

**The Doctrine of the Church and the Spirit
in the Thought of Karl Ludwig Schmidt**

John M. Morrison

1969



ABSTRACT OF THESIS

Name of Candidate..... John McFarlane Morrison
Address.....
Degree..... Ph.D. Date..... July, 1969.
Title of Thesis..... The Doctrine of the Church and the Spirit in the Thought of
..... Karl Ludwig Schmidt.

The doctrine of the Church is at once a very complex and a very central concept. Often neglected, the last hundred years have seen it become steadily more prominent. Karl Ludwig Schmidt occupies a leading place among writers on the Church. A well known NT Professor and theological editor, he made major contributions to the Kittel TWNT and was a forerunner of Formgeschichte. His Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu is examined in the light of later research, especially that of Bultmann, C.H.Dodd, T.W.Manson, J.Jeremias, W.G.Kümmel. No full biography of K.L.Schmidt exists up to now, so one is provided here from new sources supplied by his son and by some of his university colleagues.

The Ekklesia article provides one of the best examples of Schmidt's lexicographical-lexicological approach, as well as key material for his doctrine of the Church. He emphasises the OT-NT links, the basic unity of the NT view of the Church, the Messiah-gathered kenishta, the seed of the Body of Christ. The article also deals in detail with the Mt.16 and 18 passages in the light of later critical discussion.

His The Church of Early Christianity was a forerunner of Ekklesia. It takes up many of the same points and deals in more detail; with the instituting of the Lord's Supper. This is contrasted with the views of Jeremias and others. The article also brings out several important points for the post-Resurrection Ekklesia.

In the Upbuilding of the Church he examines the notion of the Church as the people of God, ekklesia and paroikia, oikos and Temple. He stresses the importance of eschatology and his views are considered in the light of Dodd's Realised Eschatology. His Opposition of Church and State and Polis articles bring out the character of the Church as (a) God's Foundation in the world; and (b) always a mixtum compositum.

The four Copenhagen lectures on the primitive Church explain his views on Formgeschichte, on the centrality of the Messiahship of Jesus for the Church, the NT development of a doctrine of the Trinity, and the complex relationships of Kingdom, Church, State and People. Further light on his thinking is given from recollections of his lectures and seminars in Bonn, and from discussion of his Basileia article, along with the views of E.F.Scott, C.H.Dodd, MacGregor, Kümmel, and others. His one article on Ministry is also reviewed.

The NT itself raises the question of the doctrine of the Trinity. How this comes about is set out with full examination of the texts in two articles which deal directly with the Spirit and the central place of the gift of the Spirit for the Church - The Trinitarian God, Subject and Object of Faith and Pneuma Hagion as Person and as Charisma.

In Barth's Theologische Studien series he wrote two booklets, one on Galatians, the other on Romans 9-11, which bring out the Cross-centredness of the Church, the fruits of the Spirit, the Church's roots in Israel, and his discussions with Martin Buber. His radio broadcasts on the Apocalypse stress the nature of the Church as one of 'Need and Promise' but always related to, though different from, the Kingdom. The Church as part of the Gospel and the relation between Church and Kerygma are brought out in his one lecture in English - The Proclamation of the Church to the Congregation - which also emphasises the close link between Word and Deed and between OT and NT. Here again eschatological considerations are central.

Critical evaluation of Schmidt's contribution divides naturally into (a) his investigation of literary problems in the NT; and (b) his philological and Biblical-theological studies. He himself pointed out the limitations of *Formgeschichte*, and this, along with his *Rahmen*, is considered in the light of the latest article on Schmidt by Vielhauer together with the views of NT scholars before and after Schmidt. His important TWNT articles raise many problems about Kingdom and Church, the authenticity of the Mt.16 and 18 verses, and the question of the Lord's Supper, in an area where the views are almost as many as the writers. His great gift was more for analysis than synthesis but many critics today are re-examining his methods, evidence and conclusions with new appreciation.

The doctrine of the Church that emerges from his varied writings has four main points. 1. The Church is the Building of God, i.e. it is what God builds, and is building. He assembles the *ekklesia* which is *ἄνωθεν*. The *ἐκκλησία τοῦ Θεοῦ* has its roots in the OT *קהל* and is a concept of faith, in the sense of abediance to God, not a concept of man-made religion. 2. The Church is the Community of the Messiah Jesus who probably spoke of it as his *kenishta*. "Ecclesiology is Christology." The *σῶμα Χριστοῦ* is the *ἐκκλησία τοῦ Θεοῦ*. The NT has one united view of the *ekklesia*, and that unity is in Christ. 3. The People of God, the Body of Christ, is based on definite witnesses to the resurrection of Jesus Christ, who is the true centre of the *ekklesia*. It is also the fellowship of the Holy Spirit, given at Pentecost. 4. The Church is a pilgrim People, whose goal is the Kingdom of God, who are already 'citizens of Heaven', but who on earth are strangers and pilgrims. The Church is not the Kingdom, but remains *militans et pressa*, yet being built by God, upbuilding its members, with a mission and task in the world for which God called it into being, preserving and guiding it by His Spirit.

CONTENTS

	Page
1. Karl Ludwig Schmidt, 1891 - 1956.	1
2. <u>Ekklesia</u> .	56
3. The Church of Early Christianity.	124
4. The Upbuilding of the Church.	164
5. Kingdom, Church, Ministry.	209
6. The Presence of the Spirit.	266
7. The Church, the Christian and the World.	301
8. "New Vistas" and Limitations.	346
9. Schmidt's Doctrine of the Church.	388

APPENDICES

1. Biographical Outline of Karl Ludwig Schmidt.	433
2. Bibliography:	
A. Works by K.L. Schmidt.	435
B. Other Works cited.	438

ABSTRACT OF THESIS

The doctrine of the Church is at once a very complex and a very central concept. Often neglected, the last hundred years have seen it become steadily more prominent. Karl Ludwig Schmidt occupies a leading place among writers on the Church. A well known NT professor and theological editor, he made major contributions to the Kittel TWNT and was a forerunner of Formgeschichte. His Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu is examined in the light of later research, especially Bultmann, C.H. Dodd, T.W. Manson, J. Jeremias, W.G. Kümmel. No full biography of K.L. Schmidt exists up to now, so one is provided here from new sources supplied by his son and some of his university colleagues.

The Ekklesia article provides one of the best examples of Schmidt's lexicographical-lexicological approach, as well as key material for his doctrine of the Church. He emphasises the OT-NT links, the basic unity of the NT view of the Church, the Messiah-gathered kenishta, the seed of the Body of Christ. The article also deals in detail with the Mt.16 and 18 passages in the light of later critical discussion.

His The Church of Early Christianity was a forerunner of Ekklesia. It takes up many of the same points and deals in more detail with the instituting of the Lord's Supper. This is contrasted with the views of Jeremias and others. The article also brings out several important points for the post-Resurrection Ekklesia.

In the Upbuilding of the Church he examines the notion of the Church as the People of God, ekklesia and paroikia, oikos, and Temple. He stresses the importance of eschatology and his views are considered in the light of Dodd's Realised Eschatology. His Opposition of Church and State and Polis articles bring out the character of the Church (a) as God's foundation in the world; and (b) as always a mixtum compositum.

The four Copenhagen lectures on the primitive Church explain his views on Formgeschichte, on the centrality of the Messiahship of Jesus for the Church, the NT development of a doctrine of the Trinity, and the complex relationships of Kingdom, Church, State and People. Further light on his thinking is given from recollections of his lectures and seminars in Bonn, and from discussion of his Basileia article along with the views of E.F. Scott, C.H. Dodd, MacGregor, Kümmel and others. His one article on Ministry is also reviewed.

The NT itself raises the question of the doctrine of the Trinity. How this comes about is set out with full examination of the texts in two articles which deal directly with the Spirit, and the central place of the gift of the Spirit for the Church - The Trinitarian God, Subject and Object of Faith and Pneuma Hagion as Person and as Charisma.

In Barth's Theologische Studien series he wrote two booklets, one on Galatians the other on Romans 9-11, which bring out the Cross-centredness of the Church, the fruits of the Spirit, the Church's roots in Israel, and his discussions with Martin Buber. His radio broadcasts on the Apocalypse stress the nature of the Church as one of 'Need and Promise' but always related to, though different from, the Kingdom. The Church as part of the Gospel and the relation between Church and Kerygma are brought out in his one lecture in English - The Proclamation of the Church to the Congregation - which also emphasises the close link between Word and Deed and between OT and NT. Here again eschatological considerations are central.

Critical evaluation of Schmidt's contribution divides naturally into (a) his investigation of literary problems in the NT; and (b) his philological and Biblical-theological studies. He himself pointed out the limitations of Formgeschichte, and this, along with his Rahmen, is considered in the light of the latest article on Schmidt by Vielhauer together with the views of NT scholars before and after Schmidt. His important TWNT articles raise many problems about Kingdom and Church, the authenticity of the Mt. 16 and 18 verses, and the question of the Lord's Supper, in an area where the views are almost as many as the writers. His great gift was more for analysis than synthesis but many critics today are re-examining his methods, evidence and conclusions with new appreciation.

