of

¹See Cullmann, op. cit., p. 154.

²Parallel: Matthew 20:28. Cf. Luke 22:27. See thorough treatment of this verse in Chapter III above. This verse is placed in both the present and suffering groups of sayings.

³E. Schweizer, Lordship and Discipleship, p. 50. See R. Bultmann, The History of the Synoptic Tradition, p. 144, who says it is a "hellenistic-Christian doctrine of salvation."

⁴Mark 14:24, Matthew 26:28, Luke 22:20 and I Corinthians 11:24. See A. J. B. Higgins, The Lord's Supper in the New Testament, 1960, p. 50.

Deutero-Isaiah. Jesus apparently refers to his mission¹ of service, declaring the humiliation or self-denial involved as being the work of the Servant of the Lord. The association of Jesus with the Servant is very old² even if it cannot be finally proved that Jesus identified himself with the Servant.

The fact that the ransom saying is omitted from Luke is no conclusive reason for questioning its authenticity. It is clear that both Mark and Luke agree in their understanding of Jesus' usage of the Son of man designation, and it is quite probable that Jesus so used it.³ Cullmann declares, "It is as if Jesus said, 'The Son of Man came to fulfil the task of the ebed Yahweh.' Jesus consciously united in his person the two central

¹With regard to the mission of the Son of man, J. A. T. Robinson, Jesus and His Coming (New York: Abingdon Press, 1957), p. 63, lists Mark 10:45 with a number of other sayings of Jesus, which speak in the past tense of the significance of a coming that has already begun, in support of his belief that there is in Jesus' teaching no "'coming of the Son of man' which does not refer to his ministry, its climax and its consequences."

²W. Zimmerli and J. Jeremias, The Servant of God, p. 80. See treatment of this verse above and the opposing position of Morna Hooker, op. cit., pp. 110ff.

³See treatment of Mark 10:45 in Chapter III above, and Higgins, Jesus and the Son of Man, p. 49, who gives an explanation as to why he feels Jesus did not use the title.

concepts of the Jewish faith, barnasha and ebed Yahweh."¹ But the relationship is not as close as this, for the fact that Jesus makes the distinction between himself and the Son of man (Mark 8:38 and cf. Matthew 19:28) yet implying an organic connexion in that a decision regarding him will determine one's status in the glory of the Son of man, indicates that he was trying to keep the two distinct yet point up their very close association.²

The Present Usage of Son of Man Sayings in
Q According to the Lukan Order

1. Luke 7:34 -- "The Son of man has come eating and drinking and you say, 'Behold, a glutton and a drunkard, a friend of tax collectors and sinners.' . . ."³ The meaning behind these words is close to the rejection expressed in Luke 9:58 (Parallel: Matthew 8:20). Both verses belong in the same context.⁴ The only real argument that can be made against the authenticity of this verse is the declaration that Jesus never used the term Son of man in reference to

¹Cullmann, op. cit., p. 65. He finds no valid argument for contesting the authenticity of Mark 10:45.

²See R. H. Fuller, The Mission and Achievement of Jesus, pp. 102f.

³Parallel: Matthew 11:19.

⁴Cullmann, op. cit., p. 162.

himself.¹ The words certainly do not sound like the work of the community, for the church would hardly have created a saying to present Jesus as eating and drinking. Also the saying does not derive from the community because the Baptist is not considered as a witness or competitor of Jesus.² The community would hardly have placed Jesus in a place of equality with John as expressed in this verse. It would have made John subordinate.³

The question of authenticity centers around "Son of man." The community may well have taken a first person singular expression of Jesus and changed it to the Son of man designation,⁴ but we cannot be sure for if Jesus considered himself the one to become the glorified Son of man he could have used the term Son of man as in other utterances considered authentic. This seems to be the case.

2. Luke 9:58 -- "And Jesus said to him, 'Foxes have holes, the birds of the air have nests; but the Son

¹E.g., the position of Higgins, Jesus and the Son Man, pp. 17f.

²See Peter C. Hodgson, "The Son of Man and the Problem of Historical Knowledge," p. 108, following E. Schweizer.

³Jeremias, The Parables of Jesus⁶, p. 160, n. 37.

⁴See Tödt, op. cit., pp. 106ff.

of man has nowhere to lay his head.'"¹ Though there are no direct predictions of the suffering of the Son of man in Q, Luke 9:58 and Matthew 8:20 present one which comes close and should be given consideration. It has been classified in the present usage sayings but could have some claim to being a suffering saying. The words of Luke 9:58 record the reply of Jesus when approached by a scribe with the intention of becoming a disciple. In comparable situations Jesus stated plainly to prospective disciples that they must deny themselves, lose their lives, and bear their crosses.² In this instance he speaks of the Son of man as having nowhere to lay his head. The words probably date back to Jesus himself.³

R. H. Fuller⁴ points out that this saying should be interpreted as a figurative expression for rejection. It is explained that Jesus could hardly have meant to be taken literally for he did in fact at times have opportunity to stay with friends and did so. The conclusion is thus drawn that this is close to the predictions of

¹Parallel: Matthew 8:20.

²Mark 8:34ff. and Matthew 10:38f., Luke 17:33, Luke 14:25ff., Luke 9:23f., Matthew 16:24ff. Cf. John 12:25.

³See W. G. Kümmel, Promise and Fulfilment, p. 46.

⁴Fuller, op. cit., pp. 104f.

the Passion, especially Mark 9:12. He was saying in essence, "The Son of man must suffer much and be rejected."

E. Schweizer declares that the community would hardly have characterised Jesus in such a manner; they spoke of his persecution but not lonely wanderings. And as pointed out above the concept of discipleship is authentic.¹

Oscar Cullmann notes that contemporary New Testament scholarship in general rightly stresses Jesus' intensified claim to exaltation as implied in his consciousness of being the Son of man, but that the emphasis may be one-sided. He says that the use of the Son of man title with reference to his humanity points to his humiliation. Pre-supposing the incarnation, suffering and death of the Son of man, he says one is faced with the concept of humiliation as a result of the Heavenly Man² now incarnate.³

¹Noted in Hodgson, op. cit., p. 108.

²See Théo Preiss, op. cit., pp. 70f. on the pre-existence of the Son of man and especially p. 29 suggesting that the ambiguity here between Son of man and man in general is intentional on the part of Jesus.

³Oscar Cullmann, op. cit., p. 162. The suggestion of Bultmann, The History of the Synoptic Tradition, p. 28, that this verse was originally a proverb, first simply spoken of men and then later applied to Jesus is hardly reasonable for the words do not have a general application.

The point being made is that in his use of the title with regard to his earthly life Jesus understood Son of man to be an indication of his humiliation; and its meaning here also indicates to the follower that the disciple will share in the tribulation of Jesus. Matthew and Luke no doubt thought of this verse as a sharp paradox: "The heavenly Son of man is homeless."¹

3. Luke 12:10 -- "And everyone who speaks a word against the Son of man will be forgiven; but he who blasphemes against the Holy Spirit will not be forgiven."² The question arises concerning the use of Son of man. Matthew and Luke in the texts given us seem to consider the words original to Jesus; thus giving the impression that words spoken against Jesus will be forgiven, but any sin against the Holy Spirit will not be forgiven. On the other hand, Matthew 10:32f. gives the impression that any denial of Jesus will not be forgiven before the Father. This is contrary to what is said in Matthew 12:32 if Son of man is understood to be Jesus. Luke 12:8-12 is the Q form of the saying and points up the contradiction more strongly.

¹Sherman E. Johnson in The Interpreter's Bible (New York: Abingdon Press, 1946, 1952), Vol. VII, p. 344.

²Parallel: Matthew 12:32--adds "either in this age or in the age to come." Cf. Mark 3:28.

H. E. Tödt states that the verse is the work of the early church which understood definite epochs in the revelation of salvation. Jesus was the same Messiah acting in different epochs. It is only in the church's day, due to the presence of Christ's living spirit, that the Messianic significance of Christ's earthly life could be appreciated. Hence blasphemy against the earthly Son of man is permissible, but not against his living Spirit.¹ Thus the church preserved the distinction between the earthly Messiah and his future coming in fulfilment of God's saving plan, while Jesus himself did not assume this identity in this situation. Mark 3:28 should be considered in this context. It makes no mention of blasphemy against the "Son of man" but mentions "Sons of men," meaning clearly man in general. Thus Mark may well be the original version. In the Q form men in general has been interpreted as the "Son of man."² It is quite probable that here Jesus meant men in general in the same sense as Mark 2:28.³

¹Tödt, op. cit., p. 249.

²T. W. Manson, The Sayings of Jesus, pp. 108ff. Manson thinks that "Son of man" stands for "The Remnant, the true Israel of which Jesus is the head."

³See Fuller, op. cit., p. 100.

Present Usage Peculiar to Matthew

Matthew 13:37 -- ". . . He who sows the good seed is the Son of man." This Son of man designation appears in an allegorical interpretation of a parable which is from Matthew's special source or editorial. The sowing in this verse seems to have reference to the present ministry of Jesus. The question is, of course, did Jesus identify himself as the Son of man or is this a product of the church? With Matthew's tendency to identify Jesus with the Son of man as in Matthew 16:13 as compared with Mark 8:27 it is doubtful that this is an authentic word of Jesus.¹

Present Usage Peculiar to Luke

Luke 19:10 -- "For the Son of man came to seek and to save the lost." This is from Luke's special source. This saying like other sayings which occur in Matthew or Luke alone has a variety of contexts and is clearly secondary.²

Editorial Comment of Matthew

Matthew 16:13 -- "Now when Jesus came into the

¹T. W. Manson, op. cit., p. 194.

²Fuller, op. cit., p. 96.

district of Caesarea Philippi, he asked his disciples, "Who do men say that the Son of man is?" This is Matthew's editorial comment. He adds "Son of man" as compared with "I" of Mark 8:27. This is pointed out as one of the two exceptions to the general idea that there is almost no variation in form and content between the parallel occurrences of the sayings. The other discrepancy is between Luke 6:22 and Matthew 5:11.¹

Editorial Comment of Luke

Luke 6:22 -- "Blessed are you when men hate you . . . on account of the Son of man." This verse may be from Q but if so there is no Matthean parallel. It is probably Luke's editorial comment.

The Suffering Son of Man Sayings

These sayings have been treated in detail in the chapter on self-denial and self-sacrifice in the life of Jesus. The authentic suffering Son of man sayings seem to indicate that Jesus, conscious of being designated as the coming Son of man, sees in his mission a work of suffering, a necessary step in his becoming the glorified Son of man. Jesus uses the Son of man title because he

¹Hodgson, op. cit., p. 92.

sees the kingdom operating prior to its being fully consummated. In Daniel 7 before Israel becomes the glorified Son of man, it must suffer oppression. "The earthly sufferings of Israel are the prelude to Israel's inauguration as the triumphant Son of man."¹ The title Son of man is used to give a sign of confirmation to the work Jesus is accomplishing, and it is used with an implicitly Christological intention.

The Future Usage of the Son of Man Sayings
According to the Markan Order

It is difficult to take the Son of man sayings and accept the half that refers to Jesus' rejection and eliminate the part referring to the resurrection. If the prophecies cannot be accepted as genuine then what have they replaced?² The question is asked: Did Jesus ever prophecy his exaltation in terms of his resurrection? The answer is that the resurrection replaces exaltation as in the Johannine saying, "the Son of man must be exalted."³ This may be the primitive form of the Gospel tradition and

¹Fuller, The Mission and Achievement of Jesus, p. 104.

²See Matthew Black, "The Son of Man Problem" in Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, 45, 1962-1963, p. 311.

³John 3:14.

a genuine saying. Thus the words about resurrection would be secondary, but quite logical, expressions for the Son of man since "the exaltation led him through death to immortality."¹

1. Mark 8:38 -- "For whoever is ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterous and sinful generation, of him will the Son of man be ashamed, when he comes in the glory of his Father with the holy angels."² This is probably a genuine saying of Jesus though the word "ashamed" is characteristic of the Hellenistic church.³ E. Schweizer thinks the stylistic distinction between the "I" and "Son of man" expresses conscious restraint on the part of Jesus indicating that he is the One appointed to be exalted.⁴ He considers the shorter wording, Luke 9:26, the more genuine form of the saying, but a detailed comparison⁵ shows that Luke 12:8f. because of its antithetic parallelism (Cf.

¹Black, op. cit., p. 317.

²Cf. Matthew 10:33, Luke 9:26 and Luke 12:8f. R. H. Fuller, op. cit., p. 85, states concerning Mark 8:38 that the original "Trinitarian formula" may have been Father, Son of man, and angels.

³Tödt, op. cit., p. 38.

⁴Schweizer, op. cit., p. 18.

⁵See more thorough explanation below on Luke 12:8f.

Matthew 10:32f.) is the closest to Jesus' words. Mark 8:38 is cited as an outstanding example of the parousia sayings in which the Son of man is spoken of as one distinct from Jesus.¹ The distinction is explained as one between the earthly ministry and the exalted ministry of the Son of man to come.² But the "organic connexion" is also shown in Mark 8:38 as compared with Matthew 19:28. Jesus often³ tells his followers to wait for the coming of the Son of man; but he never presents himself as waiting with them. The relationship between Jesus and the Son of man is one of distinction and yet with a future association.⁴

2. Mark 9:9 -- ". . . he charged them to tell no one what they had seen, until the Son of man should have risen from the dead."⁵ The words about the Son of man and

¹J. A. T. Robinson, *op. cit.*, pp. 53-55 points out that the last clause of Mark 8:38 was added in the course of transmission, as a comparison with Luke 12:8f. and Matthew 10:32f. indicates.

²R. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, I, pp. 26ff., takes this position accepting the words as genuine.

³Mark 13:33-37; Luke 12:35-40 and Matthew 24:42-51 (parallels). See this in Fuller, *op. cit.*, p. 103.

⁴Higgins, *Jesus and the Son of Man*, p. 60.

⁵Cf. Matthew 17:9. Luke does not include it.

the resurrection are abrupt but not out of context.¹ It is doubtful if the limit imposed by the resurrection was originally so exact.² This is the only Son of man saying dealing with the resurrection only.

3. Mark 13:26 -- "And then they will see the Son of man coming in clouds with great power and glory."³ Here the reference is made to Daniel 7:13. E. Lohmeyer sees "Power" as a substitution for "God."⁴ The contrast between Jesus' message and that of late Jewish apocalypticism is noted. The former is one of distinct reticence while the latter emphasises detail and fancy.⁵ This directness gives every evidence of its being a genuine word of Jesus.⁶

¹Lohmeyer, op. cit., p. 180, n. 1 says that it is the exalted Lord who possesses glory and not the risen Lord. He uses Mark 9:8 and John 20:17 to support this.

²Taylor, The Gospel According to St. Mark, p. 393. Cf. J. A. T. Robinson, op. cit., p. 58, who sees this as language of vindication.

³Cf. Matthew 24:31 and Luke 21:27.

⁴Lohmeyer, op. cit., p. 328. He notes also the usage in Mark 14:62 and Matthew 26:64.

⁵Bornkamm, op. cit., p. 67.

⁶Cf. J. A. T. Robinson, op. cit., p. 49, who says that Mark may have originally written: "You have said that I am; but from now on you will see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of Power, and coming with the clouds of heaven."

4. Mark 14:62 -- "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.'"¹ This is the second reference to Daniel 7:13. Here it is combined with Psalm 110.

Since Jesus implies some association between himself and the Son of man it makes little difference whether the Markan version or its variant² be accepted. Those who see only a reference to the vindication or exaltation of Jesus find no problem in the verse. The problem of authenticity arises when there is seen a reference to the parousia.³

E. Schweizer states that the parousia Son of man sayings are not genuine but that behind them, as illustrated in Mark 14:62, "a stage can be detected in which the coming of the Son of man with the clouds was related to the exaltation and vindication of Jesus."⁴ This verse "has its origin in the conscious restraint with which Jesus spoke of himself as the 'Son of man' because only the follower can

¹Cf. Matthew 26:64 and Luke 22:69.

²Ⓜ, f13, pc and Or show οὐ εἶπας ὅτι ἐγὼ εἶμι. See Higgins, op. cit., 68; Taylor, The Gospel According to St. Mark, p. 568; and Lohmeyer, op. cit., p. 328, n. 2.

³Higgins, op. cit., p. 70.

⁴E. Schweizer, op. cit., pp. 39f.

know what this means."¹ The assumption that Jesus' self-consciousness far surpassed that of a mere prophet leads Schweizer to take the position that the use of the Son of man title was an original formulation of Jesus.²

H. E. Tödt considers the saying unauthentic, originating after the resurrection, because of the use of Old Testament references, a usage not found in what he considers authentic Son of man sayings.³

Barnabas Lindars declares that Daniel 7:13⁴ was used in the earliest period to express the vindication of Jesus in the resurrection, the time of his announced messiahship. This would indicate, he says, the coming to God rather than a coming to earth from the Father,⁵ and the meaning would be the equivalent to that of Psalm 110:1a.⁶ He says the first half of Mark 14:62 expresses

¹E. Schweizer, op. cit., pp. 39f.

²Ibid., p. 40. See Erik Sjöberg, " DTN 72
und DTA 72 im Hebräischen und Aramäischen,"
Acta Orientalia, 21, 1950, pp. 57ff., 91ff.

³Luke 12:8f., and parallels; Matthew 24:27, 37, 39 and parallels. Tödt, op. cit., pp. 33-37.

⁴Lohmeyer, op. cit., p. 328, believes Daniel 7 has nothing to do with the exaltation.

⁵Cf. Taylor, op. cit., p. 569.

⁶Lohmeyer, op. cit., p. 328, also sees a combining of Daniel 7:13 with Psalm 110:1 in the use of "power" for God. The exaltation of the Son of man comes from Psalm 110. Cf. p. 279.

the original idea, but the second half, because the reference to sitting precedes the coming and thus refers to the parousia, is an addition to the original word of Jesus. The adaptation has taken place before it came to Mark.¹

Kümmel supporting the genuineness speaks of a tradition in which Jesus gave his assent to the question of his messiahship and explained it by describing the future coming of the Son of man. Jesus knew the declared messiahship would necessarily precede his coming in judgment. Kümmel points up the exaltation and denies any reference by Jesus to the parousia in this connection.²

Higgins summarizes the problems well by declaring that the saying is a community creation and does, in fact, make some reference to the parousia. If the saying is a word of Jesus he meant that he was the Messiah, but that was only part of the truth, the whole of which would be understood when the "Son of man in the presence of God himself and coming with the clouds of heaven"³ should be witnessed.

¹Barnabas Lindars, New Testament Apologetic, pp. 41f.

²Kümmel, Promise and Fulfilment, p. 50.

³Higgins, op. cit., p. 73.

Future Usage of Son of Man Sayings in Q
According to the Lukan Order

1. Luke 11:30 -- "For as Jonah became a sign to the men of Ninevah, so will the Son of man be to this generation."¹ This saying differs to some degree from that of Matthew. It is probably a Q saying with the Lukan form the more original² and Matthew's appearing with editorial changes. In its Lukan form the saying is clearly a future usage. The fact that there is no clear identification of Jesus with the Son of man supports the authenticity as does the fact that Jesus refers to himself as a preacher of repentance who is against demands for signs and yet in his implicit understanding of himself will at the judgment be a sign to his hearers.³

2. Luke 12:8f. -- "And I tell you, everyone who acknowledges me before men, the Son of man also will acknowledge before the angels of God, (9) But he who disowns me before men will be disowned before the angels of God." There has been a clear distinction preserved between

¹Parallel: Matthew 12:40.

²J. A. T. Robinson, *op. cit.*, pp. 84ff., sees Luke 11:30 as the original and uses the "this generation" to support his position that "the day of the Son of man" was concerned with the complete ministry of Jesus. Cf. p. 78.

³Noted in Hodgson, *op. cit.*, p. 108.

Jesus and the Son of man. The antithetic parallelism is noted in both positive and negative parts.¹

In the Matthean form² the first person singular has been substituted for "Son of man" showing the influence of the church in identifying Jesus as the Son of man. Matthew is a secondary form of the Q saying which Luke has more accurately retained.³ The antithetic parallelism of the Q form, "acknowledge . . . acknowledge" and "disown . . . disown," as compared with Mark 8:38 where only the negative part appears indicates that the Lukan form is nearest the original words of Jesus.⁴

Vielhauer accepting the authenticity of Luke 12:8f. declares that "Son of man" is an insertion into the saying.⁵ But the fact that the positive part of the Q form contains "Son of man" and the negative part of the Markan form contains Son of man indicates an early tradition

¹Cf. Mark 8:38 which tradition has changed in that the first positive line is omitted.

²Matthew 10:32f.

³Higgins, Jesus and the Son of Man, pp. 58ff.

⁴Fuller, "The Clue to Jesus' Self-understanding," pp. 64f.

⁵Vielhauer, op. cit., p. 69. He compares this with the conclusion of Luke 15:10.

before Mark and Q in which the "Son of man" title appeared in both parts.¹

3. Luke 12:40 -- "You also must be ready; for the Son of man is coming at an hour you do not expect."² The agreement between Matthew and Luke is close. Jesus used the parable of the thief in the night to warn his hearers of impending judgment. The saying as it stands probably is the result of the church's replacing Jesus' use of "day of the Lord" of Amos 5:18 by the "Son of man comes" in an effort to keep its members alert in view of the delayed parousia.³

In view of this and the fact that late Jewish eschatological literature contains no stated comparison as that of the parable of the thief in the night,⁴ this saying cannot be used as an authentic reference to the Son of man by Jesus.

4. Luke 17:24 -- "For as the lightning flashes and lights up the sky from one side to the other so will the

¹Fuller, op. cit., pp. 64f.

²Parallel: Matthew 24:44.

³Jeremias, The Parables of Jesus,⁶ pp. 49ff. Cf. Higgins, Jesus and the Son of Man, p. 140. See, however, J. A. T. Robinson, op. cit., p. 79.

⁴Jeremias, op. cit., p. 50.

Son of man be in his day."¹ The striking form of this verse gives a good basis for considering this Jesus' "indubitably authentic teaching."² R. Bultmann considers the words as genuine, but says Jesus did not claim to be the Son of man himself.³

5. Luke 17:26 -- "As it was in the days of Noah, so will it be in the days of the Son of man."⁴ Jesus is not specifically identified with the Son of man. This saying like 17:24 is generally considered a genuine saying of Jesus.⁵ E. Schweizer places this verse in the present usage group declaring that the references to "day" of the Son of man do not refer to a second coming of Jesus but to the "day" of the earthly Jesus' warning of the impending crisis. But in the light of the foregoing sayings this appears to be an authentic reference to the coming exaltation of the Son of man.

Future Usage Peculiar to Luke

1. Luke 17:22 -- ". . . The days are coming when

¹Parallel: Matthew 24:27.

²Fuller, op. cit., p. 28.

³Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, I, 1952, pp. 26ff. Cf. J. A. T. Robinson, op. cit., p. 72.

⁴Parallel: Matthew 24:37.

⁵Cullmann, op. cit., p. 156.

you will desire to see one of the days of the Son of man, and you will not see it." The genuineness of this saying is supported by R. Bultmann since "Son of man" in it, like Matthew 24:39 and other sayings, does not refer specifically to Jesus.¹ There is every reason to consider the Son of man usage a genuine word of Jesus, for it simply emphasises the eschatological role of the Son of man to be. The difficulty in the verse appears in the words "one of the days of the Son of man." T. W. Manson accepts what is probably the best explanation. The phrase is the result of a misunderstanding of the Aramaic adverb lachdā, which means "very much," as the numeral "one" with the sign of the accusative. Jesus meant, "You will greatly desire to see the day of the Son of man."²

2. Luke 17:30 -- ". . . So will it be in the day when the Son of man is revealed." This verse is possibly from Q but there is no Matthean parallel.³

3. Luke 18:8 -- ". . . Nevertheless, when the Son of man comes, will he find faith on earth?" This use of Son of man appearing only in Luke is regarded by some

¹R. Bultmann, op. cit., I, pp. 26ff.

²T. W. Manson, The Sayings of Jesus, p. 142.

³Fuller, op. cit., p. 97.

commentators as a later editorial comment on the parable which ends with the word "speedily";¹ but there is no real reason why the words cannot be genuine.