The doctrine of the Church that emerges from his varied writings has four main points. 1. The Church is the Building of God, i.e. it is what God builds, and is building. He assembles the ekklesia which is ἐκκλησία. The ἐκκλησία τοῦ Θεοῦ has its roots in the OT קהל יהוה and is a concept of faith, in the sense of obedience to God, not a concept of man-made religion. 2. The Church is the Community of the Messiah Jesus who probably spoke of it as his kenishta. "Ecclesiology is Christology." The σῶμα Χριστοῦ is the ἐκκλησία τοῦ Θεοῦ. The NT has one united view of the ekklesia, and that unity is in Christ. 3. The People of God, the Body of Christ, is based on definite witnesses to the resurrection of Jesus Christ, who is the true centre of the ekklesia. It is also the fellowship of the Holy Spirit, given at Pentecost. 4. The Church is a

pilgrim People, whose goal is the Kingdom of God, who are already 'citizens of Heaven', but who on earth are strangers and pilgrims. The Church is not the Kingdom, but remains militans et pressa, yet being built by God, upbuilding its members, with a mission and a task in the world for which God called it into being, preserving and guiding it by His Spirit.



DORLAND-KROYDE

WOMEN'S

TUB SIZED - AIR CURED

Abbreviations

AV	Authorised Version.
BKW	Bible Key Words series.
ET	English translation.
Exp.T.	Expository Times.
Lex.für Th. u K.	Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche.
LXX	The Septuagint.
RGG	Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart. 2nd. Ed. 1929.
RSV	Revised Standard Version. Scripture quotations are all from RSV unless otherwise indicated.
Schw.R.	Schweizerische Rundschau.
SJTh.	Scottish Journal of Theology.
Stud.Th.	Studia Theologica.
Th.Bl.	Theologische Blätter.
Th.R.	Theologische Rundschau.
Th.Z.	Theologische Zeitschrift.
TWNT.	Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testa- ment.
ZNTW.	Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft.
ZThK.	Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche.

For the numerous references to Schmidt's chief works, the following abbreviations are used:

<u>Rahmen</u>	<u>Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu</u>
<u>Festgabe</u>	<u>Die Kirche des Urchristentums</u>
<u>TWNT I</u>	Schmidt's <u>Basileia</u> article.
<u>TWNT III</u>	<u>Ekklesia</u> article.
<u>TWNT V</u>	<u>Paroikia</u> .
<u>Erbauung</u>	<u>Die Erbauung der Kirche mit ihren Gliedern als den 'Fremdlingen und Beisassen auf Erden'</u> .
<u>Polis</u>	<u>Die Polis in Kirche und Welt.</u>
<u>Revue 1.</u>	The first two Copenhagen articles in <u>Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie religieuses.</u>
<u>Revue 2.</u>	Articles 3 and 4.
<u>Revue 4.</u>	<u>Ministry in the Church of the NT.</u>
<u>Eranos XIII</u>	<u>Das Pneuma Hagion als Person und als Charisma in the Eranos Jahrbuch.</u>
<u>Galatians</u>	<u>Ein Gang durch den Galaterbrief.</u>
<u>Judenfrage</u>	<u>Die Judenfrage im Lichte der Kapitel 9-11 des Römerbriefes.</u>
<u>Apoc.</u>	<u>Aus der Johannes-Apokalypse.</u>

1.

KARL LUDWIG SCHMIDT

1891 - 1956

It was Hegel, in the introduction to his Philosophy of History, who maintained that "What experience and history teach is this - that people and governments never have learned anything from history, or acted on principles deduced from it."¹

The history of the Christian Church, however, at least in its beginnings, and contrary to all historical probability, contradicts this gloomy conclusion. Its centuries-old, continuing existence and growth, in spite of all its imperfections and divisions, act as a constant challenge to people and governments.

Its true nature, nonetheless, is very hard to define. Strange as it may seem, as Best has pointed out, "the Church has never received formal definition."²

The complexity of the subject is easily seen from a study of the New Testament record, obviously the essential source for a proper understanding of the nature of the Church.

¹Philosophy of History. Georg Wilhelm Hegel. 1848. (E.T. 1890).

²One Body in Christ (A study in the relationship of the Church to Christ in the Epistles of the Apostle Paul). E. Best. 1955. p.ix.

There Christians, or the Church, are variously described as the body of Christ (Eph.1:23; Col.1:24) the bride of Christ (2 Cor.11:2), the house of God, the church of the living God (2 Cor.6:16), the Israel of God (Gal.6:16), the flock of God (1 Pet.5:2), the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, the general assembly and church of the firstborn (Heb.12:22-23), the fellowship of the mystery (Eph.3:9), the flock, the church of God (Acts 20:28), a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people, the people of God (1 Pet.2:9-10), the salt of the earth, the light of the world (Mt.5:13-14). There is, above all, the New Testament word ἑκκλησία, which is, at best, only partially rendered by our word 'church'.

While the word ἑκκλησία itself is not a completed, formulated 'doctrine' - the nature of the Church was not a problem to any of the New Testament writers, none of whom would have thought of a man being 'in Christ' and not also 'in the Church' - it is a prime source for any genuine ecclesiology. "The confusing and contradictory collection of bodies which claim for themselves the title of 'church'," writes Professor Gerhard Ebeling, "all agree on one point: their identity with that which made its appearance in primitive Christianity as the ekklesia. This is the starting point for any attempt to say what the church is. As soon as we look at its history we are immediately confronted with imprecision, tensions and

disputes. Yet we may discern one characteristic which is constitutive for the church. The decisive thing is the authoritative word-event with its invocation of Jesus which unites Jews and Gentiles."¹

This underlines a fundamental point for the doctrine of the Church, namely that ecclesiology and Christology are inseparably connected, but it is far from formal definition. Even the creeds and confessions provide little help here, for no formal definition has doctrinal authority. "None can be found in the Fathers or in the Schoolmen or even in Thomas Aquinas,"² Best quotes Florovsky as saying. Indeed from Cyprian's De Catholicae Ecclesiae Unitate in the middle of the third century until Wycliffe's De Ecclesia in the middle of the fourteenth century, the doctrine of the Church was almost entirely neglected.

At the time of the Reformation, naturally enough, much more attention began to be paid to the doctrine of the Church. This is evident both in the writings of Hus, Luther, Calvin and the Reformers and, from the Roman Catholic position, in the doctrine developed by the Council of Trent.

¹From "Towards an Ecclesiology" in Theology and Proclamation. Gerhard Ebeling. 1966 (E.T.). A series of essays in which Ebeling is arguing mainly against the views of Bultmann.

²Best (op.cit. p.ix) is here quoting from The Universal Church in God's Design. G. Florovsky. p.43.

It is in the last hundred years, however, that the literature on the Church has steadily grown more and more voluminous. One has only to examine the extensive bibliography (filling 18 pages) on the Early Church given by Olof Linton in his review of the situation for the years 1880 to 1930, to be made aware of this.¹ From Hatch and Harnack, he traces the development of thought on the subject of the Church, especially the Church of Early Christianity, demonstrating that this formerly largely neglected doctrine had now become central. In his penultimate chapter dealing with what for him, writing in 1932, was "the most recent literature," i.e. works by Kattenbusch, Koester, Leclercq, Batiffol, Gloege, Schürer, Billerbeck, Bonhoeffer, Lohmeyer, Dibelius, Rademacher, Jeremias - to name only a few -, Linton cites Karl Ludwig Schmidt no less than 15 times, although at that date the great body of Schmidt's thought regarding the Church had not yet appeared.²

In English, the publication in 1898 of F.J.A. Hort's Cambridge lectures on the Ecclesia was a landmark.³ Over thirty years later C.H. Dodd described Hort's small book as

¹Das Problem der Urkirche in der neueren Forschung. Olof Linton. 1932. pp.xiv-xxxii.

²op.cit. pp.132f.

³The Christian Ecclesia. F.J.A. Hort. 1898.

"the standard work to which we all go back . . . indeed it is so sober and objective that there is little of substance in it which is antiquated."¹ "I can agree whole-heartedly with Professor C.H. Dodd in his verdict," writes another Cambridge scholar, F. Newton Flew, in his study of the idea of the Ecclesia in the New Testament.²

In addition to the contributions on the subject by such diverse scholars and theologians as B.H. Streeter³ and Karl Barth,⁴ the titles of such works as L.S. Thornton's The Common Life in the Body of Christ,⁵ George Johnston's The Doctrine of the Church in the New Testament,⁶ Professor E.L. Mascall's Christ, the Christian and the Church, and his Corpus Christi,⁷ H. Daniel-Rops' The Church of Apostles and Martyrs,⁸

¹Essays Congregational and Catholic. C.H. Dodd. 1931. p.3.

²Jesus and His Church. R. Newton Flew. 1938.

³The Primitive Church. B.H. Streeter. 1930.

⁴Theology and Church. Karl Barth. 1920-28. Also his God in Action (Theological Addresses). 1936; and, of course, his Church Dogmatics. 1956.

⁵The Common Life in the Body of Christ. L.S. Thornton. 1941.

⁶The Doctrine of the Church in the New Testament. George Johnston. 1943.

⁷Christ, the Christian and the Church. E.L. Mascall. 1946. (5th. Ed. 1963). Also his Corpus Christi. 1953. (2nd. Ed. 1965).

⁸L'Église des Apôtres et des Martyrs. H. Daniel-Rops. 1948. (Eng. Ed. 1960).