Future Usage Peculiar to Matthew

1. Matthew 10:23 -- "When they persecute you in one town, flee to the next; for truly, I say to you, you will not have gone through all the towns of Israel, before the Son of man comes." This saying in its strange emphasis on the imminence of the coming of the Son of man seems to reflect the expectation and experience of the early church; and particularly so when elsewhere it said that only the Father knows the time. Matthew is probably bringing together material that belongs somewhere else in the narrative. The statement that the disciples will be persecuted appears later in Jesus' ministry according to Luke 22:35ff. The Beelzebul reference of Matthew 10:25 seems more properly to belong to Matthew 12.² These reasons despite Schniewind's³ simplified explanation of the meaning of the verse that at the appearing of the Son of man Israel will

¹T. W. Manson, The Sayings of Jesus, p. 308. See Tödt, op. cit., p. 93, on Son of man and faith.

²Ibid., p. 182.

³J. Schniewind, "Das Evangelium nach Matthäus," 8 ed. Das Neue Testament Deutsch, VII, 1956, p. 131.

still not have accepted the Gospel indicate the secondary nature of the words.

2. Matthew 13:41 -- "The Son of man will send his angels and they will gather out of his kingdom all causes of sin and all evil doers." This is a Son of man reference in an allegorical interpretation. The fact that the explanation follows so exactly the points of the original story leads to the conclusion that the story has been made to conform to the explanation. This is a teaching device characteristic of Jewish Apocalypses. The verse has no claim to be an authentic teaching of Jesus.¹

3. Matthew 19:28 -- "Jesus said to them, 'Truly, I say to you, in the new world, when the Son of man shall sit on his glorious throne, you who will have followed me will also sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel.'" Luke 22:29 forms a saying close to this verse and thus suggests an original Q saying. If that be true Matthew's addition of "Son of man" is editorial. It should be noted however that the distinction is made between Jesus in his earthly capacity and the "Son of man" reigning in glory.² This of course leads some to the opinion that the

¹T. W. Manson, The Sayings of Jesus, p. 194.

²Cf. Mark 8:38 where the same distinction is made.

Matthean form is the more primitive.¹ But the similarity is weak and Matthew 19:28 is most likely a creation of the community supporting the leadership position of the Twelve.²

4. Matthew 24:39 -- "And they did not know until the flood came and swept them all away, so will be the coming of the Son of man." These are genuine words of Jesus for there is no identification of Jesus with the figure of the Son of man.³ The saying occurs in a context close to Q (Matthew 24:37 and its parallel Luke 17:26) but there is no Lucan parallel. A. J. B. Higgins points out that "strictly speaking verse 39b is an editorial repetition of 37b,"⁴ an authentic saying.

5. Matthew 25:31 -- "When the Son of man comes in his glory, and all the angels with him, then he will sit on his glorious throne." The context in which the term Son of man stands here "contains features of such startling originality that it is difficult to credit them to anyone but the Master himself."⁵

¹See Schweizer, Lordship and Discipleship, p. 18.

²Higgins, Jesus and the Son of Man, p. 108.

³R. Bultmann, op. cit., pp. 26ff.

⁴Higgins, Jesus and the Son of Man, p. 84, note 3.

⁵T. W. Manson, op. cit., p. 249.

Even the abrupt change from "Son of man" in verse 31 to "king" in verse 34 leads to a questioning of the authenticity of the "king" references in relation to "Son of man." Though parts of the context may have been influenced by the community this verse seems to be the authentic teaching of Jesus.¹

Future Usage of Son of Man Editorially Expressed

1. Matthew 16:28 -- "Truly, I say to you, there are some standing here who will not taste death before they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom." This editorial expression is taken from Mark 9:1 and the words Son of man are used as an addition to the kingdom reference.

2. Matthew 24:30 -- ". . . Then will appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven, and then all the tribes of the earth will mourn, and they will see the Son of man coming on the clouds of heaven with power and great glory." This editorial work seems to find its basis in Mark 13:24ff.²

¹Cf. Higgins, Jesus and the Son of Man, p. 116.

²T. W. Manson, op. cit., p. 241.

Summary of the Son of Man as Presented
in the Synoptic Gospels

With regard to the source of the Son of man title we have concluded that Jesus individualised the Danielic figure in a way similar to that of the similitudes of Enoch taking his use of the term from both the current belief that the Son of man was an individual and from Daniel where the usage seems to be collective.

Some distinction has been made between the Jesus of history and the kerygma of the early church with regard to the Son of man title. Our analysis of the present Son of man sayings, dealing with the earthly activity of the Son of man, indicates that much of the presentation has been influenced by the church. "Son of man" in Mark 2:10, 2:28 and Luke 12:10 probably refers to man in general, but Mark 10:45, though highly controversial, seems to contain an authentic use of Son of man by Jesus, indicating that the purpose of the coming of the Son of man was one of self-denial and self-sacrifice. Luke 9:58 is interpreted as a figurative expression for rejection and is very close to predictions of the passion, especially Mark 9:12. Luke 7:34 contains what seems to be an authentic Son of man reference.

As indicated in the previous chapter the authentic

suffering Son of man sayings argue that Jesus saw his work defined in the Suffering Servant. This mission he understood to be preliminary to the exaltation of the Son of man. He speaks of the Son of man as one distinct from himself; yet seeing himself as the "Son of man to be," he allows the close association to so influence him that he uses the Son of man designation with regard to the passion. Jesus thus viewed his work of self-denial and self-sacrifice as the kingdom in operation before its full appearance, a work of performing "proleptically" the functions of the Son of man.

Authentic future Son of man sayings appear in Mark 8:38, 13:26 and 14:62. It is quite possible that the references to the coming of the Son of man in 8:38 and 14:62 refer to his approaching God rather than coming from God, but this interpretation may be pressing the point. In Q Jesus speaks of the Son of man as distinct from himself as found in the authentic sayings of Luke 11:30; 12:8; and 17:24, 26. The sayings peculiar to Matthew in 24:39 and 25:31 bear the same authenticity. The problem arises from the fact that in both the present and future sayings there is reference to the Son of man. And even though Jesus spoke of one distinct from himself as the Son of man coming in glory, the impression is given that he referred

to himself as the Son of man in his earthly ministry of suffering. As in the case of the suffering sayings, Jesus understands that just as the kingdom is still to come, he has yet to become the Son of man. This helps explain why the title Son of man appears so often and so closely related to Jesus.

If the Caesarea Philippi event was a turning point in the ministry of Jesus as Mark¹ indicates, then it is quite logical to understand Jesus as construing the passion work in terms of the Suffering Servant. This explains why Jesus deliberately participates in the passion.

Jesus understood himself to be fulfilling in his person the mission and destiny of Israel. He understood this to exist in two categories, the same two as those of Daniel 7; the earthly mission and charge of the Son of man, a task full of pain and humiliation, and the destiny of exaltation,² the Son of man being the highest possible title of glorification.³ Thus to suppose that Jesus predicted his death and not his vindication or the reverse

¹Mark 8:29.

²Whether as witness or judge, see E. Schweizer, *op. cit.*, p. 41, and H. E. Tödt, *op. cit.*, pp. 254ff. Cf. Cullman, *op. cit.*, p. 158, and Matthew Black, "The Son of Man Problem," p. 317, on John's Gospel.

³See Coppens and DeQueker, *op. cit.*, pp. 87f.

would be meaningless. Only as he was conscious of exaltation in his work could he speak so openly of his passion. This was the rule of his living. This was the basis upon which he could so readily demand of his disciples what he knew himself to be already engaged in, denying himself and losing himself to gain life. If the resurrection references cannot be accepted they should be understood, with Matthew Black, as replacing words concerning the exaltation.

Since the terms Servant of the Lord and Son of man had been applied to Israel in the Old Testament, Jesus could show his disciples without making a direct claim that the pattern for his obedience to the will of God was in line with these designations. Even so, he did not equate the terms. The obedience of the Suffering Servant becomes a middle position for Jesus' becoming the Son of man. There is an association between the Son of man of the future and the mission of the earthly Jesus.

Thus as the Son of man "to be" Jesus sees suffering and rejection not as a catastrophe but as necessary humiliation and self-sacrifice by which the exaltation of the Son of man will appear. Jesus "makes reference to the Son of man with a certain detachment and reserve, for it speaks to him not of a claim to be asserted, but of a life to be

lived, a life of humility and self-oblation even unto death, and solely on the ground of that humiliation and self-oblation, of his ultimate vindication by the father."¹

Jesus united in his mind the three different usages of the term Son of man and he employs the title in clarifying his intention of fulfilling his work of self-denial and self-sacrifice. The study shows that it is not the humiliation and suffering as such which are so important in connexion with the Son of man passages but the fact that the sacrificial service is willingly undertaken and the suffering is voluntarily accepted on the part of Jesus.

¹Fuller, op. cit., p. 108.

CHAPTER V

SELF-DENIAL AND SELF-SACRIFICE IN THE TEACHING OF JESUS AS PRESENTED IN THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS

According to the Markan Order

It has been shown that in Jesus' understanding of his suffering and death there was clearly a place of sharing for his disciples. The Markan order will be followed in discussing the synoptic sayings related to self-denial and self-sacrifice.

1. Mark 6:8, 9 -- "He charged them to take nothing for the journey except a staff; no bread, no bag, no money in their belts, but wear sandals and not to put on two tunics."¹ The narratives of Matthew and Luke are probably the more primitive. It is suggested that Mark's insertion of the staff and sandals was influenced by the fact that the exclusion of staff and sandals would be curious to the Western mind. T. W. Manson points out that in the mission

¹Cf. Parallels: Matthew 10:10 and Luke 9:3 include "the staff" in their prohibitions. Cf. Luke 10:4.

charge prohibition against staff, sandals, and wallet may be significant.¹ A regulation of the Mishnah states; one "may not enter into the Temple Mount with his staff or his sandals or his wallet, or with the dust upon his feet."² The sanctity of the Temple was to be thus respected. Perhaps the disciples were to understand their mission as a sacred undertaking, and were to set forth as if going to the Temple. In Matthew 12:6 the Kingdom is understood as greater than the Temple; thus the urgency of the mission for the Kingdom explains the sacred nature of the work.

The meaning of the verse is clear. The disciples are not to think of their personal welfare but of the Kingdom, they are to live off the hospitality of their hearers. It is evident in this connection that Jesus charged them to disclaim personal comforts, for the imminence of the Kingdom demanded their concentrated effort.

2. Mark 8:34 -- "And he called to him the multitude with his disciples and said to them: 'If any man would come after me, let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow me.'"³ The phrase "and he called to him the

¹T. W. Manson, The Sayings of Jesus, p. 189, and see p. 181.

²Danby, op. cit., (Berakoth 9:5), p. 10.

³parallels: Matthew 16:24 and Luke 9:23. Matthew 10:38 and Luke 14:27 refer to the "cross bearing."

multitude with the disciples" is probably editorial on the part of Mark. Matthew limits the hearers to the disciples and Luke describes Jesus as making the declaration πρὸς πάντας. Mark may well have been unaware of the original historical context of this saying and placed it here because of the close relation between Jesus' own suffering and rejection and that demanded of his disciples. The clause, "If any man would come after me," does not have reference to an imitation of the life of Jesus. But to "follow after" meant to be with him; that is, walk behind him as a scholar.¹

As background for Jesus' teaching of self-denial it is important to have an accurate analysis and understanding of the verb ἀρνεῖσθαι, and its compound ἀπαρνεῖσθαι. There is no real distinction in meaning between the two forms.² The basic meaning of the word is to say no, but since there are numerous ways of making a negative response the distinction is made between the use of ἀρνεῖσθαι as a negative answer to

¹Julius Schniewind, "Das Evangelium nach Markus," p. 85.

²Lic Heinrich Schlier, "T.W.z.N.T., I, pp. 470 and 471.

ἀρνεῖσθαι,"

a request and negative answer to a question as to whether something is so.¹

In addition to these two early uses of the word ἀρνεόμαλ a third variation appears in the Hellenistic period. This branch of the development determining the New Testament usage, is expressed in the words: "to say 'yes' and to say 'no,' to strive (ἐφίεσθαι) for something and to reject (ἀπαρνεῖσθαι) it, to pull and to push away, would you not call all that contradiction, whether you do it or someone else does it to you?"² To reject is contrasted with "to aspire." Thus the third usage of ἀρνεόμαλ becomes clear. The meaning is "to deny one's interest in something" or "to keep oneself negative to something in a proffered situation."³ It is this usage of ἀρνεόμαλ that becomes prominent after the classical age. It usually takes a direct object and increasingly a personal one.

We now come to the cultic use of this word. In the

¹See Harold Riesenfeld, "The Meaning of the Verb 'Ἀρνεῖσθαι,'" Coniectanea Neotestamentica, XI (Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1947), pp. 206-219, to whom I am indebted for the treatment that follows. Unless otherwise noted quotations from secular literature are cited from this work.

²Plat. Rep. 437.

³Riesenfeld, op. cit., p. 210.

Septuagint translation of Isaiah 3:7 we find the word used to express a disapproval: "The men shall disdain (ἄπρόσ-
νησότητα) their idols of silver and gold."

This does not mean that the obvious existence of the idols is denied, but does imply that people deny their interest and approval of them.

The meanings of the word often overlap and it is sometimes difficult to determine which of the three usages is intended.

In the words, "But it is impossible to escape thy hand, for denying to know thee the wicked were scourged,"¹ the use of εἰσέναι with ἀπρόσῳμα implies more than simply an objective negative answer. The meaning is stronger than a lack of knowledge of God; it rather expresses a "determined neglect" or "setting aside of God," a lack of interest. This along with other examples supports the opinion that "the formal difference between οὐκ οἶσα, in certain connections, and ἀπρόσῳμα εἰσέναι consists of the fact that the latter phrase more clearly underlines the subjective decision: 'not wanting to know.'²

¹Wisdom of Solomon 16:15f.

²Riesenfeld, op. cit., p. 213.

Ἀρνεῖσθαι finds a varied usage in the New Testament¹ but nowhere does the old subjective use of the word meaning "to refuse," appear. The objective use meaning "to deny" or "to dispute" a fact appears in Luke 8:45:² "And Jesus said, 'who was it that touched me?' When all denied (ἀρνούμενων) it . . . Peter" spoke. Each individual who denied felt the question directed to him.

This same objective negative answer appears in those descriptions of Peter's denial in which the verb is not followed by a personal object.³ In the passages in which the verb takes a personal object, μὲ, σὲ, or Jesus, the subjective Hellenistic meaning appears, ". . . Before the cock crows twice, you will deny (ἀπαρνήσῃ) me three times."⁴ It should be noted that here there is an implied infinitive, εἰδέναι. The οὐκ οἶδα τὸν

¹See Anton Fridrichsen, "Zu Ἀρνεῖσθαι im Neuen Testament insonderheit in den Pastoralbriefen," Coniectanea Neotestamentica, VI, p. 94.

²Cf. Acts, 4:16.

³Mark 14:67f. Cf. Matthew 26:70, 72, Mark 14:70, Luke 21:57 and John 18:25.

⁴Mark 14:30, cf. Matthew 26:34, 35, 75, Mark 14:31, 72, Luke 22:61 and John 13:38.

ἀνθρώπων of Mark 14:71 (Parallels: Matthew 26:72, 74 and Luke 22:57) at its face value is simply a denial of acquaintance with Jesus. As a falsehood, it is an act of disownment. Thus the denial does not dispute Jesus' physical existence but attacks the solidarity of the personal relationship between the two. It is a determined act of deception meaning that Peter would let it be quite clear that he did not want to know Jesus.

The legal use is shown in the refusal to recognise a person before some court. It appears in Matthew 10:33, "But whoever denies (ἀρνήσεται) me before men, I also will deny (ἀρνήσομαι) him before my father which is in heaven," an open denial of solidarity.

The use of ἀρνεῖσθαι by the Fourth Evangelist (John 1:20) in his explanation of John the Baptist's reply to the question, "Art thou the Messiah?," is striking. The text states καὶ ὡμολόγησεν καὶ οὐκ ἠρνήσατο καὶ ὡμολόγησεν ὅτι ἐγὼ οὐκ εἰμὶ ὁ χριστός. This is a strange usage of the two words ὡμολόγησεν and ἠρνήσατο. One would expect them to be interchanged; that is, "He answered negatively and not positively but denied that he was the Christ." This is

further evidence of the doctrinal weight that has now been associated with the two words, ὁμολογεῖν¹ and ἄρνεῖσθαι. No one in the primitive church would have dared characterise any statement of the Baptist as a denial even if the term were theologically correct. The word ὁμολογεῖν, to affirm, would insinuate "speaking like a Christian" while the word ἄρνεῖσθαι, to deny, would suggest "speaking like a non-believer."

It is clear from this treatment of ἄρνεῖσθαι that the verb has two main uses in the New Testament, the objective use meaning "to deny" and the subjective use, meaning "not wanting to know of."

It remains now to analyse those Synoptic scriptures which deal with self-denial (ἀπαρνεῖσθαι ἑαυτὸν or ἄρνεῖσθαι ἑαυτὸν) in Mark 8:34, Luke 9:23 and Matthew 16:24 in such a way as to determine the real meaning behind them. Needless to say, the meaning of the words in this context is different from the usual usage. In general ἄρνεῖσθαι

¹Cf. Joseph B. Mayor, The Epistle of St. Jude and the Second Epistle of St. Peter (London: Macmillan and Co. Ltd., 1907), p. 192.

has a bad connotation,¹ but reflexive denial² is a basic requirement for discipleship.

Parallel to the thought of self-denial³ expressed in Mark 8:34, is the concept of hating one's life expressed in Luke 14:26. Both of these ideas appear in a context related to cross-bearing. A common idea must evidently lie behind them. The comparison of these two texts makes it clear that self-denial does not involve a mere repeated suppression of one's own wishes but rather demands tearing one's self away from his natural interest in life.

It is suggested⁴ that the origin of the expression to deny one's self did not find its starting point in the initiative of an individual but rather came into existence

¹Cf. Titus 2:12, "renounce (ἀπονομίμενοι) irreligious and worldly passions," an example of ἀπο-νεοθεῖαι as a worthy deed.

²See Schlier, op. cit., p. 469.

³In II Timothy 2:13, ἀπορνησάμενος ἑαυτὸν οὐ σώσεται has nothing to do with the synoptic ἀπαρνεῖσθαι ἑαυτὸν but is used here as an antithesis to ἀρνησέσθαι ἡμᾶς. Christ cannot deny or reject himself because he represents true and proper reality. See Anton Fridrichsen, "Zu 'ἀρνεῖσθαι' im Neuen Testament insonderheit in den Pastoralbriefen," p. 96.

⁴See Anton Fridrichsen, "Ålska, hata, förneka (försaka)," in Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok, V, 1940, p. 161. Privately translated.

as a result of a denial, on the part of the unbelieving world's side, of the believing disciple of some god. Possible analogies to this are seen in the phrases "The fatherland, which has cast (ἀπαρνούμενη) me off,"¹ and "We cut off (ἀπαρνούμεθα) our connection with our friends."² The meaning thus illustrated is of one being cast aside, or rejected from the fellowship of the group. It is the destiny of any disciple to be rejected and denied by the world, to be pushed aside from his surroundings.

Thus if "anyone would come after" Christ, he places himself in the difficult eventuality which demands that he break with his natural volition and deny the self (or inclination) which would cling to the old surroundings. The change which takes place within breaks the fellowship with the old ego. "The denial comprises the whole practical attitude: One gives up protecting and cherishing his own life and instead one abandons (or risks) it,"³ for another. In this way he takes up a negative attitude toward his person and interests, considering his natural human being as something irrelevant; and even here there

¹Dion. Ha. VIII 34.

²Ibid.

³Fridrichsen, op. cit., p. 162.

is an analogy with the denial which meets the disciple from the world. Thus we can conclude that ἀρνεῖσθαι ἑαυτὸν of Mark 8:34 and parallels does not mean asceticism or mere self-discipline, but the unreserved surrender of one's person. Thus "self-surrender" is probably a more accurate meaning.¹ "What Christ as a divine being cannot and must not do (II Timothy 2:13), his human disciples on earth have to do if they want to share in the divine life of their Lord: To surrender one's self, to risk one's whole existence, ἀπαρνεῖσθαι ἑαυτὸν."²

A second important ethical teaching of Jesus appears at Mark 8:34, in the phrase about taking up one's cross. We have reliable textual support for Jesus' teaching about carrying one's cross. Mark 8:34 and Matthew 16:24 are identical. The parallel Luke 9:23 has only slight variations using ἐρχεσθαι and ἀρνησάσθω in the place of ἐλθεῖν and ἀπαρνησάσθω which appear in Mark³ and Matthew, and adding καθ'

¹See J. Jeremias, The Parables of Jesus, p. 151.

²Anton Fridrichsen, "Sich Selbst Verleugnen," Coniectanea Neotestamentica, II, 1936, p. 8.

³There is the Mark variant: ἀκοιουθεῖν.

ἡμέραν. This variation and extension on the part of Luke is quite easily understood as a deviation from Mark. By the use of "daily" Luke addresses the challenge to his contemporaries to emphasise regular repetition.

In addition to these three appearances of words on cross-bearing there is the Q version which lies behind Matthew 10:38 and Luke 14:27. Matthew has "and he who does not take his cross and follow me is not worthy of

me (καὶ ὅς οὐ λαμβάνει τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀκολουθεῖ ὀπίσω μου, οὐκ ἔστιν μου ἄξιος)." Luke writes, "Whoever does not bear

his own cross and come after me, cannot be my disciple

(ὅστις οὐ βαπτίζῃ τὸν σταυρὸν ἐαυτοῦ καὶ ἔρχεται ὀπίσω μου, οὐ δύναται εἶναι μου μαθητής)." Both Matthew and Luke seem to

have taken the saying and transformed it in their own ways.¹

There are interesting references to cross-bearing

¹T. W. Manson, The Teaching of Jesus, pp. 237-240, and The Sayings of Jesus, p. 131, suggest that "is not worthy of me" in Matthew and "cannot be my disciple" in Luke go back to a common Aramaic original. The words λαμβάνει and βαπτίζῃ are translation variants.

that appear in secondary variations of Mark 10:21 where some manuscripts add ἀπὸς τοῦ σταυροῦ before¹ the phrase, "come follow me," and others add it after² the phrase.

Obviously it is through the connotations of the word ἀκολουθεῖν, to follow as a disciple, that the additions of the phrase on bearing the cross came about. This supports the opinion that the phrase concerning bearing one's cross is quite old and authentic.

When the Markan and Q tradition are compared in an effort to determine which source is the more original, it is pointed out that the negative expression of the thought on cross-bearing is used in Q while the positive presentation is found in Mark. Q does not contain the phrase

ἀπαρνεῖσθαι ἑαυτὸν.

In Mark to follow after Christ is no longer only a condition but has gained value in itself. Q is probably the more original. The traditions of Mark and Q go back to an Aramaic original representing the genuine words of Jesus.

R. Bultmann declares that this teaching is not a formation of the church.³

¹Found in W, F1, F13, a, sy, sa. It does not appear in κ, B, D, Θ, al, lat.

²Found in A, 700, sl, qr, Textus Receptus and Sy.

³Bultmann, The History of the Synoptic Tradition, p. 128.

Anton Fridrichsen points out that these words on taking up the cross are clearly related to external circumstances,¹ and are not to be interpreted mystically. The real question arises as to whether the reference to taking up the cross was a common expression of the day having no reference to Jesus' cross, a prophecy concerning Jesus' crucifixion, or derived from some other background. According to traditional criticism it is quite unlikely that Jesus was referring specifically to the cross on which he should die. R. Bultmann questions "Konnte nicht doch σταυρός schon früher ein traditionelles Bild für Leid und Opfer gewesen sein?" He then explains that Jesus probably meant something similar to what is expressed in a very general way in Luke 12:8f.² The deeper meaning of this reference points toward suffering resulting from absolute obedience and self-surrender.

Taking up the cross probably had reference to accepting martyrdom which the disciples might expect from the Roman Empire. Crucifixion was typical of Roman

¹Anton Fridrichsen, "Sich Selbst Verleugnen," Coniectanea Neotestamentica, II, 1936, p. 2.

²R. Bultmann, Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1952), pp. 173f. See E.T., The History of the Synoptic Tradition, pp. 128f.

punishment; the phrase is used because one was required to carry his own cross to the place of crucifixion.¹ "The implication of the words is that Jesus was aware of an irreconcilable hostility between the Kingdom for which he (stood) and the Empire represented by Pontius Pilate."² The meaning is metaphorical and is not to be compared with the mystical element seen in Galatians 2:20 ("I have been crucified with Christ").

It is the opinion of W. G. Kümmel that this text along with others (Luke 6:22f., Matthew 10:28, 38 and Mark 10:35ff.) alludes to a time when the disciples will be separated from Jesus before the final judgment expected to take place. Thus, for them, Mark 8:34 envisages persecutions which will not be limited to the lifetime of Jesus.³

Erich Dinkler who sees in the demand to take up the cross a sign, that is, a Tau or Chi, a T or X, says "If

¹Genesis Rabbah 56: "Abraham put the wood on to his son to carry it to the altar like someone who carried the cross on his shoulder." Strack-Billerbeck, I, op. cit., p. 587. Cross-bearing in the sense of suffering does not appear in the older Rabbinic literature.