E. Best's already mentioned One Body in Christ,¹ Oscar Cullmann's The Early Church,² Professor T.F. Torrance's Kingdom and Church,³ Archbishop Carrington's The Early Christian Church,⁴ Bishop Anders Nygren's Christ and His Church,⁵ and Claude Welch's The Reality of the Church,⁶ indicate the scope of the subject and the attention now being given to it. Professor Geddes MacGregor, in his excellent survey of the doctrine, includes a "list of some modern works relating to the nature of the Church" which comprises some 342 authors.⁷

Emil Brunner, who provides valuable insights regarding the Ecclesia as a fellowship and common life rather than an institution, draws attention in his The Misunderstanding of

¹op.cit. 1955.

²The Early Church. Oscar Cullmann. 1956 (E.T.).

³Kingdom and Church. (A Study in the Theology of the Reformation). T.F. Torrance. 1956.

⁴The Early Christian Church. Archbishop Philip Carrington. (Vol. I - The First Christian Century). 1957.

⁵Christ and His Church. Anders Nygren, Bishop of Lund. 1957 (E.T.).

⁶The Reality of the Church. Claude Welch. 1958.

⁷Corpus Christi. Geddes MacGregor. 1959. pp.277-291.

the Church¹ and in his Dogmatics¹ to several of these, notably Karl Ludwig Schmidt,² Dietrich Bonhoeffer,³ Hans von Campenhausen,⁴ and W.G. Kümmel.⁵ The last named author's Church Concept and Historical Consciousness in the Primitive Community and with Jesus, Brunner described as 'most up-to-date and comprehensive' at the time of writing.⁶

Catholic theologians today are likewise showing similar concern regarding the nature of the Church and the importance of the Ecclesia. "One can say," wrote Cardinal Cushing, Archbishop of Boston, in his preface to Father Hans Küng's book, Structures of the Church, "that the chief theological

¹Das Missverständnis der Kirche. Emil Brunner. 1951. (E.T. 1952). Also his The Christian Doctrine of the Church, Faith, and the Consummation (Dogmatics Vol. III). 1960. (E.T. 1962.)

²Especially Schmidt's major article on the work Ekklesia in Gerhard Kittel's Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. Vol. III. 1938. (E.T. 1965.) See p. 56 below.

³Sanctorum Communio (A Dogmatic Inquiry into the Sociology of the Church). Dietrich Bonhoeffer. This, Bonhoeffer's first work, was presented in 1927 as a dissertation to the Theological Faculty of Berlin University, but was not published until three and a half years later when it received little publicity. A new German edition appeared in 1960. (E.T. 1963.)

⁴Kirchliches Amt und geistliche Vollmacht in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten. H. von Campenhausen. 1953.

⁵Kirchenbegriff und Geschichtsbewusstsein in der Urgemeinde und bei Jesus. W.G. Kümmel. 1943.

⁶The Misunderstanding of the Church. p. 120.

concern of the (Vatican) Council, yes, of all the Christian communities today, is ecclesiology."¹ Father Küng's later massive volume, The Church,² is furnished with very full, up-to-date specialised bibliographies throughout its different chapters, together with an opening bibliography on Ecclesiology in general.³

Among the factors which contribute to making the doctrine of the Church more and more central in theological discussion, Dr. Lesslie Newbigin, a Bishop of the Church of South India,⁴ places (a) the breakdown of the Christian view of the world, a view taken for granted for many centuries: (b) the pressing needs of Christian mission, "missionary obedience" being fundamental for the Church's true eschatological perspective, and here Bishop Newbigin quotes Brunner - "The Church exists by mission as fire exists by burning";⁵ and (c) the growing ecumenical movement of recent years.

¹Strukturen der Kirche. Hans Küng. E.T. 1965. p.vii.

²Die Kirche (Vol.I of the Ekklesiologische Abteilung of a projected series of Oekumenische Forschungen). Hans Küng. 1967. (E.T. 1968).

³op.cit. p.43.

⁴The Household of God (the Kerr Lectures on the Nature of the Church, given in Trinity College, Glasgow). Lesslie Newbigin, Bishop in Madurai. 1953.

⁵op.cit. p.142.

Brunner himself felt that this last factor, the growing ecumenical movement, made the problem of the nature of the Church more acute. The question - What is the Church? -, he maintained, remains an unsolved problem for both Protestants and Roman Catholics. It is never clear, he says, how the Church in the sense of spiritual life and faith - the fellowship of Jesus Christ - is related to the institutions called churches.¹

Bishop Nygren puts the question in slightly different form. "Is the Church a part of the Gospel?" he asks.² To treat the Church as an outward form, an external organisation, is to make the same mistake as Loisy when he said - "Jesus proclaimed the Kingdom of God, but it was the Church that came."³ The right answer to the question has to come from an understanding of the New Testament conception of the Church, not our conception. This underlines the importance of better exegesis of the New Testament texts, the Bishop held.⁴ Brunner was no doubt right in maintaining that this process was already happening. New Testament research in the last 50-100 years,

¹ op.cit. Preface.

² op.cit. p.13f.

³ L'Évangile et l'église. A. Loisy. 1902. p.111.

⁴ op.cit. p. 16.

he wrote in 1951, has "unremittingly and successfully" been elucidating the Ecclesia of primitive Christiannity.¹

Few New Testament scholars have played a greater part in this process of elucidation of the Ecclesia than Karl Ludwig Schmidt. It is safe to say that, along with his namesake Traugott Schmidt whose best-known book, The Body of Christ,² appeared in 1919, the same year that saw the publication of Karl Ludwig Schmidt's first work, The Framework of the History of Jesus,³ he was the initiator of a revolution in our understanding of the Biblical doctrine of the Church and of the inseparable ties between it and its Head and Lord, the Messiah, Jesus Christ.

As often happens, however, his outstanding contribution was not easily discernible. If history has any favourites, K.L. Schmidt was clearly not one of them. Although he foreshadowed and, to a very large extent, anticipated the Formgeschichte School, the fame of his fellow-students Martin Dibelius⁴ and Rudolf Bultmann⁵ has far overshadowed his.

¹op.cit. p.5.

²Der Leib Christi. Traugott Schmidt. 1919.

³Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu. Karl Ludwig Schmidt. 1919.

⁴Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums. M. Dibelius. 1919.

⁵Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition. R. Bultmann. 1921.

Although at many points his life and work showed close parallels to those of another colleague, Dietrich Bonhoeffer, the latter's life and writings have become the centre of world-wide attention and recognition, whereas those of K.L. Schmidt have rather dropped more and more into the background. Up to now no proper biography of K.L. Schmidt exists.¹ Few of his works have been translated into English. Indeed much of his considerable output is now out of print and hard to obtain. A study of his thought regarding the doctrine of the Church and the Spirit, therefore, begins most naturally with the gathering together and setting down of the material, biographical and bibliographical, from which an assessment of his contribution can be reached.

"By nature a fighter"

The life of Karl Ludwig Schmidt mirrors rather remarkably the course of his theological thought, especially as regards the origin and nature of the Church. An exact and painstaking philologist, a gifted and scientific researcher of the New Testament and related fields of study, he was also a man of outstanding faith and courage.

¹ According to Dr. W.G. Kümmel, Professor of New Testament at the University of Marburg (in a letter to me about K.L. Schmidt), the most detailed, though far from complete, biography to date is one by J. Schmid in the Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche (2nd. Ed.) IX. 1964. p.434. It has only two brief paragraphs.

In the address given at his funeral in Basel on the 13th of January, 1956, by his friend and colleague, Professor Oscar Cullmann, eloquent testimony was paid to this very point.

"He was by nature a fighter," said Professor Cullmann. "If, now and then, it seemed to us who were friends of his that he tended to devote too much attention to things which did not look to us as important as they did to him, we can see beyond this when we remember how he, more so than most, found the source of the courage for his sort of polemics in the New Testament, since the New Testament seemed to him to lay a duty to fight upon a New Testament scholar, and so he stood out firmly against Nazi demands and advocated only that view of the State that was in line with the New Testament. All this he did at a time when such a course meant sacrifice. We should not forget that, when we speak of his fighting nature, and we shall always be grateful to him for having given such a living witness, a confession so much in harmony with his New Testament work."¹

Karl Ludwig Schmidt was born in Frankfurt-am-Main on the 5th. of February, 1891 and was 65 when he died in Basel in 1956. He lived through two world wars and the rise of Hitler and the Nazi State, opposition to which finally led to his being expelled from his native Germany and his being

¹Oscar Cullman "Karl Ludwig Schmidt" in Theologische Zeitschrift (12th. year, Vol.1) Jan/Feb. 1956.

deprived of his German citizenship. He was already well known to New Testament scholars through his book The Framework of the History of Jesus¹ and had occupied with distinction the chairs of New Testament in different German universities for 12 years or more, but this counted for nothing with the Nazis. Fortunately he found a second homeland in Switzerland and was Professor of New Testament at Basel University for 18 years until his death.

In his own theological writings there is to be found, naturally enough, very little in the way of personal biographical material. However, there are, here and there, some interesting historical references and memories.