²T. W. Manson, The Sayings of Jesus, p. 131.

³W. G. Kümmel, Promise and Fulfilment, p. 79 and see p. 99.

Jesus demands the eschatological seal of these select ones and sees his disciples as property or even 'sheep' led back into the absolute rulership of God, or the Shepherd, and makes them his imitators then it is only too easy to understand that after the crucifixion of Jesus the T or X became related to the historical cross so that out of this same seal there became the cross."¹ Σταυρός, he says, should be translated Tau or Chi instead of cross.

Neither concept, self-denial nor bearing one's cross, has a particularised meaning, but the latter, closely related to the former has to do with one's attitude toward external circumstances. This relationship would thus eliminate the possibility of understanding self-denial as synonymous with the new birth.² Taking up the cross is probably an old popular phrase. Neither it nor the concept of self-denial can claim originality in Christendom but both are profane expressions from the beginning.³

In these sayings we should note that Jesus quite obviously expected his disciples to experience sufferings

¹Erich Dinkler, "Jesu Wort vom Kreuztragen," Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann (Berlin: Alfred Topelmann, 1954), p. 111.

²Fridrichsen, op. cit., p. 2.

³Campenhausen, op. cit., p. 59. Cf. Fridrichsen, op. cit., p. 3.

and possibly to die for him. He was plainly associating the suffering of others with his own suffering. Their persecutions were to be undergone for his sake. Thomas Arvedson declares that the true disciple is ready to sacrifice everything else for love towards his master and "to follow after" is a concept which belongs with anointing and dedicating, consecration.¹ Thus Schlier can say that self-denial and taking up one's cross are to be understood in the words, "I shall no longer secure my life from myself, but on the contrary, I grasp my own death with resolution and become secure only in following after Christ."²

3. Mark 8:35-37 -- "For whoever would save his life will lose it; and whoever loses his life for my sake and the gospel's will save it. (36) For what does it profit a man to gain the whole world and forfeit his life? (37) For what can a man give in return for his life?"³

¹Thomas Arvedson, "Bakgrunden til Matthew 10:37-39 et parr.," Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok, V, 1940, p. 82.

²Schlier, op. cit., I, p. 471.

³Parallels: Matthew 16:25 and Luke 9:24f. The saying about finding and losing life appears also in Q, Matthew 10:39 and Luke 17:33. Cf. John 12:25, possibly the more original of them all. See C. H. Dodd, "Some Johannine 'Herrnworte' with Parallels in the Synoptic Gospels," New Testament Studies, Vol. 2, 1955-1956, p. 81.

Mark includes the phrase "for my sake and the gospel's." The καὶ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου does not appear in the parallels nor Q. Luke 17:33 is the only verse on losing one's life which omits ἐνεκεν ἐμοῦ.¹ R. Bultmann says that Matthew 16:25 and Luke 9:24 read only "for my sake" because that is probably all they found in their Marcan text. To agree with this Matthew 10:39 had added "for my sake" to the Q version. He compares this with John 12:25 in which the phrase does not appear and suggests quite rightly that Luke 17:33 is the more original of the synoptic sayings.²

The phrase καὶ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου is peculiar to Mark³ probably inserted as a word of explanation. However, it should be pointed out that εὐαγγελίου is closely associated with the person of Jesus. Behind the New Testament usage lies the influence of Deutero-Isaiah,⁴ the glad tidings of Yahweh's salvation. That the word is associated with his person shows that his

¹See Schniewind, op. cit., p. 85.

²R. Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, I, p. 15.

³Cf. Mark 10:29. See Rashdall, op. cit., p. 52.

⁴Isaiah 40:9 and 52:7 for example. Cf. Zimmerli and Jeremias, The Servant of God, op. cit., p. 102.

mission was understood as a fulfilment of that prophesied by Deutero-Isaiah. In his own person Jesus offers the salvation he proclaims just as in the Old Testament the messenger of salvation is almost identified with his proclamation.¹ In Mark 8:35 the phrase καὶ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου is very likely equivalent to ἐνεκεν τοῦ ἐμοῦ οὐράτου of Matthew 19:29 or to the βασιλεία of God of Luke 18:29.²

The Rabbinic parallel to this saying has been pointed out above: "What should man do in order that he may live? Let him kill himself. What should a man do in order that he may die? Let him preserve his own life."³ This secular proverb refers, of course, to life that is lost at death. If Jesus was using it he certainly gives ψυχή a new meaning.

The ψυχή or soul can be the bearer of one's physical life and spiritual life (one's true personality or self). Man finds himself confronted with

¹Hooker, op. cit., pp. 66f.

²Gerhard Friedrich, "Εὐαγγελισμός," T.W.z.N.T., II, p. 726.

³Tamid 32 a. See Strack-Billerbeck, op. cit., I, pp. 587f. Also, Dalman, Jesus Jeshua, p. 228.

the decision: Which form shall dominate this ψυχή?¹
 This explains the apparent contradiction of winning one's
 life by losing it. Double meanings of ζωή and
ἀποθνήσκω appear similarly in John 11:26.
 In Mark 8:36 and 37, the supreme value of ψυχή
 is emphasised to clarify the fact that if one forfeits
 one's spiritual life there is nothing, not the whole world
 of social and business enterprises, which can purchase it.
 It is fatal to value things of this world above eternal
 life.

This whole expression about losing one's life is
 not, "as some might think, a statement about death, it is
 a stark fact about life itself."² It has to do with the
 loyalty of the disciples to their calling. The words
 sound quite appropriate in light of the fact that after
 Peter's declaration concerning Jesus' identity, the Lord
 "now asks for attachment to his person, and not only for

¹Walter Bauer, "ψυχή," Griechisch-Deutsches
 Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der
 übrigen urchristlichen Literatur (Berlin: Verlag Alfred
 Topelmann, 1952), p. 1478. E.T., A Greek-English Lexicon
 of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature,
 by W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich (Chicago: University of
 Chicago Press, 1959). See also Fifth German edition,
 1963.

²H. E. W. Turner, Jesus Master and Lord (London:
 A. R. Mowbray and Co., 1957), p. 320.

the acceptance of his message."¹ If one saves one's life at the cost of damaging Jesus and his ministry one loses it. On the other hand if one walks with perfect willingness for the sake of Jesus even to death, one has actually secured and preserved one's real life.

T. W. Manson says it may be conjectured that the logion was well known in the primitive community and understood as referring to the loyalty of disciples. He points out that Luke has a doublet of the saying; 9:24 seems close to Mark 8:35. It appears a second time in Luke 17 because that is probably the position it held in Q. Luke 17:31f. may furnish the clue as to why it thus stood in Q, for in 17:31 the inference is that there are times when one should save his life by flight, but in verse 33 there appears the reminder that when escape involves denial or disloyalty to Jesus it is better to remain and die.² "When Christ calls a man, he bids him come and die. There are different kinds of dying it is true, but the essence of discipleship is contained in those words."³

4. Mark 9:35 -- "And he sat down and called the

¹M. Goguel, op. cit., p. 385.

²T. W. Manson, The Sayings of Jesus, p. 145.

³Dietrich Bonhoeffer, The Cost of Discipleship, (London: S.C.M. Press, 1948), p. 7, E.T. by R. H. Fuller.

twelve; and he said to them, 'If any one would be first, he must be last of all and servant of all.'¹ In addition to this teaching and its parallels, similar sayings appear in Mark 10:43f., ". . . but whoever would be great among you must be your servant, (44) and whoever would be first among you must be slave of all," and its parallels.²

This saying is thus well attested and genuine for here "in this teaching we stand near the bedrock of the tradition."³ The Mark 10:43f. version is probably the more primitive⁴ since 9:35 is a shortened version and also lacks the synonymous parallelism of the former. This earlier teaching compares being great and first with being servant and slave while 9:35 explains that the first must be last as well as slave.

It is quite likely that Jesus' teaching on true greatness was given more than once and was given in various settings. "It is evident that the primitive communities preserved a lively recollection of the way in which Jesus

¹Parallels: Matthew 18:3, 23:11 and Luke 9:48b.

²Parallels: Matthew 20:26f. and Luke 22:26.

³Taylor, Life and Ministry of Jesus, p. 155.

⁴Cf. R. Bultmann, The History of the Synoptic Tradition, p. 147.

rebuked personal ambition."¹ The disciples were to understand that they were not to expect the distinctions found in Judaism (Matthew 23:8-11) or the authority exercised by the Gentiles (Mark 10:42-44). Mark's version makes it clear that the way to greatness is through service.

The terms, serve and servant, for Christianity or for Judaism, retain their two-fold significance of waiting on tables and ethical service.²

Jesus, in his idea of service, unites the Old Testament commandments of love to God and neighbour to form a model attitude for his follower's service. Thus Jesus puts forward the claim, against the natural social order of things that greatness and leadership come through service. In introducing this fundamental change in the customary evaluation of social relationships he applies it to all human relationships. The demands he makes of the disciples are not something apart from his own intention. Unquestionably the leader of the group, Jesus designates himself as one who serves (Mark 10:45 and Luke 22:27). The

¹Taylor, The Gospel According to St. Mark, p. 405.

²Hermann W. Beyer, "Διáκονος," T.W.Z.N.T., II, p. 92. See James M. Robinson, The Problem of History in Mark, p. 84, cf. Mark 1:13, 15:41 and 10:45.

union of the two commandments of love is expressed in Matthew 25:40,¹ ". . . As you did it to one of the least of these my brethren, you did it to me."

Thus the meaning of suffering lies in the service which is done, for only thus does it become sacrifice.

The only way to greatness for the Christian is that he be

ἡδύτων σοῦδος. What is valid

for Christ himself (Mark 10:45 and Matthew 20:28) becomes a requirement for all disciples. Διακονεῖν

is not limited to serving at the table but now expresses

the "whole sacrifice, the devotion and offering of one's

life,"² the real essence of serving. This service clari-

fies the purpose of the principle of losing one's life to

find it.³ The personal rendering of service, the renuncia-

tion of one's rights, even life itself, for the sake of

others was essential for greatness in the kingdom.

In reality these numerous passages on true greatness

have a bearing on the spirit in which authority is handled

rather than whether authority is to be exercised in the

¹Cf. Mark 9:41.

²Beyer, " Διακονος ," T.W.z.N.T., II, p. 85.

³See Mark 8:35 and parallels.

Christian community.¹ Luke 22:26 implies that there are in fact distinctions even among them, but that is no cause for pride or privilege, leadership is a form of service.² R. Bultmann concludes that one so obedient to the will of God needs no particular rules for his conduct. He surrenders his natural will with its demand, renounces his own claim and makes his decision in every concrete situation of life.³

5. Mark 9:43-47 -- "And if your hand causes you to sin, cut it off; it is better for you to enter life maimed than with two hands to go to hell, to the unquenchable fire. (45) And if your foot causes you to sin, cut it off; it is better for you to enter life lame than with two feet to be thrown into hell. (47) And if your eye causes you to sin, pluck it out; it is better for you to enter the kingdom of God with one eye than with two eyes to be thrown into hell."⁴

Luke omits this whole passage. Matthew 18:8f. reproduces the Marcan passage and thus in Matthew 5:29f.

¹H. E. W. Turner, op. cit., p. 277.

²T. W. Manson, The Sayings of Jesus, p. 338.

³R. Bultmann, Jesus and the Word, pp. 108f.

⁴Parallel: Matthew 18:8f. Cf. Matthew 5:29f.

appears the M version of the teaching. The Marcan arrangement is the result of disparate sayings connected by catchwords. The use of poetical parallelism by Jesus is apparent in both Matthew and Mark.¹ Matthew 18:9 replaces "the kingdom of God" of Mark 9:47 with βωή "life." This fact along with the use of both terms in the Marcan version shows that the two are synonymous.

The thought presented in these verses is contrasted with the preceding verses by the fact that here the warning is not to place a stumbling block in one's way while the previous warning was not to cause another to stumble. In very strong words Jesus is declaring that as individuals "submit to the loss of a bodily organ or limb in order to preserve the body as a whole, so it is to their interest to sacrifice powers and functions of their spiritual nature which have been found to be inevitable occasions of sin."² The term "life" is of a non-historical nature³ though the main reference is to the future.⁴ It is for this "life" that one is to make the costliest sacrifice,

¹Taylor, op. cit., pp. 408f.

²Swete, op. cit., p. 210.

³J. Robinson, op. cit., p. 60.

⁴Turner, op. cit., p. 265.

even hand, foot, or eye.¹ As compared with other forms of self-denial, the renunciation here is especially strong, demanded in the picture of cutting off and tearing out.²

6. Mark 9:49-50 -- "For every one will be salted with fire. (50) Salt is good; but if the salt has lost its saltness, how will you season it? Have salt in yourselves and be at peace with one another."³ According to Leviticus 2:13 the sacrificial salt was the symbol of a covenant-relation with Yahweh. A copyist seems to have asserted this and thus it appears in some manuscripts. Since the whole section of Mark 9:34-50 is made up of separate sayings connected by catchwords, H. Zimmerman says 9:49 is to be interpreted by itself. "Fire and salt do not necessarily have the same meanings as in verses preceding and following. Taken by itself 9:49 is a spiritualisation of Leviticus 2:13. The Christian's self-sacrifice must, like the sacrifices of the Old Testament, be salted, and salted with fire, which probably symbolises

¹R. Bultmann, Jesus and the Word, p. 79, says "Jesus' attitude is indeed paradoxical; he promises reward to those who are obedient without thought of reward."

²Schniewind, op. cit., pp. 96f.

³Cf. Matthew 5:13 and Luke 14:34f. The shorter text used here of Mark 9:49 is supported by ℣, B, W, Fl, 28, 565, 700, al, sy^s, arm, and geo.

the Holy Spirit (as in Matthew 3:11). The sense of the sayings is thus seen to approximate Mark 8:35 . . . and John 3:5."¹

Verse 50, as we have seen above is a disconnected saying to be treated separately. The word salt offers the connecting link. The reference here is to salt which is used for its seasoning and preservative properties. The disciples have been set in the world with the source of life and health. They must not lose the very property that makes them precious. The saltiness of the salt seems to stand for that for which the disciples must be prepared to lose their lives (Mark 8:35).²

7. Mark 10:21 -- "And Jesus looking upon him loved him, and said to him, 'You lack one thing; go, sell what you have, and give to the poor, and you will have treasure in heaven; and come, follow me.'³

J. Schniewind declares that, "Indeed, the one thing

¹H. Zimmerman, "Mit Feuer gesalzen werden" Eine Studie zu Mark 9:49," Theological Quarterly, 1939, pp. 28-39 cited in New Testament Abstracts. Vol. IV, I, Fall 1959, p. 27, paragraph 89.

²C. E. B. Cranfield, I and II Peter and Jude (London: S.C.M. Press, 1960), p. 316.

³Parallels: Matthew 19:21 and Luke 18:22.

which is lacking to the rich man is everything."¹ Whether the tradition goes back to Jesus we cannot be certain. But the first emphasis is on the calling. Before Jesus sees the individual he calls he loves him.

R. Bultmann says of this, "man cannot maintain the cause of God merely up to a certain point, so far as may be without disturbing himself; rather the will of God claims the man completely."² Jesus is not saying that just one act of self-sacrifice will bring salvation, for he also commands the man to follow him. The renunciation of his riches is the first step toward following Jesus because they have taken the place of the Lord. Indeed the man must sacrifice himself. Thus with the power of God it is possible for even a rich man to enter the kingdom.³

8. Mark 10:29-31 -- ". . . 'there is no one who has left house or brothers or sisters or mother or father or children or lands, for my sake and for the gospel, (30) who will not receive a hundredfold now in this time, houses and brothers and sisters and mothers and children

¹Schniewind, op. cit., p. 103. See Schweizer, op. cit., p. 14.

²Bultmann, Jesus and the Word, p. 97.

³Mark 10:27, Matthew 19:26 and Luke 18:27.

and lands, with persecutions, and in the age to come eternal life. (31) But many that are first will be last, and the last first."¹ This saying is probably closely related to the narrative concerning the rich man and eternal life. At least, some of the disciples have sacrificed home, family and possessions. James and John left Zebedee (Mark 1:20), the departure from Capernaum separated Peter and Andrew from their home (Mark 1:29-31, 36), and Levi had forsaken a lucrative business. Hearing the conversation with the rich young man brings to Peter's mind the implications of the sacrifice they have made for Jesus' sake and the gospel's.

James M. Robinson² describes Jesus' response as a discussion of the eschatological replacement for the loss (10:30). The replacement is not simply in the abstract future³ but "now in this time." It is the establishment of a new society so that what is renounced and lost in the one, that is houses, family and possessions, is regained in the spiritual society a hundred-fold. It is similar to

¹Parallels: Matthew 19:28-30 and Luke 18:29-30.

²James M. Robinson, op. cit., p. 81.

³Matthew 19:28f. does not draw a distinction between rewards in this age and the age to come as do Mark and Luke.

Jesus' distinction between his natural family (Mark 3:31f.) and his spiritual family (Mark 3:34f.). Jesus could easily promise a spiritual family enriched a hundredfold. He likewise could foresee and promise the "persecutions" (10:30) over against these blessings. R. Bultmann¹ says the interest in the dignity of the church shows the later interests of the church, and V. Taylor says the saying is substantially authentic but the phrase "and in the age to come eternal life" is an adaptation to current views.²

Mark 10:31 does not appear in the Lucan parallel but the words appear in Luke 13:30. Matthew contains the saying in its parallel to Mark 10:31 and uses it at 20:16, a different context. It is impossible to be sure of the original context but the saying is undoubtedly authentic. Mark seems to have added it to the story. It may be a warning to the disciples against self-complacency or it may be the disciples who now are last, will then be first. It is clear from the story as a whole that to follow Jesus involves renouncing one's personal interest and that in the kingdom, values of the present age are reversed.

9. Mark 10:38f. -- "But Jesus said to them, 'You

¹R. Bultmann, Jesus and the Word, p. 124.

²Taylor, op. cit., p. 435.

do not know what you are asking. Are you able to drink the cup that I drink, or to be baptised with the baptism with which I am baptised?' (39) And they said to him, 'We are able.' And Jesus said to them, 'The cup that I drink you will drink; and with the baptism with which I am baptised, you will be baptised.'"¹ Luke omits this story altogether. Matthew presents the mother of the sons of Zebedee as making the request while in Mark the disciples themselves ask for the places of preference. Matthew omits the word about baptism. Those scholars who declare this saying to be vaticinium ex eventu do so on the assumption that the supposed tradition of Papias that James and John were martyred is true; but martyrdom is not necessarily meant by the words. Wm. Manson declares that if we accept Jesus' prediction of his own death as we have done elsewhere in this thesis the cup of suffering of Mark 10:38 is not contrary to the internal probabilities of the situation.²

The use of the middle voice in οὐκ οὐδέποτε τι αἰτέω may call attention to the self-seeking which prompted the request.³ The metaphor

¹Cf. Matthew 20:20-23. Luke omits the story.

²W. Manson, Jesus the Messiah, p. 126.

³Swete, op. cit., p. 236.

of the cup is a common Old Testament expression for the destiny, bad or good, which man or nation experiences as ordained by God.¹ The cup has reference to the one Jesus is drinking in the present, his suffering. The metaphor of baptism is similar. Water is used in the Old Testament to express being overwhelmed with suffering.² H. E. W. Turner points out that Matthew's omission of the word about baptism (Luke deletes the whole incident) indicates strongly that the saying was not in accord with the mind of the Apostolic Church, which laid considerable store on Baptism as a Sacrament.³ James M. Robinson says "Mark 10:38-39 and Mark 1:8 are not parallel in meaning for Mark although they could have been for John or Jesus."⁴ The sacramental conceptions may have been in Mark's mind but if there is any intentional allusion to the "Sacraments of Baptism and of the Eucharist, the point of it will be to drive home the lesson that to receive (the sacraments) is to take a step which is likely to lead to

¹See Psalms 11:6; 23:5, Isaiah 51:17; Jeremiah 49:12 and Lamentations 2:13.

²See Psalms 18:16, 42:7 and 69:1f.

³Turner, op. cit., p. 283.

⁴James M. Robinson, op. cit., p. 26.

suffering."¹ It is selfcommital. Suffering and persecution then become an indisputable part of godly life; the Christian has it in common with Christ.

Jesus' Teaching about Self-denial and
Self-sacrifice in Q According
to the Order of Luke

1. Luke 6:20-31 -- Jesus' Sermon: ". . . Blessed are you poor, for yours is the kingdom of God. (21) Blessed are you that hunger now, for you shall be satisfied. Blessed are you that weep now, for you shall laugh. (22) Blessed are you when men hate you, and when they exclude you and revile you, and cast out your name as evil, on account of the Son of man! . . . (27) . . . Love your enemies, do good to those who hate you. (28) Bless those who abuse you. (29) To him who strikes you on the cheek, offer the other also; and from him who takes away your cloak do not withhold your coat as well. (30) Give to every one who begs from you; and of him who takes away your goods, do not ask them again."²

Several reasons lead to the conclusion that the Q form is probably found in the Lucan version. The Lucan form is shorter and simpler emphasising the eschatological

¹Rawlinson, op. cit., p. 145.

²Cf. Matthew 5:1-4, 6, 11, 12, 39, 40, 42, and 44.

element, while that of Matthew shows development of thought and structure; but the use of the third person in Matthew is possibly more in line with common Old Testament usage.¹

These words addressed to the disciples² show clearly that one's self interest was to be treated as secondary. The poor -- Matthew says "poor in spirit" -- refer to the genuinely pious and spiritual persons. The background for the saying was the general assumption that material wealth was an indication of spirituality and the blessing of God while poverty indicated the opposite. The Kingdom of God thus was to be possessed by those who had submitted themselves to the kingdom and accepted God's will in obedience.

They are to understand that in their relationships with the world, they must expect to be hated, excluded, reviled and slandered on account of the Son of man. But the main point for our attention is the fact that the followers of Jesus are to consider themselves blessed when they are poor, hungry, and weeping, for it places them in the same relationship with God as the great servants of the past.

¹T. W. Manson, The Sayings of Jesus, op. cit., p. 47.

²Matthew 5:2 intimates that only the disciples were present; Luke 6:12-19 suggests a crowd was present.

The injunction to love enemies in verse 27 is repeated in verse 35 where the reason for such action is that it makes men "sons of the Most High." That is to say that God is kind even to his enemies and he expects this type of selfless love to be characteristic of his sons. It is more than sentimentality as is seen from the exhortations that follow.

William Manson points out the resemblance between Matthew 5:39-40 and Isaiah 50:6, 8 of the Septuagint.

Five words, ἀντιορνῶν, πατῆρ, οὐκ ἔσονται, σπέρων and κρίθῶν appearing in Matthew's text¹ are shared with Isaiah 50:6,8. Thus Jesus' requirement of non-resistance in its original form was a conscious allusion to the example of the Suffering Servant of Yahweh. W. Manson declares that whether Matthew or Luke contains the more primitive form the relationship to the servant remains. If Matthew contains the Q form then tradition preserves the original colouring of the saying. If Luke contains the Q form then "tradition restores the colouring after it has been temporarily obscured." Although possible, it does not seem likely that the later church has

¹The Lucan text does not include πατῆρ, οὐκ ἔσονται and κρίθῶν.

introduced the allusion to the servant.¹

David Daube in his treatment of retaliation² shows it as a product of Jewish piety. The teaching is not to be taken in a literal sense. By the time of Jesus, retaliation had been replaced by money penalties.³ The slap in the face was a case of insult and thus "eye for an eye" in this context characterises one "who stands on his rights and honour instead of humiliating himself before his fellow-man." "Eye for an eye," represented a carefully calculated compensation. Jesus' teaching is concerned with the urge for resentment when one's pride has been hurt. One must remember that the wrongdoer is also a son of God and rather than compelling him to soothe one's hurt feelings, Jesus' teaching advocates a humility which cannot be hurt, a giving of one's self to his brother. This same thought is included in the exhortation to give to the beggar, to refuse to resist the wicked, and to love the enemy.⁴

2. Luke 6:37-38 -- "Judge not, and you will not be

¹Wm. Manson, Jesus the Messiah, pp. 31f.

²Daube, op. cit., pp. 256, 258, 259 and 260.

³Strack-Billerbeck, op. cit., I, pp. 341ff.