He was a contributor to a well known series of "Theological Studies" edited by Karl Barth, and in one of these on The Jewish Question in the Light of Romans 9-11, for instance, Dr. Schmidt, writing about the Semitic race, Jewish racial characteristics and Arab characteristics, special Jewish features, the influences, both positive and negative, of the Talmud and the Ghetto, adds - "It may be permitted at this point to bring in some relevant observations from my own experience. Anyone like myself, born and brought up in Frankfurt-am-Main, gets to know many Jews, Jewish colleagues, Jewish Christians, from one's youth up. Among my many Jewish

¹Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu. 1919.

friends and acquaintances, one or another has strongly reminded me of an Arab in appearance and type in spite of all assimilation to Western civilisation, at least according to my own imagined picture of such a son of the desert. When I took part in the advance against the Russians in 1915 as an infantry soldier during the previous world war, I saw and spoke to countless Jews in Poland, right up to the borders of White Russia, this being an enormous reservoir of concentrated Judaism with its Yiddish language which is quite easily understandable to anyone born in Frankfurt.¹ In Warsaw and beyond, I was hardly ever reminded of an Arab among these Jews who came originally out of the German Ghetto. Ten years later, on a journey to the Near East to Egypt and especially to Palestine, I again saw and spoke to very many Jews and two points became clear to me. On the one hand, I was struck by the racial family affinity between the long-established Jews of the Near East with their Arab and Syrian cousins, an affinity even in bodily appearance. On the other hand, the Jews in the Zionist settlements did not remind me either of the Arab Bedouin of East Jordan or the Arab Fellahin of West Jordan. Rather, they reminded me of the Jewish masses of

¹Characteristically Dr. Schmidt adds a footnote on Yiddish, noting that it is basically German, not a mixture of German and Hebrew, though it uses many Hebrew words and expressions and, in different regions, Russian, Polish and Lithuanian words.

Poland, from where many of these Zionist settlers came. The caftan-clad Jew one had met on the Mediterranean steamer, and encountered again at his prayers at the Wailing Wall in Jerusalem, often seemed a timeless figure, as if he personalised the eternal Jew. In general, however, one's racial studies remained distinctly uncertain, judging by the appearance of these people of actually or supposedly different racial stock around the Eastern end of the Mediterranean."¹

All this sheds interesting light on his boyhood in Frankfurt, one of Germany's leading, historic cities, where he went to school, his war service in the 1914-18 conflict, when he was in his twenties, and his travels in the Near East and Palestine in his thirties.

New Testament Theologian

In the years immediately before the war, after leaving school in 1909, he began to study classical philology at Marburg University where, under the influence of Wilhelm Herrmann, he soon turned to theology. As well as Herrmann, his theological teachers included Hugo Gressmann, Karl Holl, and, from 1913 when he went to Berlin, above all Adolf Deissmann. Under Deissmann he became assistant lecturer in

¹Die Judenfrage im Lichte der Kapitel 9-11 des Römerbriefes (Vol.13 of Theologische Studien.) K.L. Schmidt. Based on a talk given Nov. 1942. p.16.

the New Testament department of the theological faculty of the university there, and it was out of the lectures that he gave in the last university semester before the outbreak of war that the theme for his The Framework of the History of Jesus came.

The Preface to this significant book adds some further light on the war years. "After being wounded during the war," he writes, "I was able to get down to detailed work on it (i.e. the book), but this was set back by my time in hospital and then in a reserve battalion. My research was presented to the Berlin Theological Faculty in 1917 as a thesis for a lectureship there."¹

Dr. Schmidt was certainly a master of the art of conveying a great deal in a very few words.

By 1918 he was back lecturing in New Testament at Berlin University and in 1919 his Rahmen appeared. This book gives him, along with Martin Dibelius whose Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums came out that same year, and with Rudolf Bultmann whom he had got to know in Marburg and whose Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition appeared in 1921, a rightful claim to be one of the co-founders of the Formgeschichte method, even though his book on the Synoptists' framework is not Formgeschichte in the strict sense.² It was, according to

¹ op.cit. p.ix.

² There is no exact single expression in English for the word Formgeschichte. C.H. Dodd (Exp. T. Vol.XLIII. March, 1932) suggested that it "is perhaps best rendered 'Form-Criticism'" and this has been followed by Vincent Taylor and most other British and American New Testament scholars, though some prefer 'Form-History'.

Professor Cullmann, "his two concerns - philological and historical examination of the text, and determination of its theological content only after stripping away all pre-judgments imported into the text from outside - that make him one of the most eminent of the founders of the so-called formgeschichtliche method of research into the Gospels."¹

The most lucid explanation of the beginnings of Formgeschichte and of K.L. Schmidt's role in its development in relationship to Dibelius and Bultmann, is that given by Professor Philipp Vielhauer of the New Testament chair in Bonn University in a lengthy tribute to Dr. Schmidt which appeared in 1968 as part of a Festschrift for the jubilee (150 years) of the University.²

"Schmidt's main work," writes Professor Vielhauer, "his dissertation for a lecturership - Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu. Literarkritische Untersuchungen zur ältesten Jesusüberlieferung - which was presented to the Berlin Theological Faculty in 1917 and which was published in 1919, is one of the three basic works of Formgeschichte research. A few months earlier the short, programme-setting book which gave this line of research its name, Die Formgeschichte des

¹ op.cit. p.3. Similarly also his brief biography of K.L. Schmidt in RGG.

² "Karl Ludwig Schmidt." Philipp Vielhauer. In Beiträge zur Geschichte der Wissenschaften in Bonn (150 Jahre Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität zu Bonn 1818-1968). 1968.

Evangeliums by Martin Dibelius, appeared, and in 1921 there followed Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition by Rudolf Bultmann. Questions of priorities are idle here. The Formgeschichte ideas 'were in the air.' They applied to the New Testament the principles of forms and types which Hermann Gunkel had employed in his studies of Old Testament literature. Schmidt, like Dibelius and Bultmann, had been a student of Gunkel's. He had also heard Dibelius as a young lecturer and knew Dibelius's earlier work which was already taking shape along Formgeschichte lines. Nevertheless both books are completely independent of one another and are, in addition, so different in content and execution that they are in no wise in competition with one another and there is no basis for any question of priority. While Dibelius analysed single sections of the synoptic tradition according to their form, and confined himself to selection of that material, Schmidt investigated the topographical and chronological framework in which the history of Jesus is told, examining the inner coherence and connections of what is reported, and carrying this out for all three Synoptic gospels. The two works complement one another. It is true that Schmidt's book, unlike those of Bultmann and Dibelius mentioned above, went into no new editions during the lifetime of the author. Formgeschichte concentrated mainly on the single sections. It was not until 1964 that an unaltered photographic reproduction of it

appeared, as Formgeschichte research began to turn its attention to the framework, i.e. the composition of the individual gospels, as a formgeschichtliche factor of great significance, thereby taking up anew in systematic form the content of Schmidt's initial work. Schmidt would hardly have been aware of this subsequent effect of his work, for by the time of the appearance of the first book along this line, the one on the theology of St. Luke by Hans Conzelmann,¹ he was already seriously ill."²

I must admit to a special interest in Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu as I had the good fortune to study under Professor K.L. Schmidt in Bonn and later made his book the basis of a chapter in the thesis I presented for the Oxford B.Litt. degree in 1934.³ The impressive feature of the Rahmen is the enormous wealth of scientific, objective, analytical detail with which the material is examined. It is only later, from the results of such careful examination, that Dr. Schmidt draws his conclusions that the Synoptic Gospels, far from being historical biographies or literary artistic creations, are composed essentially of short, unconnected,

¹See p. 32 below.

²op.cit. p.192.

³"The Structure of the Gospel according to St. Mark approached from the Standpoint of Formgeschichte."

undated and unlocalised, independent incidents and sayings. In his own words - "Mark's presentation is not a necklace of loosely strung pearls into which a few more can now and then be inserted. It is rather a heap of unstrung pearls, though a few here and there may be sticking together."¹

Wellhausen had already maintained some years earlier that "Mark gives no history of Jesus. There is no chronology and no connected thread. Details of place also leave much to be desired. Mark only collects and sets in order loose sections, stories and sayings, and gives them in three main divisions, i.e. i. Capernaum (Galilee); ii. (a) Wanderings and (b) the Way to Jerusalem; iii. The Passion."² Schmidt, through his most detailed analysis of the connections, forward and backward, of the individual sections in Mark, carefully comparing this with the methods used by Matthew and Luke, also concludes that the order of stories and incidents is not at all certain. We cannot be sure for instance, he says, whether or not Jesus called his disciples before his ministry in Capernaum. The healing of the leper that comes in here is not fixed as regards time and place, and the most we can say about Mk.1:14-45 is that these stories seem somehow to have been anchored to

¹ op.cit. p.281. Hugh Anderson refers to this in his Jesus and Christian Origins, a Commentary on Modern Viewpoints. 1964. pp. 31, 155.

² Das Evangelium Marci. J. Wellhausen. 1909 (2nd. ed.) p.8.

Capernaum and neighbourhood and possibly all belong to the same period. From this and numerous other similar examples, Schmidt concluded that Mark was clearly not interested in chronology, topography or psychology, save as these more or less unconsciously occur in his definite plan and in his telling of the story, and in the tradition place and time data may equally have fallen out or have come in at different times. On the positive side, however, this shows that the Evangelists did not tamper with a historically genuine chronology and framework.¹

Mk.2:23-28 K.L. Schmidt describes as a 'model' example of a story undefined as to time and place.² 'Sabbath' and 'cornfield' come into the story, but which Sabbath, which cornfield, which region even, is not told, and there is no necessary connection with the previous pericope. Some MSS add the usual connective $\pi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\iota\nu$ to give a chronological link. One unique point is that the time of the year is indicated in this pericope as being that of harvest, i.e. some time between April and June - "the sole reliable calendar notice in the Synoptic tradition apart from the Passion story."³ It is

¹ op.cit. p.50f.

² ibid. p.89 - "ein Musterbeispiel."

³ op.cit. p.90. So also Wellhausen - "The time is after Easter; we have here the only definite note of the season in the Gospel." op.cit. p.22.

important for the question of the length of Jesus's ministry. Without Mk.2:23 the Synoptic Gospels would not necessarily cover a period of more than three to five months. But Mark obviously lays no weight on this indirect time notice. If he knows the real length of the ministry, he is evidently not interested in giving it.

The cumulative effect of such detailed analysis of the Synoptic Gospels can in part be appreciated by observing that in Mark $\pi\rho\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\iota\upsilon$ occurs as a connecting link between pericopes 28 times and $\epsilon\upsilon\theta\upsilon\varsigma$ 42 times. Otherwise section after section is simply connected by $\kappa\alpha\iota$.¹ The great exception is the Passion narrative which "calls for a different literary evaluation. It is the only section of the Gospels which records exact place and time data, even down to the day and hour."² It provides a continuous connected story whose aim and purpose is clear from start to finish. Where, in the rest of Mark, the single sections of the earliest written tradition grew out of the need of preaching and worship and mission or, on occasion, possibly out of pure story-telling interest, here in the Passion narrative many of the stories "have neither

¹ ibid. p.781. In his Index (p.319) Schmidt lists the main pericope introductory words. In addition to the above-mentioned three, $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$, $\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\hat{\iota}\theta\epsilon\iota\upsilon$ and $\tau\omicron\tau\epsilon$ also occur frequently.

² Rahmen. p.303.

cultic nor apologetic motive."¹ It resembles a lectio continua to be read in worship. "Only as a whole is it able to answer the question that continued to arise in the missionary age of the Church: how could Jesus have been brought to the cross by a people so blessed with his signs and wonders?"² From a literary point of view the text shows all the signs of having been fixed from a very early date. "For the oldest congregation (Gemeinde) which, soon after Jesus' death, set down his Martyr's-story, 'the history of what took place was apologetics enough in itself'".³ Vielhauer observes that later critics did not follow this conclusion of Schmidt's.⁴ They maintain that apologetic and Christological motives permeate the Passion narrative also. Schmidt's literary-critical work, however, uncovers a tradition of a quite non-literary kind, not controlled by individual whim but by laws and forms inherent in their very life as the tradition of a definite community.⁵

¹ ibid. p.305.

² ibid.

³ ibid.

⁴ op.cit. p.196.

⁵ cf. Das Formgeschichte Problem des Neuen Testaments.
L. Köhler. 1927. p.24.

Much earlier, scholars like Wrede,¹ Schweitzer,² and Streeter,³ had drawn attention to the 'vignettes', brief conversations, and single scenes that largely make up the Synoptic Gospels. Indeed, as long ago as 1800 or so, according to Professor W.G. Kümmel, Herder had anticipated some of the distinctive features of Formgeschichte when he wrote - "The Gospel was there before any one of our gospels was written ... This Christianity did not begin with the writing of gospels, but with the proclamation of past and future things, with exegesis, teaching, consolation, admonition, preaching. . . . The Gospel as a whole consisted of individual sections, of narratives, parables, sayings, pericopes."⁴ Burkitt, while maintaining that it was quite possible Mark could have obtained for his Gospel from Peter, added - "but there is nothing to make us suppose that the general plan of the work comes from St. Peter, or that the first half of it should be regarded as more than a collection of anecdotes, arranged only in approximate chronological sequence."⁵ However, K.L. Schmidt's

¹The Origin of the New Testament. W. Wrede. 1909.

²The Quest of the Historic Jesus. A. Schweitzer. 1910.

³Studies in the Synoptic Problem. B.H. Streeter. 1911.

⁴Das Neue Testament, Geschichte der Erforschung seiner Probleme. W.G. Kümmel. 1958. pp.95f.

⁵The Earliest Sources for the Life of Jesus. F.C. Burkitt. 1922. p.93.

Rahmen in its new approach and thoroughness was to become, and still remains, a standard work for the study of the structure of the Synoptic gospels. Since the wealth of detail and its cumulative effect do not register their full weight in any summary, it is a book that richly repays time spent upon it.¹

Many other scholars have followed K.L. Schmidt's main conclusions, though there is a far wider divergence of opinion as regards the merits of Formgeschichte proper. Commenting on the fact that the Gospel record "only professes to cover the short period of the active ministry," E.F. Scott goes on to say - "Even of this it preserves no more than a few disjointed anecdotes, of which the sequence and often the true import, are quite uncertain."² "With the Gospel of Mark before us," V. Taylor says, "it is impossible to deny that the earliest tradition was largely a mass of fragments."³ It is also possible that the Jewish lack of biographical interest, in contrast to the Greek and Roman partiality for it, as Streeter suggests, played a part in the formation of the Gospels.⁴ At any rate, from an investigation of the results

¹It has not been translated into English, unfortunately.

²The Gospel and its Tributaries. E.F. Scott. 1928. p.49.

³The Formation of the Gospel Tradition. V. Taylor. 1933. p.38.

⁴The Four Gospels. B.H. Streeter. 1924. p.496.

of Formgeschichte, and particularly K.L. Schmidt's Rahmen, Bishop Rawlinson concluded "that it is just the framework and the arrangement of the materials in our Gospels which ought to be set down to the account of the Evangelists, the materials themselves being derived from tradition."¹

C.H. Dodd questions some of these 'results'. In an article on "The Framework of the Gospel Narrative" he writes - "Professor Schmidt seems to have made out his case that the main stuff of the Gospel is reducible to short narrative units, and that the framework is superimposed upon these units. But it seems worth while to inquire whether the order in which the units appear is indeed quite arbitrary, and the framework nothing more than an artificial construction of the Evangelist."² Schmidt admits that there are already blocks of material discernible in Mark's Gospel, and that Mark's 'editorialising' is often very difficult to trace exactly. Dodd therefore suggests that "if you have in hand a set of pictures, and desire to frame them, you construct a frame to fit the pictures; but if you have in hand a set of pictures and a frame, not designed to fit one another, you must fit them as best you can, and the result may be something of a botch. Thus it seems

¹The Gospel according to St. Mark. A.E.J. Rawlinson. 1925.

²New Testament Studies. C.H. Dodd. 1953. p.3. The article originally appeared in the Exp.T. Vol.XLIII. June, 1932.

likely that in addition to materials in pericope form, Mark had an outline, itself also traditional, to which he attempted to work, with incomplete success."¹ Dibelius had pointed to summary outlines of the life of Jesus embedded in the kerygma. Mark, Dodd suggests, with three kinds of material before him - (1) isolated independent pericopae; (2) larger complexes; (3) an outline of the whole ministry - effected "a compromise between a chronological and a topical order." Thus "we need not be so scornful of the Marcan order as has recently become the fashion, though we shall not place in it the implicit confidence it once enjoyed. It is in large measure, as Professor Schmidt argues, the result of the Evangelist's own work, rather than directly traditional. But he did that work not arbitrarily or irresponsibly, but under such guidance as he could find in tradition. It is hazardous to argue from the precise sequence of the narrative in detail; yet there is good reason to believe that in broad lines the Marcan order does represent a genuine succession of events, within which movement and development can be traced."²

In an article written a few months earlier, dealing with the rise of Formgeschichte, Dodd assessed Dibelius's tendency as "at least relatively positive," Bultmann's as

¹op.cit. p.9.

²op.cit. p.11.

"almost fiercely negative," and adds - "The judgment of Karl Ludwig Schmidt seems the soberest." Of Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu he goes on to say - "The school of Formgeschichte has not, I think it must be admitted, as yet produced a work of really first-class quality (unless we except K.L. Schmidt's book, which is rather preparatory to Formgeschichte.)."¹

T.W. Manson has been much more critical of K.L. Schmidt's book. In his article "The Life of Jesus: some tendencies in present-day research," one of a series of studies in honour of C.H. Dodd,² he held that Form Criticism had become mixed up with two other things. "One was K.L. Schmidt's full-scale attack on the Marcan framework; the other was the doctrine of the Sitz im Leben."³ The view that Mark was "putting together a random assortment of disconnected anecdotes," he said, "is difficult to believe as literary history."³ The existence of the Gospel itself was clear evidence that people wanted more than disconnected stories. Furthermore why should details such as are found in the individual stories have been remembered and the general outline forgotten?

¹"Present Tendencies in the Criticism of the Gospels."
C.H. Dodd. Exp.T. Vol.XLIII. March, 1932.

²The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology.
Edited by W.D. Davies and D. Daube. 1956. Dr. Manson's
article is No.11 in Part II.

³op.cit. p.212.