⁴Luke 6:35.

judged; condemn not, and you will not be condemned; forgive, and you will be forgiven; (38) give and it will be given to you; good measure, pressed down, shaken together, running over, will be put into your lap. For the measure you give will be the measure you get back."¹ The structure suggests Luke as the more primitive. The matter of judging is to be left to God for he is omniscient. The word forgive suggests the remission of a debt.² "As the debt is a common figure for sin, the transition from the idea of cancelling a debt to forgiving an offence is an easy one. And this brings us back to the positive demand to give."³ The man who is merciful then not only forgives the man but goes further and makes him a gift. The reward is to be given by God rather than man. It is evident that Jesus is teaching that one should be so willing to renounce his claim for repayment that he can turn around and make a gift to his debtor. This is the merciful man.

3. Luke 6:40 -- "A disciple is not above his

¹Cf. Matthew 7:1, 2.

²A. R. C. Leaney, A Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1958), p. 138. Cf. also Matthew 18:27.

³T. W. Manson, op. cit., p. 56.

teacher but every one when he is fully taught will be like his master."¹ In Matthew and John 15:20 these words are used to emphasise the fact that the disciples are to expect persecution just as their teacher has experienced it. In John 13:16 it is used to show that the disciples should follow an example of humility. The Lucan question form is probably older than the form found in Matthew. The saying is undoubtedly old and its original context is quite likely lost. The words establish a general principle, according to Luke, that the disciples should in humility follow Christ in obedience because he as the teacher has authority and speaks with truth. The slave can expect no better fate than his master.

4. Luke 9:59-62 -- "To another he said, 'Follow me.' But he said, 'Lord, let me first go and bury my father.' (60) But he said to him, 'Leave the dead to bury their own dead; but as for you, go and proclaim the kingdom of God.' (61) Another said, 'I will follow you, Lord; but let me first say farewell to those at my home.' (62) Jesus said to him, 'No one who puts his hand to the plow and looks back is fit for the kingdom of God.'"² The

¹Cf. Matthew 10:24f.

²Cf. Matthew 8:21f.

context of verses 59-62 differs from that of Matthew. Behind the words lie the urgency and demand for complete committal. The appearance of the word "first" is quite awkward in Matthew's account showing that the Lukan form is superior. However, the clause, "But as for you, go and proclaim the kingdom of God" not found in Matthew was probably not in Q. The command, "Go and preach" is premature in view of the just mentioned command, "Follow me."¹ Luke includes a reference to ploughing. The words of 61f. recall the incident of Elijah calling his disciple Elisha in I Kings 19:19f. There may have been a separate tradition according to which Jesus was considered the new Elijah.² The reference to being fit for the kingdom refers to fitness for the service and responsibilities of the kingdom rather than entrance into it or worthiness of its rewards.³

As the verses stand the requirement seems almost unreasonable in view of the fact that it was probably the son's responsibility to see to the burial of the father. Obviously the saying is meant to emphasise that there was

¹T. W. Manson, The Sayings of Jesus, p. 73.

²Cf. other references to Elijah, Luke 4:25-30 and 7:11-17, 36-50. See A. R. C. Leaney, op. cit., pp. 173f.

³Ibid.

something more important than even burying the dead, such as following Jesus and being prepared to accept the work of the Kingdom. The conclusions are clear, discipleship involves complete renunciation of self including ties of the home and even personal emotions. The Kingdom must have first place and no sacrifice was too much for it.

5. Luke 10:3 -- "Go your way; behold, I send you out as lambs in the midst of wolves."¹ It is quite likely that this saying as presented in Luke stands in the same position it held in the source. Matthew had placed the verse in a position to introduce the disciples to the warning that dangers await them.² The mission of the disciples is to entail the risk of life itself for they are sent out defenceless as lambs among wolves.

6. Luke 12:51-53 -- "Do you think that I have come to give peace on earth. No, I tell you, but rather division; (52) for henceforth in one house there will be five divided, three against two and two against three."³ Matthew 10:36 shows a closer parallel to Micah 7:6 than

¹Cf. Matthew 10:16.

²Wilfred L. Knox, The Sources of the Synoptic Gospels (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1957), II, p. 5.

³Cf. Matthew 10:34-36.

these verses of Luke but this difference may well be the result of an effort on the part of Matthew to make the Q form conform to the Old Testament. The Q form is probably preserved in Luke. Luke 2:14 represents Jesus as the bringer of peace but his words in their context here imply that he is being rejected because they do not know what is for them peace;¹ he wished more than anything else to offer men peace but realised that to do so he must create division and strife. The demands of the kingdom will create tensions compelling individuals to choose sides even in opposition to family.² This saying is another expression of the demand to place loyalty to Christ and the kingdom above personal or family affections.

7. Luke 14:11 -- "For every one who exalts himself will be humbled, and he who humbles himself will be exalted."³ The words are almost identical in Luke 18:14 and Matthew 23:12. In these words we have a saying that has been given varied applications. In Luke 14:11 the words are applied to the end of the parable of the invited guests. In Luke 18:14 the words form a conclusion to the

¹A. R. C. Leaney, op. cit., p. 96.

²See Danby, The Mishnah (Sotah 9:15), op. cit., p. 306.

³Luke 18:14, Matthew 18:4 and Matthew 23:12.

parable of the Pharisee and the Publican. In Matthew 23:12 the words occur independently after the teaching on greatness through service. In Matthew 18:4 they are used in connection with entrance into the kingdom as a little child.

Luke 14:11 is apparently the original form of the saying, for a table rule in the Rabbinical literature states, "Stand two or three places below your place and wait until they say to you, 'Come up here' . . . And so has Hillel said, 'My humiliation is my exaltation, and my exaltation is my humiliation.'"¹ The usage in Luke 14:11 is in a similar context dealing with table manners.²

Luke 18:14 may also be an original usage. Jesus may have used the saying on different occasions with a different application or the applications may be secondary. It is the context which is secondary and not the saying itself.³

In Luke 14:11 Jesus has apparently taken the Jewish ethical standard and applied it to the kingdom. In the kingdom of God greatness is not attained by self-assertion.

¹Leviticus Rabbah 1:5. Ben Simeon Azzai, c. 110 A. D. Hillel died c. 10 B. C.

²Dibelius, op. cit., p. 248.

³J. Jeremias, The Parables of Jesus, p. 85. See pp. 82f.

In Luke 18:14 the saying is a comment on the preceding narrative.

The demand of Matthew 18:4 to become like a little child involves "humiliation, self-abasement, and becoming little again before God."¹ This is the same thought behind Luke 14:11. The D text² of Matthew 22:14 has a version of the parable of the invited guest including words comparable with the saying about exaltation and humility: "But do you seek from little to become great, and from great to become less."

Thus when compared with Luke 18:14 and Matthew 23:12 the "direction in Luke 14:11 about the desirability of modest behaviour in a guest, becomes the introduction to an 'eschatological warning,'³ a call to renounce self-righteous pretensions and to self-abasement before God.⁴

8. Luke 14:26 -- "If any one comes to me and does not hate his own father and mother and wife and children and brothers and sisters, yes, and even his own life, he cannot be my disciple."⁵ There is probably an Aramaic

¹Jeremias, op. cit., p. 134.

²D, it, sy^C.

³Dibelius, op. cit., p. 248.

⁴Jeremias, op. cit., p. 135.

⁵Cf. Matthew 10:37.

original that lies behind the "loves more" of Matthew and the "does not hate" of Luke.¹ Luke seems to have preserved the more original form which Matthew has adapted to a later time. The saying emphasises as strongly as any other the real demands for renunciation and sacrifice on the part of Jesus' followers.

We look first at Matthew's version which does not make use of the word "hate:" "He who loves father or mother more than me is not worthy of me; and he who loves son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me." The unworthy choice is placed first in the arrangement of the words. This gives added strength for it emphasises that the unworthy choice seems to be the one preferred. The same thought might well have been expressed in the words, "The one who does not love me more than father and mother, etc." The words are expressed in a comparative way but they really express an exclusive contrast.² The exclusive element is clearly expressed in the Lucan form, "hate."

To hate in today's usage implies a strong emotional

¹T. W. Manson, *op. cit.*, p. 131. See A. Fridrichsen, "Älska, hata, förneka (försaka)," pp. 153ff. for the basis of the treatment that follows.

²T. Arvedson, "Bakgrunden till Mtt. 10:37-39 et parr," in *Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok*, V, 1940, p. 82, says the unity of the Godhead has the character of a relationship of the kind that excludes all other relationships.

enmity, but the word seems to have held a pointed meaning in the language of the Semitic community. This is seen in the contrast expressed by the opposite terms אֵדָוָה וְשִׂנְאָה. The two words appear in the Old Testament in situations which demand an exclusive choice. In Judges 14:16 Samson's wife said, "You only hate me, you do not love me; you have put a riddle to my countrymen, and you have not told me what it is." According to Jewish customs a man either loved or hated his wife, there was no middle course. This is clearly seen in Deuteronomy 21:15 and Malachi 1:2f. where the one individual is loved and the other hated. In the Old Testament the exclusive choice is shown on the part of the husband, father, or master. Jesus turns the whole thing about and looks at the problem from the servant's viewpoint when he says, "No one can serve two masters; for either he will hate the one and love the other or he will be devoted to the one and despise the other."¹

John 12:25, "He who loves his life loses it, and he who hates his life in this world will keep it for eternal life," stresses the contrast between "to love" and "to hate" which are opposing attitudes toward the same object, life. The words mean more than mere endearment or

¹Matthew 6:24. Synonymous parallelism is seen in "devoted to the one" and "despise the other."

indifference to life, to love life is to be so attached to one's natural existence that he will sacrifice anything for it. In Revelation 12:11 the willingness to sacrifice the natural life went so far as actually to surrender it in death. There the original antithesis "to love" and "to love not" appear.¹

In the Lucan text we are now considering, 14:26, the word μισοειν appears. The attitude expressed by "hate" is used to express the choice between Christ and the world. The word "hate" does not apply literally to parents or children as persons but as representatives of all the things that the disciple holds most dear, the ties which prevent him from following Jesus. The disciple must use force, if necessary, to free himself from these relationships which bind him. In "hating" his own life he is to break with the strongest natural instinct of self-preservation if called upon to do so. The word "hate" implies that one should treat his own inclinations as an enemy just because they are so personal and dear, and are likely to claim the place of Jesus.

Without doubt the usage in Luke is stronger than the customary "love-hate" contrast. It makes a clearer

¹Fridrichsen, op. cit., p. 156.

distinction than the expected μη ἀγαπῶ οὐκ ἀγαπῶ or ἀγαπῶ (φιλῶ) ὑπὲρ. The choice is not between alternatives which exclude each other as good and bad, but between the most valuable human values and the kingdom of God.¹ In his own person Jesus signifies the demand for decision.²

Both the commands to "hate one's life" and "to deny one's self"³ are connected with the words on bearing one's cross and apparently a common idea lies behind them both.⁴ To deny one's self means to behave negatively towards natural human self. In a comparison of the two, it appears that this latter phrase, "to hate one's life," may be a slightly stronger emotional expression in that it refers to the treatment of the self as an enemy. A. Fridrichsen says that "to hate one's own life" is an obvious Aramaism to which "to deny one's self" is the Greek equivalent.⁵

¹Fridrichsen, op. cit., p. 156.

²Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, I, p. 9.

³Mark 8:34.

⁴See treatment above.

⁵Anton Fridrichsen, "Sich Selbst Verleugnen," p. 8.

This then is another teaching¹ of Jesus which demands the entire renunciation of personal interests and affections which are of the highest human value in themselves and claims them, as of slaves, exclusively for the Master and the kingdom.

9. Luke 16:13 -- "No servant can serve two masters; for either he will hate the one and love the other, or he will be devoted to the one and despise the other. You cannot serve God and mammon."² Matthew and Luke are almost identical. Matthew uses οὐδεὶς, no one, while Luke adds οἰκέτης, a household servant or slave. Luke has the Q form. The words of this maxim do not appear in Jewish literature.³ As seen above in the treatment of Luke 14:26 the demand is for an exclusive choice. The choice is between God or some other ruler in one's life. "You cannot serve God and mammon."⁴ "God

¹With this teaching that dedication to the work of the kingdom demands that family ties be broken, should be compared the teaching that "Whoever does the will of God is my brother, and sister, and mother," of Mark 3:35 and the parallels: Matthew 12:46-50 and Luke 8:19-21.

²Cf. Matthew 6:24.

³Dalman, Jesus Jeshua, p. 232.

⁴See Martin Dibelius, From Tradition to Gospel, p. 250.

calls for the utmost of self-aggrandisement."¹

Teachings on Self-denial and Self-sacrifice Peculiar to Luke

1. Luke 14:28-33 -- "For which of you, desiring to build a tower, does not first sit down and count the cost, whether he has enough to complete it? . . . (33) So therefore, whoever of you does not renounce all that he has cannot be my disciple." Many commentators assume that verse 33 did not originally belong to twin parables of the Tower-builder and the King planning for war. It is pointed out that the parables are an exhortation to self-examination and not self-denial.²

The parables at any rate are warnings about the cost of discipleship. They are not to start something they cannot finish. It is likely to cost them everything just as the king's soldiers must be prepared to give their lives. The purpose is to secure disciples who are willing to make every sacrifice for the mission of Jesus. The word

ἀποτίνασται means to take leave of, to bid farewell, to renounce or forsake. Thus the disciple who follows Jesus must count the cost. It will entail taking

¹T. W. Manson, op. cit., p. 133.

²J. Jeremias, op. cit., pp. 86f. See also Knox, op. cit., pp. 17f.

leave of all that one has, forsaking it, and assuming the risk of losing his natural life.

2. Luke 17:10 -- "So you also, when you have done all that is commanded you say, 'We are unworthy servants; we have only done what was our duty.'" The word only, necessary for understanding the meaning above, is omitted in the Greek. It is characteristic of Semitic speech to leave this out.¹ The better of the two Old Syriac manuscripts omits the word "unworthy," and some scholars thus delete it declaring that the emphasis is on being a servant and not whether he is worthy or unworthy.² There is point in the ἀξυπελοῖ: "They deserve no credit"³ having only done their duty. J. Jeremias points out that on the basis of linguistic evidence this parable can be definitely assigned to pre-Lucan tradition.⁴

Whether the saying was addressed only to the disciples, as the present context suggests, or was

¹Cf. other examples, Matthew 5:18f., 11:13, 18:6, Mark 1:8, 9:41f., John 10:33 and many more cited by J. Jeremias, op. cit., p. 28.

²See T. W. Manson, op. cit., p. 302.

³So translated in the New English Bible.

⁴Jeremias, op. cit., p. 68. See Matthew Black, An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1954), p. 236.

originally addressed to a crowd including Pharisees, the demand is for renunciation of all Pharisaic self-satisfaction.¹ If a master can make demands of his servants for his own comforts certainly God can claim even more of his servants of the Kingdom. This is from God's point of view. But the emphasis is on the servant's side, his obligation to understand that even the most stringent requirement of self-denial is to be willingly accepted by servants of the Lord, for only absolute obedience gives him the right to be a servant.

3. Luke 22:27 -- "For which is the greater, one who sits at table, or one who serves? Is it not the one who sits at table? But I am among you as one who serves." There is no parallel to this verse in the synoptics, but according to John 13:5 Jesus himself takes the part of a servant in washing the feet of the disciples at the Last Supper. No earthly master would have done this (Luke 17:7). He then later declares his act to be an example which the disciples are to follow. There may be some similarity in the Rabbinic parallel which describes a banquet at which R. Gamaliel, the host, stood to serve. One of the guests refused the beaker and another accepted.

¹Jeremias, op. cit., p. 68.

The former asked why they should sit while Gamaliel served. The answer was that since Abraham had served the angels un-awares, and he was greater than any of them, then R. Gamaliel should stand and serve. R. Zadok (c. 100 A. D.) then said, "How long do you leave the honour of God behind and occupy yourself with the honour of man . . .?"¹

T. W. Manson says that if there was a tradition that Jesus washed the feet of the disciples at the supper it may have influenced the placing of the passage in this context and thus supports the opinion that "the whole passage (Luke 22:24-30) was already in existence as a single unit when Luke put it into its present place."²

In normal human relationships there is a clear distinction between those who serve and are served, the greater being served by the lesser. But in the community of Jesus and his disciples the reverse of human conceptions prevails. The important thing in Jesus' teaching is not simply the serving at tables as an "expression of charity towards one's neighbour, but the whole sacrifice, the devotion and offering of one's life which is the

¹Kid. 32^b, Strack-Billerbeck, op. cit., I, p. 838.

²T. W. Manson, p. 338.

essence of διακονεῖν ."¹ It is the characteristic of love which finds expression in giving. The serving Saviour is sacrificing his life and the follower should enjoy doing no less.

Teachings on Self-denial and Self-sacrifice Peculiar to Matthew

1. Matthew 7:13, 14 -- "Enter by the narrow gate; for the gate is wide and the way is easy, that leads to destruction, and those who enter by it are many. (14) For the gate is narrow and the way is hard, that leads to life, and those who find it are few." This verse is not treated as a saying of Q because the similarity between it and Luke 13:24 is limited. The only identical words are στενή and πολλοί. Matthew probably abstracted the saying from its original context. The words in Luke seem to have come from a group of unrelated sayings. It is quite likely that Luke and Matthew had different versions of the same saying from which to draw. It is possible that Matthew retained the more original form which "Luke has abbreviated perhaps from failure to appreciate the Semitic

¹Beyer, " Διακονεῖν ," T.W.z.N.T., II, p. 85, who further states that in this "being there for others in life and death" . . . the word διακονεῖν reaches its final theological depth.

parallelism."¹ "Thus it seems that a new parable has come into existence in Luke 13:24."² The emphasis there is on the necessity to persevere to enter the closed door. The antithesis of the narrow and broad ways has a varied background. Rabbinical literature has a parallel which says concerning the righteous way of life, "It is like one who sat by a cross-road, and before him were two paths, of which one was smooth to start with, and ended in thorns, and the other thorny to start with, but became smooth, etc."³ Many other parallels can be found.⁴ Matthew has probably received his narrative from his special source.

The meaning is clear that the way to destruction, or rather complete annihilation, is attractive in its beginnings, but to follow it is fatal. On the other hand, the way to eternal life is unattractive at first and costly; if the disciples wish to find this narrow gate they must deny and sacrifice themselves, they must have the courage to cut themselves off from the mass, who follow the broad way.

¹W. L. Knox, op. cit., II, p. 31.

²Jeremias, op. cit., p. 74.

³Sifre Deut., Re'eh, 86a, cited by Montefiore, op. cit., p. 549. See Strack-Billerbeck, op. cit., I, pp. 460ff.

⁴Jeremiah 21:8. See T. W. Manson, op. cit., for fuller list.

2. Matthew 11:29f. -- "Take my yoke upon you, and learn from me; for I am gentle and lowly in heart, and you will find rest for your souls. (30) For my yoke is easy, and my burden is light." The verses are peculiar to Matthew suggesting they originated from M rather than Q for Luke would hardly have omitted them. On the other hand the appearance of similar sayings in Ecclesiasticus 24:19-22 and 51:23-26 leads some authorities to question the genuineness of the verses. Ecclesiasticus 51:26 says concerning wisdom "Bring your necks under her yoke, and her burden let your soul bear; she is nigh unto them that seek her, and he that is intent (upon her) findeth her."¹ R. Otto says, it is plain that Jesus had some such passage in mind and the words are "nothing more nor less than a quotation of an old Wisdom writing, presumably known also to his hearers."² R. Bultmann says the words probably come from "some old 'Wisdom' book" and "perhaps the earliest Church already put this saying into the mouth of Jesus."³ M. Dibelius who declares that the saying is

¹Ecclesiasticus 51:26. R. H. Charles, op. cit., I, p. 517.

²R. Otto, op. cit., pp. 170, 171.

³R. Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, I, p. 48.

widely different from the synoptic type of the words of Jesus, also says they belong outside the sayings of Jesus because the "combination of self-recommendation and of the preaching of conversion is the typical mark of the divine or semi-divine herald of a revelation in Hellenistic religiousness, i.e., of a mythological person."¹ Still there is no reason why Jesus could not have thought of the words himself and have offered men the saving vision of God.

The word yoke has a varied usage.² In the Old Testament it was used to express being bound to the law of Yahweh.³ It stands for obedience and service to Yahweh and it later has a fixed meaning as the yoke of God's rule. It appears often in the Rabbinic and Jewish Wisdom literature. "Every one who takes upon himself the yoke of the Law is liberated from the yoke of empire and from the yoke of the way of the world; but whoever throws off the yoke of the Law is subjected to both of these," said R.

¹M. Dibelius, op. cit., p. 281.

²See George Bertram, " *ζυγός* ," T.W.z.N.T., II, pp. 902f.

³Cf. Jeremiah 2:20, 5:5 and Hosea 11:4.

Nehuniah benha-Kanah (c. 95 A. D.).¹

In verse 29 Jesus uses the possessive pronoun, my yoke. Thus his yoke is contrasted with that of the Torah. "My yoke" is to be taken with the proclamation of the kingdom of God. The use of μου becomes conspicuous because of its Messianic overtones it assumes in pointing to the yoke of the kingdom of God. Jesus explained himself as the Messiah implicitly and puts his yoke as it were against the Torah.² W. D. Davies says, ". . . we are probably right in finding a contrast between the yoke of Christ's teaching or law and that of the Torah. . . . In Matthew clearly there is a substitution of Christ for the Torah, and Christ, we may say, is pictured after the image of the Torah."³

E. Dinkler sees a close relation between the yoke and Jesus' words on bearing one's cross. He sees the word yoke, which is really a beam, as an older conception which has been narrowed down to the word cross. The fact that

¹Aboth 3, 5. Danby, op. cit., p. 450. See Moore, Judaism, I, p. 465, "In reciting the first sentence of the Shema (Deut. 6, 4f.) a man takes upon him the yoke of the Kingdom of Heaven (Berakhoth 2, 2)."

²E. Dinkler, "Jesu Wort vom Kreuztragen," p. 116.

³Davies, op. cit., p. 150. "In the Didache 6, 2, the commandments of Jesus are called the yoke of the Lord. See Bertram, "Zuyos", T.W.z.N.T., II, pp. 902f.

the saying about the yoke does not appear anywhere else in Jesus' teaching, and that it stands in contrast to the Torah, along with the Messianic implications, leads him to the conclusion that this teaching is in contradiction to any other saying of Jesus and therefore not a genuine word of his. He supposes it was in Q and that Luke intentionally omitted it. He further points out that words concerning the yoke are frequent in early Christian literature. Thus the Christian community is responsible. But it is quite possible to hold that the final shape of the words was influenced by the community and also hold that the saying originated with Jesus when it is recognised that a sharp distinction between Jewish and Hellenistic Christianity cannot be drawn and the possibility that the words may have originated in quite a different milieu from that which finally stamps them.¹

Jesus then, using these words, indicates that his yoke, that of the Kingdom of God, will do for his disciples what the law claimed to do, but failed to accomplish, that is, bring rest. The purpose of taking the yoke of Jesus is to lighten the load which had formerly weighed heavy upon their shoulders. The yoke is obedience. Just as a

¹W. Manson, Jesus the Messiah, p. 75.

material yoke is placed upon a man's neck and shoulders so that the load may be taken by the chains or cords at each end of the yoke and the burden lightened, so the followers of Jesus are to take their Master's yoke upon them. The yoke is not an added burden but a device intended to lighten the weight.¹

There can be seen in this saying evidence that Jesus used ideas and images of Divine Wisdom and applied them to himself.² The character of the New Torah is simpler and at the same time more demanding and exacting than the old. This is not contradictory when it is understood that the demands for self-denial and self-sacrifice are in line with Jesus' reduction of the commandments to two, love towards God and neighbour.³

3. Matthew 13:44-46 -- "The Kingdom of heaven is like treasure hidden in a field, which a man found and covered up; then in his joy he goes and sells all that he has and buys that field. (45) Again, the Kingdom of heaven is like a merchant in search of fine pearls, (46) who, on finding one pearl of great value, went and sold all that

¹Jeremias, op. cit., p. 136.

²H. E. W. Turner, op. cit., p. 323.

³T. W. Manson, op. cit., pp. 35f.

he had and bought it.

These two parables emphasise that the Kingdom of God is so valuable that no expense is too great to secure it. It is so precious that a man may well give all that he has for it. In the hidden treasure the purpose is to express the value of the kingdom and one's determination to attain it. And so with the pearl, the kingdom is so precious he sells all that he has to obtain it. There lies behind these parables the idea that if anyone has a part in the kingdom it will cost him something and most likely everything, including his life.