Our experience of remembering, he said, usually takes the pattern of - first the main course of events in their proper order, then vivid recollections of outstanding experience and incidents that fit into this order. "Prolonged study of Mark goes to confirm this a priori probability." Mark's framework "has as good a title to be considered reliable historical material as any particular anecdote incorporated in it."¹

Mark chapters 1 to 10, Jeremias suggests, already "are a secondary structure, not as is frequently maintained, of individual stories and sayings, but of separate blocks of traditional material loosely connected together, but without a continuous chronological or topographical coherence."² The chapters 1-10 thus offer a marked contrast to Mk.11 onwards which presents a compact, coherent Passion narrative, showing that this narrative must represent a very early block of Gospel tradition. This is entirely in accord with the conclusions I drew regarding the formation of Mk.2:1 - 3:6 and Mk.11:15 - 12:40.³ Jeremias, indeed, draws attention to the collection of controversy stories in Mk.12 as well as to the

¹op.cit. p.213.

²The Eucharistic Words of Jesus. J. Jeremias. 1960. (E.T. 1966). p.90.

³See p. 19 above.

eschatological saying in Mk.13, as being previously formed blocks, and adds - "It is characteristic of all the various blocks of tradition in Mark that they are only loosely connected to the whole."¹

Schmidt himself underlined the conclusions arrived at in his Rahmen in an article on "The Position of the Gospels in the general History of Literature" stressing the difference between 'literary' creations and 'popular' gospels.² "Short stories and easily remembered sayings handed on for practical reasons stand for the Gospel material as single sections," he says. "Collections, framework and interpretation stand for the Gospels as wholes."³ Overbeck had pointed out as early as 1882 that the Gospels "have neither ancestors in classical literature nor descendants in later Christian literature but represent a genuine Christian creation and belong to the category of 'Christian Urliteratur'", but his insight was largely ignored until Dibelius and Schmidt took it up afresh.⁴ Previous to

¹ op.cit. p.92.

² "Die Stellung der Evangelien in der allgemeinen Literaturgeschichte" in Eucharisterion (Part 2). K.L. Schmidt. 1923.

³ op.cit. p.65.

⁴ Vielhauer. op.cit. p.196. Ueber die Anfänge der patristischen Literatur. Franz Overbeck. In Historische Zeitschrift. 48. 1882.

that, from the time of Justin Martyr on, the Gospels had been compared to the works of Xenophon, Diogenes Laertius, Thucydides, Polybius, as if by such comparison to heighten their historical worth. Schmidt's literary-critical work showed that the form of the Gospels was unknown in classical literature, that they were not 'literature' in the classical sense at all, but 'Kleinliteratur,' i.e. folk-writings based on oral tradition.¹ Though, following Bultmann, he could write - "The Gospels are cultic folk-books or also folk cult-books"² - he nonetheless evaluated the Gospel tradition "astonishingly positively".³ More than the stricter Formgeschichte approach, his views are in line with recent study of the gospels which, in the words of R.H. Fuller, "has tended toward a greater appreciation of the evangelists as creative theologians in their own right; each offers his distinctive interpretation of the traditions with which he worked."⁴

¹Schmidt. op.cit. p.125f.

²ibid. p.124. "Die Evangelien sind kultische Volksbücher oder auch volkstümliche Kultbücher."

³Vielhauer. op.cit. p.199.

⁴The New Testament in Current Study. R.H. Fuller. 1963. p.85. He also recalls "that eccentric Jewish scholar, Robert Eisler, remarking in a conversation at Oxford in 1940 that he did not like the form critics because they were 'socialists' - they thought the gospels were the anonymous products of the communities - and Eisler for his part was a rugged individualist!" (p.85).

This, Fuller continues, is "the latest of a whole series of developments in the past thirty years which has diminished the formerly wide gap between the synoptics and the fourth gospel." The rest of Fuller's chapter on "Synoptic Studies" gives an admirable review of the trends in the years 1941-62, dealing especially with Marxsen and Robinson on Mark, Hans Conzelmann on Luke, and Bornkamm on Matthew.¹

K.L. Schmidt's work left its imprint on a whole epoch of New Testament scholarship. Interestingly enough, what he wrote usually began from his asking very simple questions. The starting-point of Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu, for example, lay in asking - 'In which places and how long did Jesus exercise his public ministry?' It is not just a question of the topography and chronology of the Gospels not matching. For him the question was - Is there a topography, a chronology?

The answers are many and varied. "Form criticism has been accepted in Germany," says Heinz Zahrnt in his review of dialectical theology and form criticism.² "One may confidently venture to say that in Germany no New Testament study is conceivable without it. This is not, however, the case in

¹Der Evangelist Markus. W. Marxsen. 1956. The Problem of History in Mark. James M. Robinson. 1957. The Theology of St. Luke. Hans Conzelmann. 1960. Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew. G. Bornkamm (et al.). 1963.

²The Historical Jesus. Heinz Zahrnt. 1960. (Eng. Ed. 1963). pp.66f.

other countries, particularly in England."¹ Be that as it may, the likelihood is that K.L. Schmidt would be made an exception. William Manson does not mention him, though he (Manson) assembles a powerful array of arguments against Bultmann's claim that the Church "did not live by history. It did not preserve any real history."² This cannot be deduced from 'form' alone, as Fascher and E.F. Scott pointed out.³ "The form alone permits no historical value-judgments."⁴ Even more important, regarding the most valuable Formgeschichte emphasis on searching for the Sitz im Leben of any section or saying, Fascher makes the observation - "It is remarkable but characteristic of Dibelius, and still more of Bultmann, that they look for the Sitz im Leben in the community and not in Jesus himself, i.e. they do not take the all-important step to the ultimate source."⁵

¹ op.cit. p.79.

² Jesus the Messiah (The Synoptic Tradition of the Revelation of God in Christ: with special Reference to Form Criticism). William Manson. 1943. p.26.

³ Die formgeschichtliche Methode. E. Fascher. 1924.
The Validity of the Gospel Record. E.F. Scott. 1938.

⁴ Fascher, op.cit. p.221.

⁵ op.cit. p.221.

T.W. Manson, who, as we have seen,¹ considered that the Sitz im Leben was not Form Criticism proper, strongly asserted that while it was good to investigate the interests, problems, and needs of the early Christians, that was very far from showing that the Gospels were created by the community. It was eminently conceivable that one of the chief motives for the preservation of the stories was "just plain admiration and love for their hero." Jesus was interesting to first century people for his own sake, just as he still is to twentieth century people. We need to look for a Sitz im Leben Jesu or a Sitz im Leben des jüdischen Volkes and not, automatically, a Sitz im Leben der alten Kirche.²

Uncompromising though his researches into our literary, historical and theological knowledge of the New Testament certainly were, K.L. Schmidt uncovered important and positive results. Even in the early stages of Formgeschichte he was on many points not wholly in agreement with Dibelius and Bultmann, especially in regard to their often extreme radical historical scepticism. He was wholly against Bultmann's later excursions into the realms of existentialism and against Bultmann's, to him unscientific and unwarranted, tendency to interpret the faith of the Gospels through the coloured spectacles

¹See p. 28 above.

²op.cit. p.214.

of modern, liberal, speculative philosophies. He would probably have been quite in accord with T.W. Manson's view that demythologising usually only produces the myth of a Jesus in the author's image.¹ Both certainly agreed on the step forward in New Testament research brought about by Formgeschichte. Manson called it one of "the two most outstanding developments of our own day," the other being Realized Eschatology.²

In 1921, at the age of 30, K.L. Schmidt became Professor of New Testament in the University of Giessen and taught there until 1925. From Giessen he went to the University of Jena and taught New Testament there until 1929. In 1929 he went to the University of Bonn where he held the New Testament chair until his expulsion by the Nazis in 1933.

Professor Vielhauer, who holds the same chair in Bonn at present, quotes K.L. Schmidt's own words in the biographical section of his essay on Schmidt on the occasion of the University's 150th. anniversary.³ The paragraph was written into the "Album Professorum" by K.L. Schmidt on 3rd. November, 1933, a week or two after his dismissal.

¹Manson, op.cit. p.216.

²op.cit. p.212. For detailed discussion of 'Realized Eschatology', see pp.169f. below.

³op.cit. p.190.

It has come about that only in these last days of mine in Bonn have I taken in hand, following the usual practice, to make my entry in the Album Professorum, My curriculum vitae can be found in the current Who's Who?; my academic works are listed in Kurschner's Gelehrten-Kalender. Only the highlights are mentioned here: b. 5/2/1891 in Frankfurt/Main as son of the shoemaker Anton Friedrich Schmidt. 1900-1909 Lessing High School (Gymnasium) in my home town. 1909-13 Student of classical philology and theology in Marburg and in Berlin. 1913 Theology licentiate. 1913-21 Assistant in the New Testament seminar of the University of Berlin. In between (1915/16) a soldier in Königsberg in Prussia, severely wounded in Russian Poland, in hospital in Küstrin; reserve (2nd.class) regiment. 1916 first theological examination in Berlin. 1917/18 assistant pastor. 1918 Thesis accepted in Berlin. 1921-25 full Professor in Giessen. 1925 Journey to the Near East. 1925-29 Professor in Jena. 1929-33 Professor in Bonn - 1918 married Ursula von Wegnern, daughter of Minister of State Martin von Wegnern, in Bückeburg, a descendant of Martin Luther. - 5 children. Member of the SPD (German Socialist

Party) since 1924. Dismissed from Government employment on the grounds of Paragraph 4 of the law on the 'Reconstruction of the Professional Services,' on the 15th. September, 1933.¹

Bonn Memories

It was in Bonn I met him and studied under him in 1931-32. Quiet and clear in his method of lecturing, often with a flash of unexpected humour, he was invariably open and friendly and available to his students. His fame may have been somewhat overshadowed by Karl Barth, whose lectures on dogmatics at that time in Bonn drew enormous crowds of students, even at 7 a.m. (in the summer semester), but Professor Schmidt was an equally familiar figure and his ever-ready, encouraging smile from behind his round glasses will be remembered by all who knew him.

In the course of these memorable months in Bonn, I had the opportunity of attending not only his New Testament lectures but also his seminars. These more informal sessions covered a wide area of ground in his particular field - detailed examination of the results achieved by Dibelius and Bultmann in their varied approaches to the problems through

¹ op.cit. p.190. To add to these laconic facts, Professor Vielhauer notes that he had additional valuable information from Dr. Schmidt's widow.

Formgeschichte, studies in his own Framework of the History of Jesus, consideration of the Synoptic problem, the Fourth Gospel, the Acts of the Apostles, the Pauline Epistles, Apocryphal writings, the Canon, later Church developments.

Reference to this material, especially as it relates to the doctrine of the Church, is set out at greater length in the following chapters. At this point it is enough to note that he always presented careful and exact etymological study of any word under discussion and that he always sought the objective, historical facts presented in the text, after all pre-judgments had been noticed and eliminated. This brought him back again and again to consideration of the earliest Christian community, the Urgemeinde. The early Church was not an inventing machine, he was fond of saying. From the very start its message, its κήρυγμα, was a historical proclamation. It was Christology not mythology. The important point was not so much the 'form' of a particular saying or incident, but rather WHO spoke thus, WHO acted thus.

This was further borne out in a private conversation I had with him on the 13th of May, 1932. It was not long after I had become enrolled in his current course of lectures, and he was kind enough to take time to listen and reply to my questions as to the main lines of his thinking on Formgeschichte and on the Church, as of that date.

Fortunately I made notes of our talk immediately afterwards

and can still recall his keen intelligence and quiet confidence. Several times he referred to the Messiahship of Jesus and how the Gospels at every point presuppose this. Indeed, the crucial point always to keep in mind, he insisted, is that they were written AFTER the Resurrection. Without that central fact there would have been no Gospels. The disciples had all fled in fear.

He went on to refer to his articles in RGG, dealing especially with the Gospels as non-literary 'popular' writings (Kleinliteratur) and with the person and significance of Jesus, the Christ. I remember he did not think much of the psychological-philosophical approach to these questions favoured by some theologians, Goguel being one he instanced. They tend to be far too psychological, he said. They know too much.

Dr. Schmidt certainly could never be accused of that. He was always open, open to people, to ideas, open to listen and learn. He had numerous links abroad and was keenly interested in all that I could tell him of the theological and Church situation in Scotland.

During these years he was editor of the important Theologische Blätter monthly, from its inception in 1922 and indeed until 1937. It was this monthly that carried the report of his discussion with Martin Buber in Stuttgart, in January 1933, on the subject of "Church, State, People, Jewry,"

which is taken up in more detail later.¹ He also contributed authoritative articles - for instance, "Jesus Christus" and "The Lord's Supper in the New Testament" - to the standard theological lexicon Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart.² Later, in Switzerland, he became chief editor of the Basel Theological Faculty's bi-monthly Theologische Zeitschrift which he was to edit until 1952 when illness struck him down. Professor Cullmann, perhaps the closest of his Basel colleagues, described him as a "born editor." "He was the born, scholarly editor," he wrote, "not only because of his organisational thoroughness, which he would sometimes, with a touch of self-irony, describe to his friends as pedantry (how annoyed he could get over a printing error, for instance!), but above all because of his openness, his ability to establish links far and wide, and, not least, because of his courage in rejecting unsuitable material."³

The publication in 1927 of his long article "The Church of Early Christianity" marks a new phase in the direction of his thinking and from then on he dealt more with the problem

¹"Zwiesgespräche im Jüdischen Lehrhaus in Stuttgart am 14. Januar 1933" on "Kirche, Staat, Volk, Judentum." Theologische Blätter. September 1933. Referred to in Die Judenfrage im Lichte der Kapitel 9-11 des Römerbriefes. 1942. p.69. See below - pp.312 f.

²RGG.

³Cullmann. op.cit. p.6.

of the Church. The article appeared in a 'Festgabe' or symposium he organised and edited in honour of the 60th birthday of his former professor and friend in Berlin, Adolf Deissmann. It is taken up in detail in a later chapter here.¹

Further light on his thinking about the Church comes from his notable contributions to the Kittel dictionary of the New Testament, work which he began in Bonn. Gerhard Kittel, a contemporary of K.L. Schmidt's, had started his project for a major, new Theologisches Wörterbuch zum neuen Testament in 1928 and the first thick volume appeared in 1933 covering words beginning with the first three letters of the Greek alphabet, α to γ.² For this, Dr. Schmidt wrote articles on ἀκροβυστία, ἀπωθέω, ἀσφαλεία (and its associated words) and his major article on βασιλεία (τοῦ Θεοῦ).

Unquestionably the greatest of his articles is the one he wrote for Volume III (Θ - Κ) on the word ἐκκλησία. This is such an important source for his thinking on the Church that it is examined in detail in a later chapter.³ As in the case of his The Framework of the History of Jesus, it is quite impossible to convey the cumulative effect of the

¹Die Kirche des Urchristentums. (See pp. 124 f. below).

²Kittel, who died in 1948, saw four volumes published in his lifetime, bringing the dictionary up to the letter Nu. (See next chapter).

³See pp. 56 f. below.

vast amount of the material provided and of the conclusions reached by examination of it, by a summary. It is a book in itself, a key volume for a real understanding of the nature of the Church.

Further contributions from him include the articles on the words διαφορά, ἔθνος, θεμέλιος (etc.) θρησκεία (etc.), κείω, καλέω (and its several derivatives including ἐκκλησία), κολλάω, κύμβαλον, ὀρίζω (etc.), πτάω, πυγή, πυκτεύω.

Two other articles, one on πάροικος, παροικία, παροικέω, the other on παχύνω, παρώ, τλήρος (etc.), are of special interest since they were written in collaboration with his son, Dr. Martin Anton Schmidt, now Professor of Medieval Church History at his father's former university, Basel.¹ It is of special interest also, in that, written after his finding refuge in Switzerland, the παροικία, denoting in the Old Testament the state, position or fate of an alien living abroad without citizen or native-born rights, denoting in the New Testament the position of the Christian as an alien on earth since his real citizenship is in heaven, poignantly portrayed K.L. Schmidt's own position in this world. Again the article contains valuable material for his thinking about

¹This collaboration, writes Professor Martin Anton Schmidt in a letter to me in May 1968, "was solely due to the fact that when it was to go into print (1952 or 1953) my father was already ill, so he was not able to do the last revision, and I did it for him."

the Church of the New Testament which is "ἐκκλησία and παροιμία, or, rather, - as ἐκκλησία it is at once παροιμία."¹

This work of the Kittel dictionary was very close to his heart and Professor Cullmann reports that "it hit him especially hard when the publishers, under Nazi pressure, broke their contract with him, and following on his expulsion from Germany and after he had become a professor at the University of Basel, when he was deprived of his German citizenship in 1939, they refused him any further part in the work."²

Basel

In Switzerland, fortunately, the doors were open. He had in preparation a further article on the word πόλις and when he was invited by the Regents of Basel University, as "an ostentatious mark of honour for the banished foreigner,"³ to deliver the 'Rektoratsprogramm' address in the Autumn of 1939, his "lexikographische und exegetische Studie" was published by the University Press under the title The Polis in Church and World.⁴

¹TWNT. V. . . p.850.

²op.cit. p.5.

³Vielhauer. op.cit. p.191.

⁴Die Polis in Kirche und Welt. K.L. Schmidt. Rektoratsprogramm der Universität Basel für das Jahr 1939. Dr. M.A. Schmidt tells me that his father was "reinstated" as a contributor to the TWNT. after the end of the war, and it is from this time his contributions under ο and π date. His major article on πόλις should have appeared in the TWNT. but, like some other articles he had also finished in manuscript, ξένος for example, other scholars had already written on these words, and K.L. Schmidt did not insist on a strict return to the terms of his original contract.

From what he wrote in the Preface to this address some further biographical material comes to light.

"In 1933," he notes, "after being dismissed from my post as professor in my native Germany, I found a position and livelihood in Switzerland, first as a minister in the Church, and then again as Professor of New Testament. As one deprived of citizenship rights by the Third Reich, I can gratefully accept the opportunities afforded the foreigner, the ξένος, for here the foreign-ness, the ξενία, means not only far away, but near, /friendly hospitality."¹

He goes on to pay tribute to the Polis, or City State, of Basel and in a reference to his articles in the Kittel dictionary, mentions, in addition to the βασιλεία and ἐκκλησία articles, his related article on the word ἔθνος.

The Polis address, in printed form a brochure of over a hundred pages, follows the same general pattern as his other Kittel articles. After a very thorough-going etymological survey of the word, he examines its New Testament use, its use by the Apostolic Fathers, the early Christian apologists and Origen, its use in Hebrew and Greek as in Philo, Josephus and the Septuagint, its Greek and Roman legal and philosophic content, and he concludes with a section outlining the differences and the relationships between the three entities of

¹op.cit. Preface. p.V.