4. Matthew 19:12 -- "For there are eunuchs who have been so from birth, and there are eunuchs who have been made eunuchs by men, and there are eunuchs who have made themselves eunuchs for the sake of the Kingdom of heaven. He who is able to receive this, let him receive it." This saying describes three types of celibacy. Those born sexually impotent from the mother's womb, those who have been made eunuchs by men, and those who have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom's sake. One thing is clear from this saying, "renunciations even of the most radical kind may be demanded for the sake of the kingdom."¹

¹Turner, op. cit., p. 241.

But the question may well be raised as to whether literal physical mutilation is meant by this third category. It can be interpreted to mean that individuals have voluntarily renounced marriage and undertaken a life of celibacy for the sake of the kingdom without becoming sexually impotent.

T. W. Manson¹ gives a number of reasons why this view may be taken. The whole idea of castration was opposed to Jewish sentiment. There is no evidence that Jesus supported ascetic ideals. The greatest sacrifice is not too much for the kingdom; if the kingdom requires one to eliminate the pleasure of marriage he should willingly make the sacrifice, but that does not necessitate self-mutilation. Many of the disciples, John the Baptist and Jesus, were unmarried; and other disciples gave up their home life for the kingdom. But they did not become eunuchs. It is to be noted that Clement of Alexandria said, "The true eunuch is not he who cannot but he who will not indulge himself."²

The context of this saying in Matthew 19:12 should not be ignored. The saying follows immediately on Jesus'

¹T. W. Manson, op. cit., pp. 507f.

²Paed. III, 4. See T. W. Manson, op. cit., pp. 507f.

discussion of marriage and divorce. Verse 10 may have been composed by Matthew to make a transition from the words on marriage to the words on celibacy or verses 10-12 may be the conclusion of a passage, and what preceded verse 10 is lost.¹ It is clear that the cause of the kingdom is first; its claims must be met. "Christ never undervalued family life and its claims, but steadily refused to treat it as ultimate."² This is probably the meaning of this sharply expressed statement.

Summary of Self-denial and Self-sacrifice
in the Teaching of Jesus as Presented
in the Synoptic Gospels

The Synoptic Gospels make it clear that Jesus taught the disciples to understand their mission as a sacred undertaking (Mark 6:8).³ Personal welfare was to be considered subservient to the work of the kingdom which was greater than the Temple.⁴ Thus Jesus' specific call to the disciples stressed self-denial and cross-bearing. Our

¹T. W. Manson, op. cit., pp. 214, 215.

²H. E. W. Turner, op. cit., p. 317.

³Note that in this summary the Scriptural references in parenthesis indicate the source where this idea is treated in this Chapter. The various parallels can be found there.

⁴Cf. Matthew 12:6.

analysis of the verb ἀρνεῖσθαι shows that the word has two main uses in the New Testament: the objective use meaning "to deny one's interest in something" and the subjective use meaning "not wanting to know of" or "to keep oneself negative to something in a proffered situation."

Reflexive denial is a basic requirement for discipleship (Mark 8:34). This self-denial refers to the unreserved surrender of one's person rather than self-discipline or asceticism. The expression "deny oneself" had its origin on the unbelieving side and not in the initiative of the believing disciple of some God.

The true servant is obligated to absolute obedience and to consider himself unworthy even when he has done his best (Luke 17:10). If the master experiences humility, the disciple, being inferior, can expect no better fate (Luke 6:40 and 22:27). If Jesus must accept a cup and baptism of suffering that same suffering and persecution must become an indisputable part of the life the follower has in common with Jesus (Mark 10:38). The point is that the disciple is to consider himself blessed when, because of his self-committal to the person of Jesus, he is persecuted, poor or weeping (Luke 6:20-31). The demands of the kingdom will create division and strife, and loyalty to

Jesus must precede other personal affection (Luke 12:51-53). The disciple is warned that he should count the cost of his discipleship for in fulfilling the requirement to renounce all that he has he may be losing his life (Luke 12:28-33).

Our study reveals that in Jesus' call to men to follow him (Mark 8:34), the following meant a literal walking after Jesus as a pupil walking behind his master rather than an imitation of the life of Jesus. With regard to cross-bearing (Mark 8:34) the reference has to do with external circumstances but has no relation to the cross of Jesus' crucifixion. Neither the concept of carrying one's cross nor that of self-denial can claim originality with Jesus. In his teaching that one should lose one's life for the sake of Jesus, Jesus placed emphasis on the fact that one's real life is secured and preserved through laying it down for the sake of the Gospel (Mark 8:35-37). He thus offered in his person the salvation he proclaims just as in the Old Testament the messenger of salvation was almost identified with his proclamation. Man is confronted with a decision as to whether his physical life or his spiritual life shall have priority.

Jesus puts forth the claim, against the natural

social order of things, that greatness and leadership are determined by service (Mark 9:35). He makes a call to renounce self-righteous pretensions and to present oneself in abasement before God (Luke 14:11). This teaching takes a concentrated form in various exhortations. "Sell what you have and give to the poor" (Mark 10:21) was required of the rich man. Values of the present age are reversed in the kingdom for what is lost in one realm is gained in the spiritual a hundred-fold (Mark 10:29). In the requirement to hate one's own life in coming to Jesus, hate is used to express that one must break with the strongest natural instinct of self-preservation if called upon to do so. One should treat his own inclinations as an enemy. To hate oneself is an Aramaism for the Greek to deny oneself (Luke 14:26). Matthew 19:12 teaches that family life must not be treated as ultimate. Luke 10:3 shows the disciple commissioned to suffering.

There are other injunctions. The disciple is to love enemies, to accept hatred, hunger, and persecutions as blessings (Luke 6:20-31). He is to understand that there are some things more important than burying the dead (Luke 9:59-62), that entering the narrow gate is difficult (Matthew 7:13ff.), that one should renounce his claim for repayment and make a gift to his debtor

(Luke 6:37f.), and that the kingdom of God is so valuable that no expense is too great to gain a part in it (Matthew 13:44-46).

A part in this kingdom is accomplished only through self-denial, self-sacrifice and attachment to the person of Jesus. This attachment replaces previous commitments to the Law, and Jesus thus can say, "Take my yoke upon you" (Matthew 11:29f.) indicating that the kingdom of God can do what the Law could never accomplish.

The meaning of self-denial and self-sacrifice lies in the service done, for only thus does it become sacrificial. It has to do with the spirit in which the authority given is handled (Mark 9:35). The teaching of Jesus with regard to self-denial and self-sacrifice is in line with his reduction of the commandments to two.

CHAPTER VI

SELF-DENIAL AND SELF-SACRIFICE IN THE LIFE AND TEACHING OF JESUS AS PRESENTED IN THE GOSPEL OF JOHN

An Introduction to John

Because of its very nature, the Fourth Gospel must be treated separately from the Synoptic Gospels. In this regard, the words of Clement of Alexandria are often quoted: "John, divinely moved by the Holy Spirit, wrote a spiritual Gospel on observing that the things obvious to the sense had been set forth in the earlier Gospels."¹ There is general agreement that John's view is in accord with the Synoptics² and that he is to some extent indebted to his predecessors. However, his plan and presentation were essentially original;³ he felt no compulsion to be confined to Synoptic authority.

¹Eusebius, H. E. VI. 14. 7.

²See R. H. Lightfoot, St. John's Gospel, A Commentary (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1957), p. 32.

³A. J. B. Higgins, The Historicity of the Fourth Gospel (London: Lutterworth Press, 1960), p. 13.

It seems to be characteristic of this writer to refer in a rather allusive way to what "is explicit in the tradition known to him, and to us through the Synoptic Gospels."¹

In the Fourth Gospel, the meaning of some words and their connotations are different from those of the Synoptics and therefore, the words of the Fourth Gospel must be understood in the spirit of the Fourth Gospel. Comparison of John with the Synoptics supports the conclusion that in his formulation of the sayings of Jesus, the author has deliberately allowed his own convictions and theological beliefs to influence him to a much greater extent than do the synoptic writers.² But this can be more easily understood when it is realized that, unlike the Synoptics which introduce the reader to the passion of Jesus, John's primary emphasis is on the passion itself³ and often deals with the personal aspect of salvation.⁴

It is characteristic of John in a way different from

¹A. J. B. Higgins, The Lord's Supper in the New Testament, p. 75.

²Cullmann, op. cit., p. 183.

³Wilhelm Thüsing, Die Erhöhung und Verherrlichung Jesu im Johannesevangelium (Münster, Westfalen: Aschen-dorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1960), p. 124.

⁴Ibid., p. 129.

the Synoptics to allow his post-resurrection knowledge to project itself into the early experiences of Jesus.¹ Jesus the exalted one speaks, but he speaks as the one who appeared on earth.² It was John's intention to present the earthly and exalted Christ together and so allow both to speak at one time. This gives weight to the opinion that major events in this Gospel may have been intended to contain a double aspect as illustrated in the fact that there are three references to the "hour" not having yet come³ while there are two passages in which Jesus declares, "The hour cometh and now is."⁴ "Up to a point it is itself the hour; but it also points forward"⁵ with the forward aspect having priority.⁶ The Synoptic writers consciously intended to present the words of Jesus as he spoke them, but John, following the disclosure of the Spirit, was interpreting the Christ of the Church and very likely created

¹For example: John 1:50f.

²E. Schweizer, op. cit., p. 53. See John 21:13-22.

³John 2:4, 7:30, and 8:20.

⁴John 4:23 and 5:25.

⁵Lightfoot, op. cit., p. 61.

⁶Cf. remarks on 12:20 by Ernst Käsemann, Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen, Volume I (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht), pp. 254ff.

settings in order to give purpose to words of Jesus.¹ John's purpose is to put forth the faith already delivered,² and this Gospel could be properly read by the believer both before and after his confession of faith.³

With regard to the Messianic secret, John makes practically no mention of it. No one is sworn to secrecy and none of the miracles are hidden.⁴ John's usage is merely an interpretation of his own, not a contradiction of the Markan presentation.

In the discourses of the Gospel of John some distinction can be made between genuine tradition and constructions of John. S. Schulz finds a special layer of tradition in the Fourth Gospel which he feels can be separated easily from other tradition.⁵ The point is that distinctions can most easily be drawn when Johannine discourses appear in teachings that resemble synoptic

¹Cullmann, op. cit., p. 182.

²Higgins, op. cit., p. 13.

³Dodd, Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, pp. 8f.

⁴See Sjöberg, op. cit., pp. 210 and 213.

⁵Siegfried Schulz, Untersuchungen zur Menschensohn-Christologie im Johannesevangelium (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1957), p. 87.

sayings.¹ Examples are found in John 12:25,² John 13:16,³ John 13:20,⁴ and John 20:23.⁵ It is of particular importance to note that the content of these verses is directly relevant to self-denial and self-sacrifice in the life and teaching of Jesus.

It is characteristic of John to present the discourses of Jesus in long narratives.⁶ This supports the assertion that the Johannine "Gospel enshrines a genuine tradition of an aspect of Jesus' teachings which has not found a place in the Synoptics."⁷

When the Johannine approach is properly understood and given serious reflection there is much to be said in favor of the claim that John is indebted to "sources or

¹Higgins, op. cit., p. 68.

²Parallels: Mark 8:35, Matthew 16:25, and Luke 9:24; Cf. Matthew 10:39, and Luke 17:33.

³Parallels: Matthew 10:24 and Luke 6:40. Cf. John 15:20.

⁴See Matthew 10:40. Parallel: Matthew 18:18.

⁵Dodd, "Some Johannine 'Herrnworte' with Parallels in the Synoptic Gospels," pp. 75-86.

⁶See Dodd, op. cit., p. 400, and Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1963), p. 315.

⁷I. Abrahams, op. cit., p. 12. Cf. Higgins, op. cit., p. 68.

traditions which may claim a degree of reliability not inferior and sometimes even superior to the Synoptic tradition."¹

The Son of Man in the Gospel of John

The appearance of Son of man ideas in the Gospel of John is indicative of the author's familiarity with the title. The designation appears in decisive passages of the Gospel.² There is also, unlike the Synoptics, a repeated presentation of Jesus the Son of man as having come from heaven. This Johannine aspect of the title when such emphasis is not found in the synoptics suggests that in the actual proclamation of Jesus the pre-existence probably played a minor role. Jesus' own interest does not lie in the pre-existence of the Son of man but presses forward through his present work to the eschatological appearance.³

It could be assumed that Jesus took the meaning of the pre-existence of the Son of man from Judaism; but since in his use of the designation he was in no way bound to Jewish understanding of the title, this assumption would be uncertain. Even so, the interpretation of Jesus as

¹Higgins, op. cit., p. 60.

²See Cullmann, op. cit., p. 185.

³Ibid., p. 241.

being related to the pre-existence of the Son of man is a logical consequence of the presentation of the Son of man as the representative of God.¹

R. H. Fuller says that the difference "between Q and this Johannine stratum appears to be that in the Q sayings Jesus is already exercising the transcendental functions of the eschatological Son of man, whereas in the Johannine sayings Jesus is already exercising the transcendental functions of judgment and salvation."²

In John the Son of man name is used by Jesus in such a way that there could be no mistake of Jesus pointing toward himself.³ At times, however, not everybody knows that Jesus makes this claim. The one born blind does not know it until Jesus tells him,⁴ and when cured the man seems to carefully avoid the phrase, "Son of man."⁵

John uses the term ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ

¹Sjöberg, op. cit., pp. 241f.

²Reginald H. Fuller, The New Testament in Current Study (Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1962), p. 114.

³See John 5:27 and 6:53f. This identity is suggested there.

⁴John 9:17, 25, 30 and 35ff. See Sjöberg, op. cit., p. 205.

⁵Ethelbert Stauffer, Jesus and His Story, p. 234.

ἄνθρωπου just as the synoptic writers do while Paul uses the general expression ἄνθρωπος.¹ This gives evidence to support the claim that the writer of John in common with the Synoptic writers, knows a tradition which makes a distinction not clear in the word barnasha between man and Son of man.²

S. Schulz has found in the Gospel of John a special layer which speaks of the Son of man and which can be separated from the other tradition.³ This Christological theme has its origin at a time before a specific Johannine theology had been developed or at least in a tradition to which the Johannine theology remained strange. He finds that the Son of man motif is practically without exception associated with the expectation of the exaltation, glorification and role of the Son of man in the last judgment.⁴

The early church seems to have had the idea that in Jesus the whole history of Israel had come to its end. Up

¹See Romans 5:12, 15, 17; I Corinthians 15:21, 45, 47; I Timothy 2:5.

²See Cullmann, op. cit., pp. 183 and 185.

³Schulz, op. cit., pp. 96ff.

⁴See the Review of S. Schulz' "Untersuchungen zur Menschensohn-Christologie" by James M. Robinson in Journal of Biblical Literature, Volume 78, September 1959, pp. 247-252.

to a point Jesus seems to be the representation of Israel interpreted in such a way that he was the end of Israel's way; the one who had fulfilled what had previously been fragmentary.¹ The thought adopted in John 15:1 shows that now a new concept of representation presents Jesus as "the One who has gone to the end of Israel's way through suffering to exaltation by God." When Jesus is called the true vine in John 15:1ff. the Evangelist uses the figure which in the Old Testament stood for the nation, Israel, the vine of Yahweh.² In Psalm 80:17 this vine is also the "Son of man," as clearly substantiated by a mistaken translation in the LXX version.³ Thus in John 15:1ff. the vine of God, Israel in the Old Testament, is identified with the Son of man, Jesus. And the disciples, as branches, have become a part of the "Son of man." The collective interpretation of the Son of man stands out here. This was "the final expression of the truth already given by Jesus: nobody could find his real life except in absolute dependence on Jesus' message and acts, sharing his trust in God,

¹E. J. Tinsley, "The Way of the Son of Man," Interpretation, A Journal of Bible and Theology, VII, 1953, pp. 421f.

²Psalm 80. See LXX.

³See C. H. Dodd, The Fourth Gospel, p. 411.

his obedience, sonship, and following in real discipleship.¹

Son of Man Sayings as Recorded in
the Gospel of John

1. John 1:51 -- "Truly, truly, I say to you, you will see heaven opened, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of man." The designation used here in connection with Jesus' earthly work also points up his glorification. The person of the Son of man becomes the connecting link between earth and heaven. John substitutes the Son of man for Jacob of Genesis 28:12. The Hebrew יְהוָה of Genesis 28:12 should be translated, with the Rabbis, "upon him" referring to Jacob rather than "upon it" referring to the ladder.² Jacob's new name, Israel, shows he represents the whole nation. Thus in the old layer of tradition of John 1:51 the Son of man is the true Israel. The expression is used to suggest the eternal contact between the two places, earth and heaven.³ It presents the coming work of Jesus in unbroken

¹Eduard Schweizer, "The Son of Man," Journal of Biblical Literature, Volume 79, 1960, p. 129.

²See E. Schweizer, op. cit., p. 125.

³C. K. Barrett, The Gospel According to Saint John, p. 156.

communion with the Father.

It is possible that John in his usage of Son of man along with other titles in John 1 was making it clear that his teaching was based on the messianic beliefs of the early church for the titles considered messianic by the church cannot be proven messianic in their pre-Christian form. On the other hand this may well be a complete saying of Jesus himself.¹

2. John 3:13f. -- "No one has ascended into heaven but he who descended from heaven, the Son of man. (14) And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, so must the Son of Man be lifted up. . . ." In verse 13 the author is thinking of the descent of the pre-existent divine man who descends to fallen man and ascends to glory. It is characteristic of this Gospel to emphasize the exaltation rather than the human experiences of the Son of man, because the writer expresses the connexion of the Suffering Servant and Son of man in the unity of the "Incarnate and Exalted One."² In verse 14 the exaltation is again expressed. The word ὁ υἱοῦν

¹E. M. Sidebottom, "The Son of Man as Man in the Fourth Gospel," The Expository Times, Vol. 28, p. 231.

²Cullmann, op. cit., p. 185.

appears here in John 3:14, and later in 8:28 and 12:32. In Johannine theology the meaning certainly applies to the crucifixion and seems intended to carry a double implication that both the hour of death and the glorification are identical.¹ Thüsing in saying that the crucifixion, glorification and exaltation are one, points out that ὑψοῦν in its original meaning does not refer to an exaltation from an earthly world to a heavenly one, but is an exaltation to a throne. It is noticeable that in verse 13 even before Jesus' death his exaltation can be spoken of as past and then in verse 14 as future² emphasizing that the exaltation takes place on the cross.³ In the New Testament church exaltation was closely connected with the bestowal of power. Thus the spatial moment of exaltation to the throne (according to John, to the cross) connects with the spiritual exaltation to power.⁴

Thus the character of ὑψοῦν for the Johannine Gospel is the "lifting up of Jesus on the throne"

¹Käsemann, op. cit., pp. 255f.

²Barrett, op. cit., p. 178.

³Cf. Mark 8:31. Mark makes a clear distinction between the suffering and the glorification while John uses the one word ὑψωθῆναι to express both.

⁴Thüsing, op. cit., p. 34.

of the cross."¹ Though the term is usually thought of as having reference to after death, John uses the word when he means death as well as glorification. Each time the word ὑψοῦν appears in the Gospel of John it has this double usage,² referring to both the physical lifting up on the cross and the exaltation, and invariably is used in relation to the Son of man.

Matthew Black³ declares that the place to look for an authentic Jesus Son of man tradition in the New Testament is not in the synoptics but in the hymn of Philip-
 pians 2, generally considered the oldest Aramaic tradi-
 tion of the New Testament. The phrase οὐρανῶν
εὐπεθεῖς ὡς ἀναρῶν is traced to
 Daniel 7:13. The important thing to be noticed says Black
 is that there is no mention of the resurrection at any
 point. What is clearly expressed is the vindication or
 exaltation in the use of the verb, ὑπερῴω.

The real point of interest is that this verb appears
 in the same connexion in its simple form at John 3:14,

¹Thüsing, op. cit., p. 33.

²See Barrett, op. cit., p. 178, Schweizer, Lordship and Discipleship, p. 69, and Cullmann, op. cit., p. 185.

³Matthew Black, "The Son of Man Problem in Recent Research and Debate," pp. 314-316.

8:28, 12:32, and 12:34. In the Johannine usage the word undoubtedly takes for granted a belief in the resurrection as does the Philippian passage; but the point can be made that in John as in Philippians we have a very early tradition which expresses belief only in the rejection and exaltation of the Son of man. It is of further significance that the verbs ὕψω θῆναι and δοξασθῆναι, key words of Johannine Christology, are used with reference to the Servant of the Lord in Isaiah 52:13.¹ Dr. Black concludes that there is every reason to believe that the oldest tradition of the Son of man referred only to his rejection and exaltation. If this theory that the earliest stratum of the Son of man tradition referred only to the rejection and exaltation of the Son of man be accepted, it may be with good reasoning that this Johannine version of the tradition, "The Son of man must be exalted,"² can be considered the earliest form of the Gospel tradition and an authentic word of Jesus. Any reference to the resurrection would be

¹Black, op. cit., p. 316. Dr. Black asks, "Is this the original foundation in the Old Testament of the Christology of the suffering and exalted Servant of the Lord?"

²John 3:13f.

secondary but a legitimate inference.¹

3. John 5:27 -- ". . . and has given him authority to execute judgment, because he is the Son of man." In every instance but this in the Gospel, the article is used before both "Son" and "man" (ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου) but here both articles are omitted.

Schulz says the expression is very old for when compared with the general reference to "one like a son of man" in Daniel 7:13 it becomes clear that the term has not yet been identified with Jesus.² Higgins however points out that it is unlikely that John 5:27 means "a son of man" as in Daniel 7:13 but that it has been borrowed from Psalm 8:4 to illustrate the humility and exaltation of Jesus rather than his humanity.³ The expression may well be an "isolated pre-Johannine saying from a tradition about the Son of man"⁴ adapted to its present context meaning the Son of man, for grammatically the term represents "the Hebraic construct state such as is used in the Aramaic of Daniel 7:13."⁵

¹M. Black, op. cit., p. 317.

²Schulz, op. cit., pp. 111ff.

³Higgins, Jesus and the Son of Man, p. 166.

⁴Ibid., p. 168.

⁵Ibid., p. 166.

This verse supports the theory that in the Gospel of John the picture of Christ is entirely determined by obedience to the Father. All things have been given to him by the Father and the authority of judgment is given him here.¹

John starts from the common Christian belief that Christ as Son of man is judge of the quick and the dead² (3:17-21). The Father here hath committed both the bestowal of life and the responsibility of judgment to the Son. Life and judgment are characteristically treated as both present and future in the scope in this Gospel.³ However, if we accept the theory of Matthew Black mentioned above on John 3:13f. that the earliest stratum of tradition referred only to the rejection and exaltation of the Son of man, and the theory that originally some of the parousia sayings referred to the exaltation of the Son of man, then the eschatological role of the Son of man meant more than that of witness, and John 5:27 may be nearer the mind of Jesus in declaring that the Father

¹See Schweizer, op. cit., p. 68. See also Higgins, op. cit., p. 167. Cf. J. A. T. Robinson, Jesus and His Coming, p. 170, who sees the judgment as having already occurred.

²Dodd, op. cit., p. 209.

³Barrett, op. cit., p. 215.

has given (the Son) authority to execute judgment, because he is the Son of man.

4. John 6:27 -- "Do not labor for the food which perishes, but for the food which endures to eternal life, which the Son of man will give to you; for on him has God the Father set his seal." The title Son of man remains in the background in the Gospel of John, while other titles are used in reference to the majesty of Jesus. When Son of man does appear in John, as here, it is obviously a part of the old tradition of the original church.¹ Jesus is the heavenly man and men are foolishly concerned with material food rather than truth; yet they cannot earn the spiritual food, for it is a gift of the Son of man.² This Son of man is the accredited representative of the Father.³

5. John 6:53 -- "So Jesus said to them, 'Truly, truly, I say to you, unless you eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, you have no life in you.'" This may be a special branch of Johannine tradition of the word of interpretation which calls the elements

σάρξ (not σώμα) καὶ

¹Bornkamm, Jesus of Nazareth, p. 175.

²Barrett, op. cit., p. 235.

³Lightfoot, op. cit., p. 158.

αὐτῶν.¹ The common explanation is that for theological reasons the author of the Fourth Gospel intentionally used "flesh" instead of "body."² The appearance in John 6:51b of a new thought in the use of ὄψις has led many scholars to the conclusion that 51b-58 are the work of a redactor interested in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper.³ Higgins on the other hand finds the framework of the whole discourse in the two verses 6:27, the Son of man gives imperishable food, and 6:53, the Son of man himself is this food. Both sayings are probably derived from a pre-Johannine eucharistic discourse. The church declares its faith as it speaks through the Son of man.⁴

In this connexion it should be noted that there is a Western addition⁵ following John 6:56: "As the Father is in me and I in the Father. Truly, truly, I say to you, unless you take the body of the Son of man as the bread of

¹Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, p. 141.

²A. J. B. Higgins, The Lord's Supper in the New Testament, p. 49, n. 2.

³Ibid., p. 80, and also p. 83. Notice, for example, the omission of Bornkamm, op. cit., p. 175.

⁴Higgins, op. cit., pp. 174ff.

⁵D, (a, ff²).

life, you have no life in you." Apparently this arises from 6:53.

6. John 6:62 -- "Then what if you were to see the Son of man ascending where he was before?" When it is understood that for the author of the Gospel of John the ascending¹ of the Son of man includes the suffering, the mounting upon the cross, and the glorification to the Father, the vindication, this verse supports the view that Jesus is the pre-existent (indicated by τὸ
πρὸτερον) heavenly man who descends to his saving work and then ascends.² The Johannine Son of man is emphatically the Son of God.³ "It is in his death above all that He is exalted, and, in 'drawing' men to Him, uniting them with Him, affirms the character which specifically belongs to the Son of Man, the character of the inclusive representative of true humanity."⁴ It is further pointed out that, for the writer of this Gospel the simple expression ἀναβαίνειν εἰς Ἰεροσόλυμα

¹Cf. J. A. T. Robinson, op. cit., p. 166, on the theological significance of "going up."

²Barrett, op. cit., p. 251.

³Dodd, The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, p. 244.

⁴Dodd, op. cit., p. 247.

used by every pilgrim, possibly had a special significance in regard to the ἡνδραβάνης of the Son of man.¹ Apparently the doctrine of pre-existence has influenced the writer's presentation of Jesus' words.

7. John 8:28 -- "So Jesus said, 'When you have lifted up the Son of Man, then you will know that I am he, and that I do nothing on my own authority but speak thus as the Father taught me.'" The similarity of Isaiah 43:10f. with John 8:28 indicates that it is difficult not to identify the "I am" (אֲנִי הוּא), (ἐγώ εἰμι in LXX) of Jehovah of Isaiah 41:10f. with the "I am" of Jesus in John 8:28. The self-existent is fully revealed in Christ. The same majesty and glory is involved.² Through his works and death men who have no vision will come to know the Father.³ The double meaning of the verb ὑψοῦν seems appropriate here as in verse 3:13f. The lifting up to the cross and the exaltation to glory proves the complete obedience to the Father. Then John understands Jesus to have identified himself as the Son of man. This saying, of course, has no

¹Dodd, op. cit., p. 385, n. 1.

²Ibid., pp. 95f., 168, and 248.

³Ibid., p. 397.

synoptic parallel but Mark in 14:62 presents the idea that after his death people will see Jesus as the Son of man, "Ye shall see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of power." If those Johannine sayings which have close parallels in synoptic sayings have real historic value, we have such a value here. There is no legitimate objection to the saying as a genuine word of Jesus. If the saying was created by the Evangelist, it is close to the mind of Jesus if similar synoptic verses are accepted.¹ It is quite improbable that John is in any way indebted to Mark for his presentation here. It is the result of individual treatment of traditional material.² John 8:28 contains the verb ὕψομαι with the same connection as the old hymn of Philippians 2. If we accept the suggestion of M. Black,³ previously presented, that the earliest stratum of the Son of man tradition referred only to the humiliation and exaltation of the Son of man, then we have here again a saying very close to the words of Jesus if not an authentic saying, since there is no mention of the resurrection.

¹V. Taylor, Jesus and His Sacrifice, p. 246.

²C. H. Dodd, Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1963), p. 89.

³M. Black, op. cit., pp. 314-316.

8. John 9:35 -- "Jesus heard that they had cast him out, and having found him he said, 'Do you believe in the Son of man?'" John sets forth his conception of the work of Jesus. There is no reason to suppose the whole section to have been invented:¹ The narrative probably originated out of a tradition still in flux. Dodd considers this verse along with its context to be instrumental in John's expounding the doctrine of the Spirit in that Jesus is given the place of advocate.²

There is a variant reading, "the Son of God," but there is little doubt about the preference of "the Son of man."³ The identification of Jesus as Son of man is used by John to point up the necessity of belief in Jesus as the Son of man, an article of faith of the community. In explaining this Higgins⁴ points out that the main elements of the preaching of the church in the Johannine circle with regard to Jesus are presented in terms of the Son of man: the incarnation (3:13), his death as being

¹C. K. Barrett, op. cit., p. 294.

²C. H. Dodd, The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, p. 414.

³"Son of man" is supported by p⁶⁶, ℵ, B, D, W, pc, sy^s, sa, ac², fa^m.

⁴See Higgins, Jesus and the Son of Man, p. 155.

lifted up or glorified (3:14; 8:28; 12:34; 12:23; 12:31f.), the ascension (3:13; 6:62) and judgement (5:27). The reply of the man, "Lord, I believe," further shows the influence of the early confession, "Jesus is Lord."¹

9. John 12:23 -- "And Jesus answered them, 'The hour has come for the Son of man to be glorified.'" "The hour has come" seems to bear peculiar Johannine characteristics. This clause appears in only one passage of the synoptics, Mark 14:41 and Matthew 26:45. This Johannine peculiarity is further supported by the unique use of ^{c1} ωρα with the personal genitive of possession² in the Fourth Gospel. When John 12:27f. is taken with John 12:23 it becomes clear that in the same act (or hour) in which the glory of God is given Jesus, the name of God is glorified.³ The glory is achieved in the humiliation. Here again the close relationship between humiliation and exaltation is brought out in the context. The saying adds to the conclusion that the Gospel of John

¹Higgins, op. cit., p. 155. Higgins points to Acts 2:36; Romans 10:9; I Cor. 12:3; and Phil. 2:11.

²C. H. Dodd, Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel, p. 371. Notice, however, the contrast of "my hour" with "your hour" of Luke 22:53. See Taylor, op. cit., p. 195.

³C. H. Dodd, The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, p. 95.

contains an extensive Son of man Christology,¹ which in many cases may be very near the mind of Jesus.

10. John 12:34 -- "The crowd answered him, 'We have heard from the law that Christ remains forever. How can you say that the Son of man must be lifted up? Who is this Son of man?'" John 12:34 taken with John 12:32 is no real exception to the Son of man being used as a self-designation of Jesus.² "From the law" must refer to passages such as Isaiah 9:6-7 and Ezekiel 37:25 rather than the Pentateuch.³ Here when John speaks of the lifting up of the Son of man he means much the same as when he speaks of the Son of man being glorified.⁴ John in using the example of the Old Testament would readily understand Isaiah 52:13 in the light of 53:7-8 where the servant of the Lord is "Exalted and glorified exceedingly" in his death. In 12:33f. it is explained that the lifting up of Jesus refers to his dying and specifically his crucifixion.⁵ As we have seen this is a turn of thought essential to the

¹Cf. Schulz, op. cit., p. 96.

²Dodd, op. cit., p. 241.

³Ibid., p. 78.

⁴Ibid., p. 247.

⁵Thüsing, op. cit., p. 3.

whole Johannine position.¹ This comment of 12:33 is often said to be the work of a redactor. In verse 34, the multitude understands ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου to be referring to Jesus' death as indicated by their statement that, according to the Scripture such a death would be contradictory to Messianic expectations. In response to their question the implication is given that they are right in assuming that Jesus is referring to the death of the Son of man; but wrong in assuming it to be contrary to the Scripture. For the death of Jesus is the means to his eternal exaltation and glory. If this be true then the death must be of such a nature that ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου can be used in relation to it without straining the meaning. This can be done since crucifixion in a very literal sense is a lifting up to the cross. The verse 33 need not be assigned to a redactor since it adequately explains the implicit argument.² This points up the fact that the work of Jesus was inconsistent with current Jewish messianic presuppositions.³

¹Dodd, op. cit., p. 247. See Thüsing, op. cit., p. 3.

²Dodd, op. cit., p. 378.

³Barrett, op. cit., p. 357. Cf. Lightfoot, op. cit., p. 253.

11. John 13:31 -- ". . . Jesus said, 'Now is the Son of man glorified, and in him God is glorified.'" This is the moment of his glorification. Δοξαδοθήναι is again used with reference to Jesus' death.¹ The words of 13:31, "Now is the Son of man glorified, and in him God is glorified," come "with dramatic force"² as a climax to the rising expectations of glorification. As has been pointed out in the LXX of Isaiah 52:13 the two verbs to be exalted and to be glorified are used, side by side, of the servant of the Lord.³ The hour which has now struck is both the hour of Jesus' departure in death and the hour of his glory. In this perfect obedience God also is glorified.

The distinctive synoptic tradition of the Son of man is that he must suffer. John combines the suffering and the glorification (found outside the New Testament) of the Son of man bringing together into one composite whole experiences of suffering and glory which in Mark are chronologically distinguished.

The fact that there is no mention of the resurrection

¹See Thüsing, op. cit., p. 99, showing that death and exaltation are one.

²Dodd, op. cit., p. 396.

³Lightfoot, op. cit., p. 252.

in connection with the exaltation and glorification further supports the conclusions of Matthew Black already discussed above, that the most primitive form of the Son of man tradition limited its reference to the rejection and exaltation of the Son of man. Since the Johannine presentation is so limited and can be compared with the Choral of Philippians 2, probably the oldest piece of Aramaic tradition in the New Testament, John 12:32, 34 may well be the most ancient layer of the Son of man tradition.¹

Summary

The pre-existence of Jesus the Son of man is presented in the Gospel of John. This emphasis not found in the Synoptics suggests that in the actual proclamation of Jesus the pre-existence played a minor role. Jesus could have taken the pre-existence of the Son of man from Judaism, but that he did so is by no means certain. The interpretation of Jesus as being related to the pre-existence of the Son of man is a logical consequence of the presentation of the Son of man as the representative of God. It is apparent that the doctrine of the pre-existence of the Son of man has influenced the writer's

¹M. Black, op. cit., pp. 314-316.

presentation of Jesus' words in John 6:62.

Son of man as used by John is presented in such a way as to make it clear that his teaching was based on the messianic beliefs of the early church (John 1:51). John understands Jesus to have identified himself as the Son of man (John 8:28) and if the earliest stratum of the Son of man referred only to the humiliation and exaltation this verse could be very close to the words of Jesus.

Though numerous other names are used in John for the majesty of Jesus, Son of man is the term used in the main presentation of the kerygma concerning Jesus (John 3:13, 14; 6:62; 8:28; 12:23; 12:34; and 13:31, 32) and is therefore John's principal Christology.¹ When the title Son of man appears as in John 1:51; 3:14; 5:27 and 6:27 it is part of the old tradition of the original church. The saying concerning eating the flesh and drinking the blood of the Son of man (John 6:53) stems from the experience of the church in declaring its faith with the use of what is probably a pre-Johannine eucharistic discourse. In 9:35 John sets forth the work of Jesus. The influence of the early confession, "Jesus is Lord," is noted. This saying springs from a tradition still in flux.

¹Higgins, Jesus and the Son of Man, p. 155.

In the theology of John the use of ὑψοῦν (John 3:14, 8:28 and 12:32) carries a double implication that both the hour of death and the glorification are identical. Thus for the Johannine Gospel the reference is to a lifting up of Jesus to the throne of the cross. The point can be made that in John as in Philippians 2, probably the oldest Aramaic tradition in the New Testament, we have a very early tradition which expresses belief only in the rejection and exaltation of the Son of man with no mention of the resurrection (John 3:13f., 8:28, 12:32f., 12:34 and cf. 13:31). The two verbs, ὑψωθήναι and σοφροθήναι, are the same two used with reference to the Servant of the Lord in Isaiah 52:13. The fact that the mention of the resurrection is omitted indicates that this tradition, "The Son of man must be exalted" (John 3:13f.), may well be the earliest form of the Gospel tradition and an authentic word of Jesus. This view and the theory that originally some of the parousia sayings referred to the exaltation of the Son of man suggest that the eschatological role of the Son of man meant more than that of witness and that John 5:27 may be near the mind of Jesus in declaring that the Father has given him authority to execute judgment because he is (to be) the Son of man.

From our analysis of the Johannine presentation of the Son of man little additional information has been found to solve the problem of Jesus' relation to this title. Though our results are mostly negative we do see the important place the designation Son of man held in the early church. There is an absence of sayings about the earthly work of the Son of man walking in humility, and the suffering sayings point to the lifting up of the Son of man to the throne of the cross, which is at the same "hour" the self-sacrifice, the exaltation and the glorification.

Self-denial and Self-sacrifice in the
Life of Jesus as Presented in
the Gospel of John

Having examined the Son of man sayings in the Gospel of John, an analysis of verses related to self-denial and self-sacrifice in the life of Jesus is required.

1. John 1:29 -- "Behold, the Lamb of God, who takes away the sin of the world!" John 1:36 -- "Behold the Lamb of God!" We have here a title given to Christ which is peculiar to John. It is difficult to explain the origin of the term and its usage by the Evangelist. The language certainly reflects sacrificial thoughts.¹

¹Cf. John 17:19. A different word for lamb, ἀρνίον, appears as a synonym for Christ or the Messiah in the Apocalypse where two elements seem

The reference could hardly be to the daily Tamid offering for it was not considered expiatory.¹ The Lamb of God might be interpreted as the paschal lamb but the paschal offering was an ordinary sacrifice and like the daily offering was not expiatory.² The reference to no bones being broken in 19:36 may be an allusion to the paschal victim of Exodus 12:46 but may just as well be a citation from Psalm 34:20. The interpretation of the Lamb as the Servant of Deutero-Isaiah has much to commend it. Isaiah 53 is quoted elsewhere in John (12:38). The phrase "who takes away the sin of the world" is certainly comparable with the Servant of Isaiah 53 who "makes himself an offering for sin," and "bore the sin of many." The question is then whether the Lamb here refers to the Lamb of Isaiah 53:7 or not.

to be involved in the usage. On the one hand the lamb is a sacrifice (Revelation 5:6, 12; 7:14, et al.) for the redemption of man (Revelation 5:19) while on the other, the lamb is the shepherd (Revelation 7:17) or leader of the people fighting the enemies of God (Revelation 17:14 and 6:16). Dealing with this C. H. Dodd points out that the paradox found in associating the ideas of violence with the figure of a lamb is explained from Enoch 59 sqq. where the people of God are represented as a flock and its successive leaders as sheep, rams, or Bell-wethers. See C. H. Dodd, *op. cit.*, pp. 231, 232.

¹Exodus 29:38-46.

²Cf. G. Dalman, *Jesus-Jeshua*, p. 151, who points out that the paschal lambs offered at the Exodus had a redemptive effect upon the offerer.

It has been argued that ἀμνός is a mistranslation of ܐܡܢܘܢ the Aramaic equivalent of אֵיִשׁ, which was understood in the sense of the Hebrew אֵיִשׁ, meaning lamb. If this is so the Servant reference would be far clearer.¹

Another interpretation is offered by C. H. Dodd who points out that not only is ἀμνός peculiar to John in that it is not found in the synoptics, it is also strange to this writer apart from this passage. It is not clearly related to Johannine theology, and if at all, it is difficult to see how the term grew out of Johannine concepts. The conclusion is drawn that the title was taken from pre-Johannine tradition as an authentic saying of the Baptist.²

The ἀμνός of John 1:29, as well as the ἀρνίον of The Revelation, probably refers to the horned lamb, the young wether of the flock, as a messianic symbol. In 1:29 the coming of the Messiah is foretold as in Mark 1:4-15 and in John 1:41 Jesus is identified as the Chosen one. The Lamb is an apocalyptic

¹See C. F. Burney, The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1922), pp. 104-108.

²Dodd, Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel, pp. 269f.

figure for the Messiah and the Evangelist is offering the first in a series of testimonies concerning Jesus. The fact that Andrew hears John's statement (1:36) and then says to his brother Simon Peter, "We have found the Messiah," creates a context with good reason for interpreting the title as Messianic.

If the argument thus far be accepted then ὁ ἀίρων τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου does not refer to the removal of guilt as would be necessary if the lamb were a sin-offering, but instead indicates the abolishing of sin, meaning the Messiah "makes an end to sin."¹ There is every reason to accept this interpretation. Those opposing the theory of C. H. Dodd declare that the weakness of his position is in his explanation of "takes away the sin of the world" and his undervaluing of the paschal allusions.² C. K. Barrett recognising the value of the apocalyptic element comes to the conclusion that originally John the Baptist had in mind the apocalyptic figure, the Messianic Lamb. But the Evangelist saw the significance of the term in

¹Dodd, The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, pp. 236ff.

²C. K. Barrett, "The Lamb of God," New Testament Studies, I, 1954-1955, pp. 210f.

the paschal lamb with which the Suffering Servant had been fused through the influence of the Christian Eucharist.¹

Regardless of which interpretation is accepted we have here a title given Jesus which represents his giving himself to take away sin. However, the interpretation of the lamb as the bell wether would represent the early tradition.

2. John 2:19 -- "Jesus answered them, 'Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up.'"² This saying rests on a tradition different from that behind the Synoptics and represents an interpretation of the Evangelist.³ These words form the reply of Jesus to the demand of the Jews for an explanation of his authority, a sign to justify his action in cleansing the temple. Jesus is probably not speaking of a future event but suggests that the questioners see in his action which has already been performed, the sign they seek.⁴ The action

¹Barrett, op. cit., pp. 214-218.

²Cf. Mark 13:2; 14:58; and Matthew 26:61.

³Dodd, Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel, p. 91.

⁴Dodd, The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, pp. 300, 301. See Origen, Comm. in Joann, 10:24, p. 184 (in cleansing the temple) "I believe He wrought a deeper sign so that we understand that these things are a symbol that the service of that temple is no longer to be carried on by way of material sacrifices."

thus signifies the removal of the present sacrificial system and the replacement of the temple with a new one. But both the crowd and the disciples misunderstood by taking the saying quite literally. John then explains that it was only after the resurrection that the disciples understood.¹ It seems evident then that the sign of cleansing the temple is to be interpreted as signifying the replacement of the temple cult with a new religious order brought by Jesus.

3. John 3:14 -- "And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, so must the Son of man be lifted up." This passage may be related to the Suffering Servant of Deutero-Isaiah. The Septuagint uses ὕψωθήσεται (shall be exalted) in Isaiah 52:13. John 3:14² uses ὕψωθήναι δεῖ (must be lifted up). The context insinuates a relation to the ascension. The use of δεῖ emphasises the element of necessity. This then can be taken as an illustration of John's tendency to unite Jesus' death and exaltation.³ Υψοῦν

¹John 2:21, 22.

²Cf. John 8:28 and 12:32.

³Cf. Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, I, pp. 82 and 44f., who uses this relationship to explain Easter.

for the Fourth Gospel designates the "lifting up of Jesus on the throne of the cross,"¹ for whenever it appears in this gospel it carries a double reference to the lifting up on the cross and the glorification as one act. The reference to the fact that the Jews ("When you") will lift up Christ in John 8:28 shows that death was in mind. Likewise the explanation given in John 12:33 suggests death. This death, though, is spoken of as a glorifying.²

The related emphasis on δοξα, glory, is comparable with the Hebrew usage of תִּירוּת which meant the manifestation of God's being in such a way as to be accessible to human experience, a manifestation of splendour.³ Thus the death of Jesus is a glorification for the Father and the Son,⁴ a reciprocal action.

4. John 3:16 -- "For God so loved the world that he gave his only Son, that whosoever believes in him should not perish but have eternal life." These are probably the words of the Evangelist showing his belief that Jesus is

¹Thüsing, op. cit., p. 33. See treatment above on Son of man in John on John 3:13f.

²John 12:23, 28 and 17:1.

³See G. Kittel and G. von Rad, " Δόξα ," in T.W.z.N.T., II, pp. 239 and 240. Cf. Dodd, op. cit., p. 206.

⁴John 17:1, 4.

the gift of God's only Son. This verse is related to the Son who descends and ascends and the reason for this action is love. John 13 expands this concept of love. John 13:3 shows Jesus' recognition of having come from the Father and his expectation of returning to God, thus restoring his glory. Jesus is not only a gift from God but his self-giving is presented as being under his own control.¹

5. John 6:51-57 -- "I am the living bread which came down from heaven; if any one eats of this bread, he will live forever; and the bread which I shall give for the life of the world is my flesh . . . Unless you eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, you have no life in you; he who eats my flesh and drinks my blood has eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day. For my flesh is food indeed, and my blood is drink indeed . . . As the living Father sent me, and I live because of the Father, so he who eats me will live because of me."

The thoughts contained in these verses bring to mind the Last Supper and Mark's reference to Jesus' body and "blood of the covenant."² John omits the account of the

¹Cf. John 7:30; 8:20 and 13:1 referring to "his hour" and also 10:18, 12:33, 12:27 and 18:32; also John 15:13 where Jesus' action is proof of his love.

²Mark 14:22-24.

Last Supper. Perhaps the Evangelist consciously left out the narrative to prevent any disclosure of the sacred formula to the heathen;¹ but he is familiar with it.² The question arises as to why these words are placed after the feeding of the five thousand rather than as a part of the Supper reference in Chapter 13. C. K. Barrett considers it related to the narrative of the feeding of the five thousand, both meals anticipating the kingdom banquet. Jesus rather than simply creating and distributing the food, becomes the food.³ J. Jeremias says that the words do not belong in the present discourse but have come from a pre-Johannine eucharistic homily. If this be so, then John uses them here to interpret the teachings of Jesus. It is difficult to say just where the saying belongs but the words do have a relation historically to words of Jesus.

Jesus says that he is the bread and also declares that he gives the bread. Thus Jesus gives himself, his flesh and blood (6:51), and he gives them universally, for the world, in contrast to the simple expression of

¹Jeremias, op. cit., p. 73.

²Cf. John 13:1-20.

³C. K. Barrett, The Gospel According to St. John, p. 236.

Luke 22:19 in which he gives his body "for you." The meaning is that by participation in the body and blood of Christ as in the Eucharist, "the believer obtains 'eternal life,' in the Johannine sense of the term (cf. 6:54), and mystical fellowship with Christ¹ or mutual indwelling

(cf. 6:56). Though δοῦναι τῆν
ψυχὴν is commonly used for the idea of voluntary death, δοῦναι τὴν σὰρκα certainly points to more than a figurative death.² Jesus then gives himself, willingly, ὑπὲρ τῆς
τοῦ κόσμου ἡμῶν.

6. John 10:11 -- "I am the good shepherd. The good shepherd lays down his life for the sheep." Several Old Testament Scriptures can claim to influence this verse and the whole section on the shepherd. The words τὴν
ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ τίθησκει
ὑπὲρ (John 10:11, also cf. verses 15, 17, 18) remind us of the Hebrew of Isaiah 53:10, "when he makes himself an offering for sin."³ In John ὑπὲρ

¹v. Taylor, Jesus and His Sacrifice, p. 236.

²See F. Büchsel, " Δίδωμι ," T.W.z.N.T., II, p. 168, and cf. Dodd, op. cit., p. 339. Cf. Kümmel, op. cit., p. 120.

³Zimmerli and Jeremias, The Servant of God, p. 92, cf. 95n.

usually is related to death.¹ C. H. Dodd says the resemblance between Ezekiel 34 and John 10:1-18 is far reaching.² In Ezekiel God sets over the sheep one shepherd, David, to replace the deposed evil shepherds. In John, Jesus, the Messiah of David's line, becomes the one good shepherd who replaces the hireling Pharisees. The picture in John includes ideas which go beyond those of Ezekiel for the shepherd brings life. This shepherd goes forth and lays down his life for his sheep. This "provides the evangelist with the clearest and most explicit statement he has yet permitted himself upon the Passion of Christ as a voluntary . . . self-sacrifice."³ Thus the gift of life eternal of John 3 is to be related to Jesus' giving of himself. At the cost of his own life others receive life.

The shepherd, already a symbol of the redeemer in the Ancient East,⁴ is used to express allegorically the purpose of Jesus' death. He lays it down for others

¹C. K. Barrett, The Gospel According to St. John, p. 311. Cf. John 6:51; 10:15; 11:50ff.; 18:14 and cf. 17:19.

²C. H. Dodd, The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, pp. 358f.

³C. H. Dodd, op. cit., p. 360.

⁴Jeremias, The Parables of Jesus, p. 97.

(John 10:11 and 15), even those not of his fold (John 10:16), he does so willingly with the whole matter under his control (John 10:18); he lays down his life that he might take it again (John 10:17, 18). The fact that "no one takes it from me, but I lay it down of my own accord," emphasises the distinction between the suffering of Jeremiah, for example, and that of the Servant of Yahweh.¹ It is, however, important to notice, alongside 10:18, that John is quite realistic about the human agents -- Judas, the arrest, the trial, the crucifixion.

7. John 12:20-36 -- (23) "And Jesus answered them, 'The hour has come for the Son of man to be glorified. (24) Truly, truly, I say to you, unless a grain of wheat falls into the earth and dies, it remains alone; but if it dies, it bears much fruit.'" (27) "And what shall I say, 'Father save me from this hour?' No, for this purpose I have come to this hour." (28) "Father, glorify thy name. Then a voice came from heaven, 'I have glorified it, and I will glorify it again.'" (31) "Now is the judgment of this world, now shall the ruler of this world be cast out; (32) and I, when I am lifted up from the earth, will draw

¹Oscar Cullmann, The Christology of the New Testament, p. 70, says that this should perhaps be taken with 5:8 making men like Judas the Galilean or the Teacher of Righteousness of Qumran the "thieves and robbers."

all men to myself." (35) "He said this to show by what death he was to die."

The thought in the background of these words is life through death. At this point John's readers are aware of the glory of Jesus and the fact that it is bound up with the glory of God and not self-seeking. The metaphor about the grain of wheat dying to bear fruit makes it clear that the glory of the Son of man involves self-renunciation. Life is to be lost if life is to be gained (John 12:25). This is the keynote of the discourse. It is in conquering death by laying down his life in self-sacrifice that Jesus both glorifies¹ God and receives the glory which comes from God.

In understanding the "hour" it is well to keep in mind the thought of John 10:18 where John stresses Jesus' free will, his voluntary activity, but at the same time points out that it is the Father who sets the hour and to be in harmony with his Father, Jesus must comply with the Father's will.² The unity of the Father and Jesus with regard to the "hour" is shown also in John 5:19 where the

¹See G. Kittel and G. von Rad, "Δόξα," in T.W.z.N.T., II, p. 239.

²Thüsing, Die Erhöhung und Verherrlichung Jesu im Johannesevangelium, p. 276.

Son can only do what he sees the Father do. Because of this complete dependence of the Son on the Father, "the work of the Father becomes the work of Jesus,"¹ and the Father's hour becomes Jesus' hour. The hour expresses the essence or climax of Jesus' work. He becomes one with the Father.²

The hour is the moment of crisis in the relationship between Jesus and the world of men as compared with 13:31 where it is the relationship of Jesus to the disciples and 17:1, the relationship between Jesus and the Father. Nevertheless, it is the same hour in each relationship.³

In John 12:27, the word now makes reference to the entire passion and is not limited to the moment. The word "trouble" implies a continuous feeling present throughout the passion. The use of τεταραχται points to the source of the trouble, some external force. The reference evidently is being made to the fact that the suffering comes through the will of the Father.⁴ If there is a specific moment for the "hour" or "now" it takes place

¹Thüsing, op. cit., pp. 88f.

²Ibid., p. 99.

³Dodd, op. cit., p. 417.

⁴Thüsing, op. cit., p. 78.

when Jesus dedicates himself to death in love for man.¹ For John this is the final manifestation of glory. At John 12:23 the reader can see that there is really no self-glory but the glory of Jesus is the glory of God. The glory involves self-renunciation, a renunciation made clear in the seed metaphor.

The prayer (John 12:28) is an act in which Jesus devotes himself to the will of God, an acceptance of God's appointment. Thus in John's presentation the death of Jesus is seen as the great work toward which his whole life has been directed. The passage, it must be noted, has resemblances to the narratives of Gethsemane in the Synoptics as well as to the thought of Hebrews 5:7-9. Jesus' death and exaltation become the judgment of the world (John 12:31) bringing about a universal gathering (John 12:32). The association of ὑψωθῆναι with σοδοθῆναι may go back to Isaiah 52:13 (LXX); but the use of these two words is peculiarly Johannine in uniting the death and exaltation in such a way that the lifting up "to the throne of the cross" is

¹Dodd, op. cit., p. 207. See John 12:23-28; 13:31; and 17:5.

also the glorification.¹ The Servant of the Lord is to be exalted and glorified in consequence of his passion and death.²

8. John 13:3-17 -- (5) "Then he poured water into a basin, and began to wash the disciples' feet, and to wipe them with the towel with which he was girded." (14) "If I then, your Lord and Teacher, have washed your feet, you also ought to wash one another's feet." Some scholars believe this section, because of a number of Semitisms and other reasons, represents a very early tradition which John used.³ The humble service of Jesus is brought out in the narrative of foot-washing. When Jesus stood to serve he girded himself with a towel only, as a servant, and washed the feet of his disciples (John 13:4). The washing of a master's feet was not required of Jewish slaves, but was required of others. Jesus takes the very lowest place of service. He as master and teacher does for them what is not even required of a disciple. The natural

¹See Thüsing, *op. cit.*, pp. 33ff. See above on Son of man in John on John 3:13f.

²See Dodd, *op. cit.*, p. 375.

³J. Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, p. 70; Cf. Barrett, *op. cit.*, p. 363, and R. Bultmann, *Das Evangelium des Johannes* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1941), pp. 351 sq.

relationship is reversed in this unnecessary act of humility. In this striking act he clarifies the character and greatness of his office. Jesus washes their feet as an example of love that "stooped to serve." The self-humiliation of Jesus can "be seen in its full depth only when it is realised that the Messiah serves at the Messiah's table."¹ This illustrates the strong sense of security the disciples must have felt in the hands of Jesus.²

Thus according to the rule of discipleship, the disciple is to act as the master who charged him to act has acted.³ This symbol of service was a reminder that service which renounced one's own rights for the sake of others, was the essential element in his life work. The motive was absolute devotion to others. Jesus was willing to renounce even life itself, the highest earthly good. He twice explains the meaning of his action; once in 13:6-11 and again in 13:12-20.

9. John 18:11 -- "Jesus said to Peter, 'Put your sword into its sheath; shall I not drink the cup which the

¹Jeremias, op. cit., p. 127.

²Jeremias, The Parables of Jesus, p. 148.

³Karl Heinrich Rengstorf, " Δοῦδος ," T.W.z.N.T., II, p. 281.

Father has given me?"¹ John's theology shows a double implication here for the will of God brings suffering on Jesus but as can be noticed in John 10:18 Jesus accepts it of his free will. The reference to the cup is related to the suffering. There is a basic difference between the Synoptics and John with regard to the cup. John turns Jesus' inward struggle into a declaration. The synoptic writers combine the cup with a necessary baptism. For them the cup carries the meaning of the wrath of God and Jesus vicariously takes the wrath upon himself for all. John emphasises the will of the Father. When compared with John 18:11 the synoptic parallels omit "the Father." The fact that John includes this "Father" reference makes the understanding of John 4:34 clearer. The idea of the cup is common to the total tradition; and therefore, "the picture of the cup is taken from the tradition and probably contains some of the elements of the wrath of the cup."²

10. John 19:28-30 -- (28) "After this Jesus, knowing that all was now finished, said (to fulfil the scripture), 'I thirst.'" (30)"When Jesus had received the vinegar, he said, 'It is finished;' and he bowed his

¹Cf. Mark 10:38 and 14:36. Cf. also Luke 12:50.

²Thüsing, op. cit., p. 82.

head and gave up his spirit." The dying words of Jesus recorded here differ from those of Luke 23:46.¹ This can be explained by the fact that Luke emphasizes the personal relationship of Jesus to the Father while John emphasizes the work; and particularly so at the moment of death.² The moment of Jesus' death is a special climax for the author of John. The verb τετέλεσται seems to be lifted out of its association in verse 28 and placed in verse 30. The reference in verse 28 to Jesus' knowledge of what was taking place points up the importance of what takes place in verse 30. This supports the opinion that the statement in verse 28 was expressed by John while Luke 23:46 presents the original. The conclusion is drawn that the death of Jesus is meant as the completion of the Gospel.³

Summary

With regard to the Johannine witness of Jesus' self-denial and self-sacrifice certain remarks are appropriate. The Evangelist seems in most instances to be writing independently of the Synoptic Gospels. The Fourth

¹Mark 15:37 (Matthew 27:50) reports a loud cry.

²Thüsing, op. cit., p. 69.

³Ibid., p. 64.

Gospel is highly theological and contains much material which is the original creation of the author. There is evidence that it follows a tradition that goes back to a period before the New Testament writings. That tradition contains the witness of John the Baptist to Jesus being the Messiah, one who would bring sin to an end. The words on the living bread from heaven to be eaten seem to have been used by the writer to interpret the teachings of Jesus, but they have a relation historically to Jesus' words.

The Evangelist himself declares that God gives Jesus for the world, and later uses the good shepherd narrative to present the passion of Jesus as a voluntary self-sacrifice. References to the "hour," the unity of the Father and Son, and the oneness of humiliation, exaltation and glorification are characteristic of the theology of the Fourth Evangelist.

John is probably indebted to a very early tradition in his picture of Jesus humbly washing the feet of the disciples as an example of self-renunciation. In using the cup reference with regard to Jesus' suffering, the Evangelist was simply using a tradition common to the whole. Jesus giving his life in self-denial and self-sacrifice is so important to the writer that he removes "It is

finished" from its original place that it may express with finality that the death of Jesus is the completion of the Gospel.

Self-denial and Self-sacrifice in the
Teaching of Jesus as Presented in
in the Gospel of John

The fourth Gospel does not contain sayings fully comparable to those of the Synoptics that call for self-denial and self-sacrifice from Jesus' disciples. It rather speaks of parallel sufferings which the disciples are expected to undergo.¹ This demand for cross-bearing is often overlooked and fails to get the attention it deserves.²

The demands made of Jesus' disciples first appear in John 1:35-51. Not only is the disciple to break ties with family and possessions, but also with other persons from whom a salvation type help might come, John the Baptist, for example.³ Concerning John 21:18-22, it should be explained that following Jesus begins immediately after Jesus calls the individual and from then on includes the

¹V. Taylor, Jesus and His Sacrifice (1959), p. 269.

²Thüsing, op. cit., p. 129.

³See E. Schweizer, Lordship and Discipleship, p. 81, who points out that the Gospel is opposed to any suggestion of a Messianic John the Baptist.

whole life of the individual experienced in the walking behind the Master. But after Easter, following Jesus becomes an expression to describe a life surrendered completely to the will of Jesus.¹ The change is expressed in John 13:36ff. where the indication is that the disciple will no longer limit himself to the earthly following of Jesus but, having reached his earthly goal, is "allowed to ascend to the Father like His Master."²

An analysis of appropriate verses will help clarify the Johannine presentation of Jesus' teaching.

1. John 12:25, 26 -- "He who loves his life loses it, and he who hates his life in this world will keep it for eternal life. (26) If anyone serves me, he must follow me; and where I am there shall my servant be also; if anyone serve me, the Father will honour him."³ There are three general forms in which the saying takes shape in the Synoptic Gospels:⁴

¹E. Schweizer, op. cit., p. 83.

²Ibid., p. 85.

³Sayings similar to this are found in Mark 8:35; Luke 9:24, 17:33; Matthew 10:39, and 16:25.

⁴See C. H. Dodd, "Some Johannine 'Herrnworte' with Parallels in the Synoptic Gospels," New Testament Studies, Volume 2, 1955-56, pp. 78-81, to whom I am indebted for the analysis which follows. See also Dodd, Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel, pp. 338-343.

- I. "For whoever would save his life will lose it; and whoever loses his life for my sake and the Gospel's will save it." Mark 8:35. See Luke 9:24.
- II. "For whoever would save his life will lose it, and whoever loses his life for my sake will find it." Matthew 16:25. This form is characteristically Matthean.
- III. "Whoever seeks to gain his life will lose it, but whoever loses his life will preserve it." Luke 17:33. This form is characteristically Lucan and completely independent of the other Lucan form, 9:24, which contains the ΕΥΕΚΕΝ clause.

Quite obviously all forms contain antithetical parallelism. Form III of Luke 17:33 is the least disturbed by added comments. It is noticeable that the two qualifying clauses of I and II "whoever would save his life" and "whoever loses his life," are different in John where appear "He who loves his life" and "he who hates his life" with added phrases explaining that the loss of life is a loss "in this world" and that the gain is for "eternal life." If these explanatory remarks of John be omitted there appears a general antithetical parallelism similar to Luke 17:33.¹ But the use of the different contrasting words, "love and hate," in the qualifying

¹Julius Schniewind, "Das Evangelium nach Markus," Das Neue Testament Deutsch, I, p. 85.

clauses is significant, for it expresses a voluntary choice not found in the second qualifying clause of the synoptic versions. The use there is simply "to lose" in either the future indicative or aorist subjunctive.¹

The appearance of the "love-hate" terminology is of further significance when it is recognized that it has usage in the Old Testament² as well as a Synoptic tradition distinct from the Johannine one.³ In the presentation then of John 12:25 only the two phrases, "in this world" and "for eternal life," are editorial. But even these phrases bear marks of early ideas, both Jewish and primitive Christian, which speak about two types of life, a distinction not characteristic of the fourth Gospel.⁴

The conclusion is drawn that the simple couplet of the words of John 12:25 may well be nearer the common original than the synoptic ones.

The "losing" and "keeping" of life are placed in

¹Note that the element of choice is indicated in the ΕΥΕΚΕΝ clause of Mark 8:35 and Luke 9:24, Matthew 10:39 and 16:25, but this usage is an insertion.

²See Deuteronomy 21:15, Malachi 1:2f. and Psalm 45:7.

³See treatment of Luke 14:26 (Parallel: Matthew 10:37) in Chapter V of this thesis. See also A. Fridrichsen, "Alska, hata, förneka (försaka)," pp. 153ff.

⁴Schniewind, op. cit., p. 85.

this context in a juxtaposition without the thought of martyrdom.¹ Jesus does not mean the separation of soul and body in the "losing of life" reference, but indicates that love to the point of self-denial because of self-surrender leads toward exaltation. The death and glorification pictured of Jesus in the grain of wheat of verse 24 is applied to the followers in verses 25f. The idea is that Jesus and those who want to follow him live under the same law. To follow him demands going through death. Jesus tells the Greeks who have come that they cannot get to know him just by seeking him philosophically; but to know him, he must be followed.²

The expressions of John 12:26, a variant of Mark 8:34,³ appear in conjunction with verse 25 so that the words of verse 25 which would primarily refer to Jesus quite naturally have now been applied to the disciples as well. It is almost difficult to say whether phrases of verse 25 refer to Jesus or to the disciples. "Being where he is" is offered to his followers. This shows the personal closeness of the disciples with Jesus up to the

¹Schniewind, op. cit., p. 85.

²Käsemann, op. cit., p. 256.

³Parallel: Matthew 10:38. Cf. Matthew 10:24 and Luke 6:40 and their treatment in Chapter V above.

glorification. And then with the phrase, "the Father will honour him," the exalted Jesus "draws his followers not only to the cross but through the cross to his completed unity with the Father."¹ The following is based on obedience, indicated by the use of the imperative, ἄκολουθετε.

The meaning set forth in the Synoptic Gospels is that if anyone wants to serve Jesus, the only way to accomplish that purpose is to follow him.² But the "following" includes more than simply walking behind one's Master step by step; it points to a relationship after death.³ The words are addressed to the Christian community in its call to suffering but the thought reaches back to Jesus' preaching.

2. John 13:14f. -- "If I then, your Lord and Teacher, have washed your feet, you also ought to wash one another's feet. (15) For I have given you an example that you also should do as I have done to you." The Gospel of John does not seem to be dependent upon the synoptics for the tradition behind the general context of

¹Thüsing, op. cit., p. 256.

²Dodd, Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel, pp. 352f.

³Schweizer, op. cit., p. 87.

these verses.¹ The sequence is similar to that of the Synoptics but is not characteristically Johannine. This general passage may be considered a part of the very primitive tradition, comparable to that of Philipians 2:1-11. Rather than creating the narrative the Evangelist simply found it in the tradition and used it with the theological applications he desired.

The words that are spoken by Jesus do not carry the weight of the lesson; rather, it is his action which offers an example of humility and service.² The time when the act takes place makes this meaning even more significant, for Jesus is fully aware of his destiny. In verse 14 footwashing becomes the standard for the Apostles and the followers. In the Orient this would indicate love, for it was a slave's task³ to wash feet just as crucifixion was a slave's death. Jesus' reply to Peter's refusal meant that it was not until he had accepted Jesus' service of love was he capable of brotherly love. The disciple is called to do the same slave service as his master.⁴

¹Dodd, op. cit., pp. 337 and 388. See treatment above of John 13:3-17.

²Ibid., p. 390.

³Strack-Billerbeck, op. cit., II, p. 557.

⁴Thüsing, The Theology of the Fourth Gospel,

3. John 13:16 -- "Truly, truly, I say to you, a servant is not greater than his Master; nor is he who is sent greater than he who sent him." There are similar sayings in the Synoptics. Matthew 10:24f. reads "A disciple is not above his teacher, nor a servant above his Master. It is enough for the disciple to be like his teacher and the servant like his master." Luke 6:40 states, "A disciple is not above his teacher, but everyone when he is fully taught will be like his teacher." Again the question as to whether John is dependent upon the Synoptics is asked. Only the longer form of Matthew has anything in common with John and could be considered as a Johannine source. But every consideration should be given to the possibility that variant forms of the saying existed orally, that in a very early stage of the tradition the differences in parallelism were established, and that a simpler form of the oral tradition was taken up by Luke.¹ If this explanation can be accepted, it supports the idea that the writer was not dependent on the synoptics

p. 132. See also E. Schweizer, *op. cit.*, p. 99, who points out that "the shallow rationalist interpretation that the way of Jesus is simply the example to be imitated has never had any decisive influence on the Church's preaching."

¹Dodd, "Some Johannine 'Herrnworte' with Parallels in the Synoptic Gospels," pp. 75-78, gives valid arguments for this position.

but transmitted common oral tradition independently.

The saying appears in John 15:20a in the words, "remember the word that I said to you, 'A Servant is not greater than his master.'" Suffering is a sign of service to be expected since the Master himself suffered. The meaning is clear that as Jesus set the example the disciples must willingly deny themselves and serve. It implies that if Jesus, the Master, suffers, the disciples should expect no less.

4. John 15:19 and 20b -- "If you were of the world, the world would love its own; but because you are not of the world, but I chose you out of the world, therefore the world hates you," (20b) "If they persecuted me, they will persecute you. . . ." The disciple is to expect hatred and persecution from the world and to accept it willingly. Such persecution is a form of communion with Jesus since he too is hated by the world.¹ They are to go the way that he himself has gone before them. It is this Gospel that sets forth so clearly the paradox that in humble obedience the exaltation and glorification take place. "It is in the midst of the world that freedom from the world becomes

¹See Dodd, The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, p. 413.

a reality in obedience."¹ The love-hate terminology appearing here is characteristic of John; that is, it appears in the Fourth Gospel more frequently than in the synoptics. The warning is that the disciple cannot expect an easier lot than his Master.

5. John 16:2 -- "They will put you out of the synagogues: indeed, the hour is coming when whoever kills you will think he is offering service to God." Like the section above on John 15:20, this is a part of Jesus' warnings of persecution. The phrase "the hour is coming" sounds characteristic of John when compared with other "hour" sayings.² John agrees with Mark rather than Matthew in placing the warning just before the passion.³ The reflection of the church may be indicated by the reference to mistaken piety, but the prediction of martyrdom is deeply grounded in the tradition.⁴ The exclusion from synagogues seems to be clearly Johannine;⁵ but even John

¹Schweizer, op. cit., p. 110.

²Thüsing, op. cit., p. 78, and Dodd, Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel, p. 371.

³See Mark 13:9-13, Matthew 5:11-12 and Matthew 10:17-25.

⁴Dodd, op. cit., p. 209. Cf. Luke 21:16, 12:14, and Matthew 10:28.

⁵See, however, Luke 6:22.

felt the danger to be present before the death of Jesus.¹ We cannot be sure whether or not this part of the saying is the result of the community.

6. John 16:33 -- "I have said this to you, that in me you may have peace. In the world you have tribulation; but be of good cheer, I have overcome the world."² This bears strong marks of having been influenced by the early church.³ It is the risen Lord who speaks, "I have overcome the world."

Summary

In comparing the Johannine sayings of Jesus' calling for self-denial and self-sacrifice on the part of his disciples with those of the Synoptic writers we find the former to be much less extensive. The Gospel of John emphasises the parallel sufferings which the disciples are to undergo. Some of the sayings may well present a tradition nearer the common original than those of the Synoptics. This seems particularly true of John 12:25, where to hate one's life is to keep it, and John 13:16 where a servant is not

¹John 9:22, 34, and 12:42. See Dodd, op. cit., p. 410.

²Cf. Mark 13:13.

³See Schweizer, op. cit., p. 101.

greater than his Master.

The predictions of suffering for the followers are taken by John from the common early tradition and presented in the light of his theological interests.¹ Such persecutions form a communion of the disciples with Jesus for he too is hated. Humble obedience leading to suffering as the beginning point of the exaltation and glorification, is peculiarly Johannine as is the prophecy that the followers will be excluded from the synagogues. The Gospel indicates that self-denial and self-sacrifice formed a principal facet of Jesus' teaching.

¹Dodd, op. cit., p. 409.

SUMMARY OF THE RESEARCH

The underlying purpose of sacrifice in the Old Testament was the offering of life to God. In accomplishing this purpose of releasing life, sacrifice came to have three general aspects: gift, communion and expiation. The forms which the different sacrifices took upon themselves were the varied expressions of certain principles of substitution, representation, commutation of sacrifice, human sacrifice, and the practice of vowing persons to Yahweh. These principles were influential in creating the form in which the offering of one's self to God was to be expressed in succeeding generations.

Expressions of self-denial and self-sacrifice appear in the lives of early patriarchs but with the prophetic denunciation of improper sacrificial activity came a spiritualising of sacrificial terminology alongside the continued offering of material sacrifice. Thus language indicating concepts of self-sacrifice appears to a great extent in the Psalms; but the highest expression of self-sacrifice is found in the character of the Suffering Servant of Deutero-Isaiah. The servant terminology and the

obedience involved, both based on the social codes of the day, take on special meaning for the concepts of self-denial and self-sacrifice.

The historical situation created by the Exile led to a spiritualising of the sacrificial system so that charity and good works were understood to atone for sins as well as did material sacrifice. In the Extra-canonical writings the individual who presented an acceptable sacrifice to Yahweh was understood to be making an offering of his own soul. The sacrifice of the wicked was of no avail. The lives of the Maccabean martyrs, freely given in death, were considered as "burnt-offerings" for the sins of the nation.

The Qumran discoveries throw light on the sacrificial cult of the Old Testament and on possible contacts with the concepts of self-denial and self-sacrifice as practised and taught by Jesus. They enable us to trace the gradual crystallisation of the concept of "spiritual sacrifice" among Jews before the time of Jesus.

The points of interest include the comparison of the self-renouncing mission of the community with the invitation of Jesus to take his yoke (the new Torah); the emphasis on sanctification through suffering; and the actual statement that everything that was to be done by a Covenanter

should be acceptable as a free-will offering.

Certain attitudes and concepts with regard to self-denial and self-sacrifice in the life and teaching of Jesus bear the influence of Rabbinic Judaism. These include the yoke of Christ, obedience to death, the doctrine of merit, renunciation, finding greatness in service, humility and the losing of one's life to find it. Not least among these concepts was the image of redemption. The rabbis were familiar with the idea of losing one's life voluntarily or otherwise for the sake of others. The thought of death as atonement was quite common.

In his attitude toward sacrifice, Jesus was conscious of the real value of the cultus but was quite aware of its limitations. He supported the temple and its sacrifices by identifying himself with the Jews, by paying the tax to support sacrificial practices, by encouraging others to support the sacrificial system, by participating in the passover, by expressing his belief in the sanctity of the altar and by adding the term "blood" to the new covenant of Jeremiah's proclamation.

In his challenge of many of the presuppositions of the Temple cultus Jesus showed the "provisional and at the same time necessary value" of the sacrifices. It is not clearly stated that Jesus offered sacrifices nor that he

attacked sacrificial practices. It seems he assumed a position of "detachment with acquiescence" in regard to the cult. He interpreted his self-sacrifice as fulfilling the Old Testament sacrifice. Actually the cultus is best interpreted as an "imperfect expression of a principle which is completely manifested in his sacrifice."

Our study has brought to light the sacrificial character of Jesus' self-offering. The unifying element in Jesus' thoughts concerning his self-sacrifice is the principle implicit in the Old Testament sacrifices. Jesus sees his work defined in the Suffering Servant. The obedience of Jesus is shown in his willing acceptance of the will of God for his life and death. The character of the Last Supper emphasises the covenantal and sacrificial nature of Jesus' self-offering. The disciples symbolically take part in the surrendered life of Christ. The sacrificial significance of Jesus' self-giving is well attested. The work of Jesus is one of expiation and redemption.

A distinction has been made between the Jesus of history and the kerygma of the church with regard to the Son of man sayings. From this analysis the conclusion can be drawn that Jesus foresaw his passion, and the suffering Son of man sayings represent authentic words of Jesus.

That is to say that Jesus deliberately participates in his passion.

Jesus understood himself to be fulfilling in his person the mission and destiny of Israel which would be expressed in humiliation and exaltation. The study shows also that the sayings concerning Jesus' present work and those concerning the parousia bear general authenticity.

By using the terms Servant of the Lord and Son of man, both of which had been applied to Israel, Jesus could show his disciples without making a direct claim that the pattern for his obedience to the will of God was in line with these designations. The obedience of the Servant becomes the prerequisite for being the Son of man. Thus as the Son of man "to be" Jesus sees suffering and rejection not as a catastrophe but as necessary self-denial and self-sacrifice by which the exaltation can take place.

Jesus united in his mind the three different usages of the term Son of man and employs the title in clarifying his intention of fulfilling his work of self-denial and self-sacrifice.

Jesus' ethical teaching of renunciation and self-sacrifice demanded that the disciples understand their personal welfare to be subservient to the work of the

kingdom. His specific call stressed self-denial and cross-bearing. Of the former, Jesus' use refers to unreserved surrender of one's person rather than self-discipline or asceticism. Of the latter Jesus' use refers to external circumstances. He taught that one preserved and secured his life by losing it for the sake of Christ. He taught that greatness and exaltation came through service, humility and suffering. All of this has come to be included in the term self-sacrifice.

The Gospel of John claims to be a Gospel even though by its nature and intent it stands distinct from the Synoptic Gospels. It has therefore received separate treatment.

In the fourth Gospel Jesus using the title Son of man with reference to himself exercises judging and saving functions, characteristic of the coming Son of man according to the Synoptics, before his death and exaltation. There is evidence that special Son of man words may be quite reliable for presenting the mind of Jesus. This is particularly true of John 3:14, 8:28, 12:32 and 12:34 which express belief in only the rejection and exaltation of Jesus. For the writer of John the lifting up to the cross in humiliation is at the same "hour" the exaltation and glorification.

With regard to self-denial and self-sacrifice in the life of Jesus according to the presentation of the fourth Gospel, the author of the Gospel seems to be writing independently of the Synoptic Gospels but following a tradition which may well go back to a period before the New Testament writings. This tradition includes the witness of John the Baptist to Jesus' Messiahship. Words concerning the bread of life are used by the writer for theological interpretation but they have a relation historically to words of Jesus.

The Evangelist editorially declares that God gives Jesus for the world, and uses the good shepherd narrative to present the passion of Jesus as a voluntary self-sacrifice. The author is probably indebted to a very early tradition in picturing Jesus washing the feet of the disciples and to a tradition common to the whole for the cup analogy.

Jesus giving his life in self-denial and self-sacrifice is so important to the writer that he removes "It is finished" from its original place that it may express with finality that the death of Jesus is the completion of the Gospel.

In comparing the Johannine sayings of Jesus' calling for self-denial and self-sacrifice on the part of his

disciples with those of the Synoptic writers, the former are much less extensive. The fourth Gospel emphasises the parallel sufferings which the disciples are to undergo. Some of the sayings may well present a tradition nearer the common original than those of the Synoptics. This seems particularly true of John 12:25, where to hate one's life is to keep it, and John 13:16 where a servant is not greater than his Master.

The predictions of suffering for the followers are taken by John from the common early tradition and presented in the light of his theological interests. Such persecutions form a communion of the disciples with Jesus for he too is hated. Humble obedience leading to suffering as the beginning point of the exaltation and glorification, is peculiarly Johannine as is the prophecy that the followers will be excluded from the synagogues. The Gospel indicates that self-denial and self-sacrifice formed a principal facet of Jesus' teaching.

CONCLUSION

This research leads to the conclusion that the understanding of Jesus as to the basis for his life, his teaching, his relation to others and to God, and his willing acceptance of death are identical in each case for they stem from the conviction that the whole of his existence was to be one of self-denial and self-sacrifice. These ideas of self-denial and self-sacrifice were not original with Jesus, but he clearly gave them a unique prominence.

Our analysis of the actual content and meaning of self-denial and self-sacrifice has led to the conclusion that the two terms as expressions of the life and teaching of Jesus are essentially identical and the term self-surrender or self-renunciation, connoting personal sacrifice for a higher end, could be substituted for them.

There is virtually unanimous agreement that self-denial and self-sacrifice are central in the life of Jesus and central in his demands of his followers. These characteristics are not ends in themselves but central in his

re-interpretation and revision of traditional Judaism as a means of offering the kingdom of God to all. This conclusion is not dependent on any particular interpretation of Jesus' identification such as the Son of man or the Servant of the Lord.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Works of Reference

- Abrahams, Israel (ed.). S. Singer's Authorized Daily Prayer Book. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, Ltd., 1912.
- Bauer, Walter. Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur. Berlin: Verlag Alfred Topelmann, 1952. [Fifth edn., 1963] Also the English translation and revision, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, by W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1959.
- Brown, Driver and Briggs. A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1906.
- Charles, R. H. The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English, I, II. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1913.
- Colson, F. H. Philo. The Loeb Classical Library. London: William Heinemann, 1941.
- Emmet, C. W. (ed.). The Third and Fourth Books of Maccabees. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1918.
- Freedman, H. and Simon, Maurice. Midrash Rabbah. London: Socino Press, 1939.
- Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar. Edited by G. W. Collins and A. E. Cowley. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1898.

Hastings, James. A Dictionary of the Bible. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1904.

Hastings, James. Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1907.

H Kaivy Διαθήκη. London: The British and Foreign Bible Society, 1958.

The Holy Bible. Revised Standard Version. New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1952.

The Interpreter's Bible, VII, VIII. New York: Abingdon Cokesbury Press, 1954.

Jackson, Foakes and Lake, Kirsopp. The Beginnings of Christianity, I-V. London: Macmillan Co., 1920.

Kittel, Gerhard, and Friedrich, G. Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, I-VI. Stuttgart: Verlag von Kohlhammer, 1933ff.

Koehler, Ludwig and Baumgartner, Walter. Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1953.

The Mishnah. Edited by Herbert Danby. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1933.

Montefiore, C. G. A Rabbinic Anthology. London: Macmillan and Company, 1938.

Moore, George Foot. Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era, I, II. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927.

Moulton, J. H. and Milligan, G. The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1949.

Septuaginta. Edited by A. Rahlfs. ^αPrivilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1935 and subsequent parts.

Shorey, Paul. Plato the Republic. The Loeb Classical Library. London: William Heinemann, 1930.

Singer, J. The Jewish Encyclopedia. London: Funk and Wagnalls Co., 1901.

Strack, Herman L., and Billerbeck, Paul. Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch, I-IV. München: Oscar Beck, 1922-1928.

Von Allman, J. J. Vocabulary of the Bible. London: Lutterworth Press, 1958.

Articles and Periodicals

Albright, A. F. "Recent Discoveries in Palestine and the Gospel of St. John," The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology. W. D. Davies and D. Daube, Editors. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1956.

Arvedson, Thomas. "Bakgrunden til Matthew 10:37-39 et parr," Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok, V, 1940.

Barrett, C. K. "The Background of Mark 10:45," New Testament Essays. A. J. B. Higgins, Editor. Manchester: University Press, 1959.

Barrett, C. K. "The Lamb of God," New Testament Studies, I, 1954-55.

Baumgarten, J. M. "Sacrifice and Worship Among the Jewish Sectarians of the Dead Sea (Qumran) Scrolls," The Harvard Theological Review, XLVI, No. 3, July 1953.

Black, M. "The Son of Man Problem," Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, 45, 1962-1963.

Brownlee, W. H. "Messianic Motifs of Qumran and the New Testament," New Testament Studies, III, 1956-57.

Conzelmann, H. "Jesus Christus," Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart³, III, 1958.

Coppens, Joseph and Dequeker, Luc. "Le Fils de l'homme et les Saints du Très-Haut en Daniel, VII, dans les Apocryphes et dans le Nouveau Testament," Analecta Lovaniensia Biblica et Orientalia, Ser. III, Fasc. 23, 1961.

- Davies, W. D. "Knowledge in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Matthew 11:25-30," The Harvard Theological Review, XLVI, 3, July 1953.
- Dinkler, Erich. "Jesu Wort vom Kreuztragen," Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann. Berlin: Alfred Topelmann, 1954.
- Dodd, C. H. "Some Johannine 'Herrnworte' with Parallels in the Synoptic Gospels," New Testament Studies, 2, 1955-1956.
- Flusser, David. "The Dead Sea Sect and Pre-Pauline Christianity," Scripta Hierosolymitana. Jerusalem: The Hebrew University, 1958.
- Fridrichsen, A. "Älska, hata, förneka (försaka)," Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok, V, 1940.
- Fridrichsen, A. "Sich Selbst Verleugnen," Coniectanea Neotestamentica, II, 1936.
- Fridrichsen, A. "Zu 'Αρνεῖσθαι' in Neuen Testament Insonderheit in den Pastoralbriefen," Coniectanea Neotestamentica, VI.
- Fuchs, Ernst. "Die Frage nach dem historischen Jesus," Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche, LIII, 1956.
- Fuller, R. H. "The Clue to Jesus' Self-Understanding," Studia Evangelica, III, 1964. Edited by F. L. Cross.
- Higgins, A. J. B. "Son of Man," New Testament Essays, A. J. B. Higgins, Editor. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1959.
- Hodgson, Peter C. "The Son of Man and the Problem of Historical Knowledge," The Journal of Religion, 41, 1961.
- Jeremias, Joachim. "Das Loesegeld für Viele," Judaica, III, 1948.
- Jeremias, Joachim. "Review of Jesus and the Servant by Morna D. Hooker," Journal of Theological Studies, n.s. 11, 1960.

- Käsemann, Ernst. "Das Problem des historischen Jesus," Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche, 51, 1954.
- Kilpatrick, G. D. "Luke 22:19b-20," Journal of Theological Studies, XLVII, 1946.
- Kohler, K. "The Essenes and the Apocalyptic Literature," The Jewish Quarterly Review, Volume XI, Number 2, October, 1920.
- Manson, T. W. "Mark 2:27f.," Coniectanea Neotestamentica in honorem A. Fridrichsen, XI, 1947.
- Manson, T. W. "Realized Eschatology and the Messianic Secret," Studies in the Gospels edited by D. E. Nineham. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1957.
- Preiss, Théo. "Le Fils de l'Homme," Études Théologiques et Religieuses, 26, 1951.
- Risenfeld, Harald. "The Meaning of the Verb ' Ἀπο-
τείνωθαι,'" Coniectanea Neotestamentica in honorem A. Fridrichsen, XI, 1947.
- Robinson, James M. "Review of Untersuchungen zur Menschensohn-Christologie im Johannesevangelium," Journal of Biblical Literature, 78, 1959.
- Schniewind, Julius. "Das Evangelium nach Markus⁸," Das Neue Testament Deutsch, I, 1958.
- Schniewind, Julius. "Das Evangelium nach Matthäus⁸," Das Neue Testament Deutsch, VII, 1956.
- Schweizer, Eduard. "Discipleship and Belief in Jesus as Lord," New Testament Studies, II, 1956.
- Schweizer, Eduard. "The Son of Man," Journal of Biblical Literature, 79, 1960.
- Sidebottom, E. M. "The Son of Man as Man in the Fourth Gospel," The Expository Times, 28.
- Sjöberg, Erik. " DTX 12 und 72 DTX im Hebräischen und Aramäischen," Acta Orientalia, 21, 1950.

- Taylor, Vincent. "The Origin of the Markan Passion-Studies," New Testament Studies, I, 1955.
- Tinsley, E. J. "The Way of the Son of Man," Interpretation, A Journal of Bible and Theology, VII, 1953.
- Vielhauer, Philipp. "Gottesreich und Menschensohn in der Verkündigung Jesus," Festschrift für Gunther Dehn. Wilhelm Schneemelcher, Editor. Neukirchen: Kreis Moers, 1957.
- Yadin, Y. "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Epistle to the Hebrews," Scripta Hierosolymitana, IV. Jerusalem: The Hebrew University, 1958.
- Zimmerman, H. "'Mit Feuer gesalzen werden' Eine Studie zu Mark 9:49," Theological Quarterly, 1939.

General Literature

- Abrahams, I. Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels. First Series. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1917.
- Barrett, C. K. The Gospel According to Saint John. London: S. P. C. K., 1959.
- Black, Matthew. An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts². Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1954.
- Bonhoeffer, Dietrich. The Cost of Discipleship. London: S. C. M. Press, 1948.
- Bornkamm, Günther. Jesus of Nazareth. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1960. English translation of Jesus von Nazareth by Irene and Fraser McLuskey with James M. Robinson.
- Branscomb, B. H. Jesus and the Law of Moses. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1930.
- Büchler, A. Studies in Sin and Atonement in the Rabbinic Literature of the First Century. London: Oxford University Press, 1928.

- Bultmann, Rudolph. Das Evangelium des Johannes. Göttingen: Vandenhoech and Ruprecht, 1941.
- Bultmann, Rudolph. The History of the Synoptic Tradition. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1963. E.T. of Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition, by John Marsh.
- Bultmann, Rudolph. Jesus and the Word. London: Ivor Nicholson and Watson, 1935. E.T. by Louise P. Smith and Erminie Huntress.
- Bultmann, Rudolph. Theology of the New Testament. I, II. London: S. C. M. Press, 1952. E.T. of Theologie des Neuen Testaments by Kendrick Grobel.
- Burkitt, F. D. Christian Beginnings. London: University of London Press, 1924.
- Burney, C. F. The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1922.
- Burrows, Millar. The Dead Sea Scrolls. London: Secker and Warburg, 1956.
- Charles, R. H. The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1908.
- Conzelmann, Hans. The Theology of St. Luke. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960. E.T. by Geoffrey Buswell.
- Cox, G. E. P. The Gospel According to Saint Matthew. London: S. C. M. Press, 1958.
- Cranfield, C. E. B. I and II Peter and Jude. London: S. C. M. Press, 1960.
- Cripps, R. S. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Amos. London: S. P. C. K., 1929.
- Cullmann, Oscar. Baptism in the New Testament. London: S. C. M. Press, 1952. E.T. of Die Tauflehre des Neuen Testaments by J. K. S. Reid.
- Cullmann, Oscar. The Christology of the New Testament. London: S. C. M. Press, Ltd., 1959.

- Curtis, William A. Jesus Christ the Teacher. London: Oxford University Press, 1945.
- Dalman, G. Jesus-Jeshua. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1929. E.T. by P. O. Levertoff.
- Dalman, G. The Words of Jesus. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1902. E.T. by D. M. Kay.
- Davies, W. D. Paul and Rabbinic Judaism. London: S. P. C. K., 1948.
- Daube, David. The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism. London: The Athlone Press, 1956.
- Denney, James. The Death of Christ. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1902.
- Dibelius, Martin. From Tradition to Gospel. London: Ivor Nicholson and Watson, 1934. E.T. of Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums by Bertram Lee Woolf.
- Dodd, C. H. According to the Scriptures. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1953.
- Dodd, C. H. The Bible and the Greeks. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1935.
- Dodd, C. H. Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1963.
- Dodd, C. H. The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1953.
- Dodd, C. H. Parables of the Kingdom. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1936.
- Duncan, George S. Jesus Son of Man. London: Nisbet and Company, 1947.
- Elmslie, W. A. L. How Came Our Faith. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1950.
- Fisch, Rabbi R. S. Ezekiel. London: The Socino Press, 1950.

- Frankfort, H. The Intellectual Adventure of Ancient Man. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1946.
- Fuller, R. H. The Mission and Achievement of Jesus. London: S. C. M. Press, 1956.
- Fuller, R. H. The New Testament in Current Study. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1962.
- Gloebe, Gerhard. The Day of His Coming. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1963. E.T. of Aller Tage Tag by Stanley Rudman.
- Goguel, Maurice. The Life of Jesus. London: George Allen and Unwin Limited, 1933.
- Grant, Fredrick C. The Earliest Gospel. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1943.
- Grant, Fredrick C. An Introduction to New Testament Thought. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1950.
- Gray, George Buchanan. Sacrifice in the Old Testament. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1925.
- Harnack, A. Mission and Expansion of Christianity. London: Williams and Norgate, 1908.
- Hicks, F. C. N. The Fullness of Sacrifice. London: Macmillan and Company, 1930.
- Higgins, A. J. B. Jesus and the Son of Man. London: Lutterworth Press, 1964.
- Higgins, A. J. B. The Historicity of the Fourth Gospel. London: Lutterworth Press, 1960.
- Higgins, A. J. B. The Lord's Supper in the New Testament. London: S. C. M. Press, Ltd., 1960.
- Hooke, S. H. The Siege Perilous. London: S. C. M. Press, Ltd., 1956.
- Hooker, Morna. Jesus and the Servant. London: S. P. C. K., 1959.

- Hunter, A. M. The Work and Words of Jesus. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1950.
- Jacob, Edmund. Theology of the Old Testament. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1950. E.T. of Theologie de l'Ancien Testament by A. W. Heath and Philip J. Allcock.
- James, E. O. Origins of Sacrifice. London: J. Murray, 1933.
- Jeremias, J. The Eucharistic Words of Jesus. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955. E.T. of Die Abendmahlsworte Jesu by Arnold Ehrhardt.
- Jeremias, J. The Parables of Jesus. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1963. E.T. of Die Gleichnisse Jesu⁶, by S. H. Hooke.
- Käsemann, Ernst. Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen, I, Göttingen: Vandenhoech and Ruprecht, 1959.
- Knox, Wilfred L. The Sources of the Synoptic Gospels. Cambridge: At the University Press, I, 1953, II, 1957.
- Köhler, Ludwig. Old Testament Theology. London: Lutterworth Press, 1957. E.T. of Theologie des Alten Testamente by A. S. Todd.
- Kuhl, Curt. The Prophets of Israel. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1960. E.T. of Israels Propheten by Rudolf J. Ehrlich and J. P. Smith.
- Kümmel, W. G. Promise and Fulfilment. London: S. C. M. Press, 1957. E.T. of Verheissung und Erfüllung by Dorothea M. Barton.
- Leaney, A. R. C. A Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1958.
- Lightfoot, R. H. St. John's Gospel, A Commentary. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1957.
- Lindars, Barnabas. New Testament Apologetic. London: S. C. M. Press, 1961.

- Lindblom, Joh. The Servant Songs in Deutero-Isaiah. Lund: G. W. K. Gleerup, 1951.
- Lindhagen, Curt. The Servant Motif in the Old Testament. Uppsala: Lundequistska Bokhandeln, 1950.
- Lofthouse, W. F. Ethics and Atonement. London: Methuen and Company, 1906.
- Lohmeyer, Ernst. Das Evangelium des Markus. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1954.
- Lohse, E. Märtyrer und Gottesknecht. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck, 1955.
- Mach, R. Der Zaddik in Talmud und Midrasch. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1957.
- Manson, T. W. The Sayings of Jesus. London: S. C. M. Press, 1949.
- Manson, T. W. The Teachings of Jesus. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1931.
- Manson, William. Jesus the Messiah. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1944.
- Mayor, Joseph B. The Epistle of St. Jude and the Second Epistle of St. Peter. London: Macmillan and Co., 1907.
- Menzies, Allan. The Earliest Gospel. London: Macmillan and Company, 1901.
- Michel, Otto. Prophet und Märtyrer. Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1932.
- Milik, J. T. Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judea. London: S. C. M. Press, Ltd., 1959.
- Montefiore, C. G. Rabbinic Literature and Gospel Teaching. London: Macmillan and Co., 1930.
- North, C. R. The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah. London: Oxford University Press, 1948.

- Oesterley, W. O. E. Sacrifices in Ancient Israel. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1937.
- Oesterley, W. O. E., and Robinson, Theodore H. Hebrew Religion, Its Origin and Development. London: S. P. C. K., 1930 and 1937.
- Otto, Rudolph. The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man. London: The Lutterworth Press, 1938. E.T. of Reich Gottes und Menschensohn by F. V. Filson and B. Lee Woolf.
- Penn, William. No Cross, No Crown. A Discourse Showing the Nature and Discipline of the Holy Cross of Christ. 10th Edition. London: Luke Hinde, 1762.
- Rashdall, Hastings. The Idea of Atonement in Christian Theology. London: Macmillan and Company, Ltd., 1919.
- Rawlinson, A. E. J. The Gospel According to Saint Mark. London: Methuen and Company, 1925.
- Richardson, Alan. An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament. New York: Harper and Row, 1958.
- Robinson, J. A. T. Jesus and His Coming. New York: Abingdon Press, 1957.
- Robinson, James M. The Problem of History in Mark. London: S. C. M. Press, Ltd., 1957.
- Robinson, Wheeler. Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament. Oxford: University Press, 1946.
- Robinson, ^HWheeler. The Cross in the Old Testament. London: S. C. M. Press, Ltd., 1955.
- Rowley, H. H. The Servant of the Lord and Other Essays in the Old Testament. London: Lutterworth Press, 1952.
- Sanders, Jim Alvin. Suffering as Divine Discipline in the Old Testament and Post-Biblical Judaism. Special issue of Colgate Rochester Divinity School Bulletin. Rochester: Colgate Rochester Divinity School, 1955.

- Schechter, S. Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1909.
- Schulz, Siegfried. Untersuchungen zur Menschensohn-Christologie im Johannesevangelium. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1957.
- Schoeps, H. J. Theologie und Geschichte des Judenchristentums. Tübingen: Verlag J. C. B. Mohr, 1949.
- Schweizer, Eduard. Lordship and Discipleship. Naperville, Illinois: Alec R. Allenson, 1960. E.T. of Erniedrigung und Erhöhung bei Jesus und seinen Nachfolgern. See also 2nd Edition of 1962.
- Selwyn, E. G. The First Epistle of St. Peter. London: Macmillan and Company, 1940.
- Sjöberg, Erik. Der verborgene Menschensohn in den Evangelien. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1955.
- Skinner, John. Prophecy and Religion. Studies in the Life of Jeremiah. Cambridge: University Press, 1922.
- Smith, B. T. D. The Parables of the Synoptic Gospels. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1937.
- Stauffer, Ethelbert. Jesus and His Story. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1960. E.T. of Jesus: Gestalt und Geschichte by Richard and Clara Winston.
- Strachan, R. H. The Fourth Gospel, Its Significance and Environment. London: S. C. M. Press, 1941.
- H.B.
Swete, F. C. The Gospel According to St. Mark. London: Macmillan and Company, 1913.
- Taylor, Vincent. Jesus and His Sacrifice. London: Macmillan and Company, 1937.
- Taylor, Vincent. The Atonement in New Testament Teaching. London: The Epworth Press, 1946.
- Taylor, Vincent. The Gospel According to St. Mark. London: Macmillan and Company, 1959.

- Taylor, Vincent. The Life and Ministry of Jesus. London: Macmillan and Company, 1954.
- Thüsing, Wilhelm. Die Erhöhung und Verherrlichung Jesu im Johannesevangelium. Münster, Westfalen: Aschen-dorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1960.
- Tödt, H. E. Der Menschensohn in der synoptischen Überlieferung. Gütersloh: Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1959.
- Turner, H. E. W. Jesus Master and Lord. London: A. R. Mowbray and Company, 1957.
- von Rad, Gerhard. Old Testament Theology. New York: Harper Brothers, 1962. E.T. of Theologie des Alten Testament by David M. G. Stalker.
- Vriezen, Th. C. An Outline of Old Testament Theology. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1960. E.T. of Hoofdpijnen der Theologie van het oude Testament by S. Neuijen.
- Weiss, Johannes. Earliest Christianity, A History of the Period A. D. 30-150. I, New York: Harper and Brothers, 1959. E.T. of Das Urchristentum edited by F. C. Grant.
- Welch, Adam C. Prophet and Priest in Old Israel. London: S. C. M. Press, 1936.
- Welch, Adam C. Post-Exilic Judaism. Edinburgh: Wm. Blackwood and Sons, 1935.
- Wernberg-Møller, P. The Manual of Discipline. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1957.
- Wright, Ernest. Biblical Archaeology. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1957.
- Zimmerli, W. and Jeremias, J. The Servant of God. London: S. C. M. Press, 1957. E.T. of "Παῖς Θεοῦ," T.W.Z.N.T., V, pp. 653-713, by Harold Knight and others.