βασιλεία, ἐκκλησία, and πόλις.¹

It was in 1935, then, after two years as a parish minister in Lichtensteig in the Canton of St. Gallen, that Karl Ludwig Schmidt was made Professor of New Testament Theology at the University of Basel. For his inaugural lecture in 1936 he took as his subject the same theme of the relationship between Church and State that is also dealt with in the Polis address. In this lecture, entitled The Opposition of Church and State in the Congregation (Gemeinde) of the New Testament, he deals with many points of importance for his thinking about the Church.² One is the identity of Congregation and Church (Gemeinde und Kirche), the New Testament always using the same word, ἐκκλησία, for both. Another is the nature of the Church as a mystery, though never in a spiritualised or pietistic sense. These are in addition to a fuller development of the Church-State relationship. At the end he comes back to his much repeated thought of the New Testament/^{Church}as both ἐκκλησία and παροιμία.

From Basel he continued his work of editing Theologische Blätter (until 1937), and even with this and the extra work of

¹See pp. 242f., 56f., 182f. below.

²Das Gegenüber von Kirche und Staat in der Gemeinde des Neuen Testaments. The text of the lecture was printed in the January number (1937) of Theologische Blätter which Professor Schmidt had edited since 1922.

the beginning of a new professorship, he found time to produce a major address for a Christian student conference in Aarau on the question How does God speak to Modern Man?,¹ an address which is as relevant today as it was then.

"Religion," Dr. Schmidt pointed out, "whether as an idea or a reality, has no place in the Bible, either Old Testament or New. It (the Bible) speaks always of faith, faith in the sense of obedience to God. There are believing (i.e. obedient) people, and there are unbelieving (i.e. disobedient) people."² This is a basic factor in human experience. In New Testament (and Old Testament) times there were atheists, materialists, sceptics, cynics, mockers, just as there are today. That is not new, far less modern. The messengers of the Gospel, sent out into all the world since the days of Jesus Christ on earth, were quite well aware of the differences and divisions between individuals and races. Yet they dared to bring ALL men the same Gospel - the message of judgment and salvation in Jesus Christ, i.e. a message of God becoming flesh in the person of the Jew, Jesus of Nazareth."³ The Church has always had to proclaim Jesus as Messiah against all forms of Ersatz

¹Theologische Blätter. No.6. June 1936.

²op.cit. p.132.

³op.cit. p.131.

religions which would depersonalise, collectivise, mythologise, or otherwise pervert God's truth and God's action, Dr. Schmidt told the students. 'Modern man' is an abstraction. Actual, individual men live in need, with fear and with joy, with labour and with leisure, and with death. It is to this man, through word and sacrament, that God speaks.

In 1937 he was in Copenhagen. Over a period of four days, 21st to 24th September, in the University there he delivered a series of lectures under the general title The Problem of Primitive Christianity.¹ These covered a wide range of New Testament study - the basis, aim and limits of the Formgeschichte method; Jesus of Nazareth, Messiah and Son of Man; the Trinitarian God, subject and object of faith; Kingdom, Church, State and People, relations and contrasts.²

Here again, although only the last of these four lectures deals directly with the subject of the Church as such, the series provides many insights into his thinking about the Church as, for instance, when in the opening lecture on Formgeschichte he is speaking about the limitations of the method. "The Christian community," he says, "is doubtless a collective

¹Le problème du christianisme primitif.

²The first two lectures were printed in the Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie religieuses of January/February 1938, the two last in March/April 1938. They also appeared in book form in a Paris edition, 1938.

entity which can be studied sociologically as such. But when it comes to the question of the Church of Christ, the People of God in Jesus Christ - which is what the ἐκκλησία θεοῦ claims to be in its quality as σῶμα Χριστοῦ - to try to grasp it in a purely sociological manner is not enough and ends up causing errors."¹

These lectures appeared in the University of Strasbourg's theological bi-monthly Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie religieuses, and I must here record my grateful thanks to Professor Martin Anton Schmidt for very generously giving me his own copies of his father's lectures in French. The same journal some months earlier published a smaller study, also related to the problem of the Church, entitled Ministry and Ministries.²

During the years of the second world war, in addition to his regular courses of New Testament lectures in Basel University and all his other activities, he produced two booklets for a series of Theological Studies edited by Karl Barth, who was now also a professor at Basel, and a series of six radio talks on the Book of Revelation.³ The first of the

¹op.cit. p.19.

²Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie religieuses. 1937.
(See p.247f. below).

³Aus der Johannes-Apokalypse dem letzten Buch der Bibel. 1946.

booklets he called Going through Galatians, explaining in the introduction that such a 'tour' meant being guided by the author (of the Epistle) on the one hand, and giving guidance to the reader on the other hand.¹ The second dealt with a very relevant problem for those years - The Jewish Question in the Light of Romans 9-11, reference to which has already been made.²

The radio talks, ranging over the apocalyptic descriptions of Christ as Lion and Lamb, of the Four Horsemen, of the Number 666, of the fall of Babylon, of the heavenly Jerusalem, has one section, the fifth talk of the series, on the Church. In this he again underlines the true meaning of ἐκκλησία and how in it all are one in Christ Jesus. Even the last enemy, death, will be overcome.³

These talks, delivered in 1944, were dedicated to his mother for her 80th birthday which fell on the 10th of July. In the third printing (1946) however, he had to add that they were also in memory of his mother as she died in Frankfurt on the 29th of August 1945.

¹Ein Gang durch den Galaterbrief. Vol.11/12 of "Theologische Studien", edited by Karl Barth, 2nd Edition, 1947. (See pp.302f. below.)

²Die Judenfrage im Lichte der Kapitel 9-11 des Römerbriefes. Vol.13 in the above-mentioned series. This is an expanded version of an address given on the 16th of November 1942 to the Swiss Evangelical Mission (Hilfswerk) in aid of the Confessing Church in Germany.

³See further p.322 below.

A "Born Editor"

In the years after the war his literary output falls roughly into three sections. From 1945 on until his last illness he was chief editor of the Basel theological Faculty's bi-monthly Theologische Zeitschrift, a large enough task in itself to occupy most of his time. In addition, however, his busy pen produced in 1946 an important paper for discussion organised by Emil Brunner and others on The Nature and Task of the Church in the World which took place in Romanshorn in September of that year.¹ The theme of which Dr. Schmidt spoke was - The Upbuilding of the Church with its Members as the 'Strangers and Pilgrims on the Earth' (Heb.11:13).² The title alone indicates the significance of this paper for his thinking regarding the Church. The third section includes writings on theological subjects for non-theological audiences. His radio talks on Revelation had shown his gift for expressing theological ideas simply and newspaper comment of the time bears this out.³ But in doing so he never waters down the

¹Wesen und Aufgabe der Kirche in der Welt. Verhandlungen des Schweizerischen reformierten Pfarrvereins vom 23-25 September 1946 in Romanshorn. Zwingli Verlag, Zürich. 1947.

²Die Erbauung der Kirche mit ihren Gliedern als den 'Fremdlingen und Beisassen auf Erden.' (Heb.11:13).

³The Basel National-Zeitung reported that he had "brought out of the New Testament Apocalypse's historical material the permanent and eternal truths and made them plain for our day," and described the style and content as a "really masterly performance." Aus der Johannes-Apokalypse. p.62.

content of the message or deviates from the fundamental, underlying, theological realities involved. In his Basel Academic Addresses this ability of his was manifest in those published under the title The Canonical and Apocryphal Gospels and Acts of Apostles (1944) and those under the title Lucifer. (1951).¹ Probably the most outstanding examples of this ability, however, are his articles in the Eranos year-books.

Eranos was the name for a circle of distinguished writers and intellectuals who met yearly in Ascona, largely through the initiative of C.G. Jung. Mathematics, Islam, the Renaissance, Goethe, biology, Patristic theology, Aristotle, Yoga, man, and dozens of other subjects came within their purview from 1933 on, including several papers from Dr. Jung himself on psychology. In 1945 the general theme was on 'Spirit' and for this meeting Dr. Schmidt's contribution was entitled The Holy Spirit as Person and as Charisma, and, as usual, he dealt with it as a study both in lexicography and in Biblical theology.² In 1946 he wrote on Natural Forces and Spiritual Forces in Pauline Perception and Faith;³ in

¹Die kanonischen und apokryphen Evangelien und Apostelgeschichten und Luzifer published later from K.L. Schmidt's Akademische Vorträge, Basel.

²Das Pneuma Hagion als Person und als Charisma. Eranos Jahrbuch, Vol.XIII, 1945.

³Die Natur- und Geistkräfte im paulinischen Erkennen und Glauben. ibid. Vol.XIV, 1946.



1947 on Homo Imago Dei in the Old and New Testaments;¹ and in 1950 (for Jung's 75th birthday) on Jerusalem - the Original and the Copy.² The 1945 article is the only one devoted entirely the Holy Spirit, though naturally numerous references to Him occur throughout Dr. Schmidt's other writings.

One final work deserves special mention as the only article by Dr. Schmidt to appear first in English and not in German, even although in its original form it was delivered in German in the Riehen church, a village near Basel. It was in 1948 that Professor Schmidt paid his only visit to Britain and delivered this address on The Proclamation of the Church to the Congregation before the theological faculties of Cambridge and Manchester Universities. It appeared in print in the first volume of the Scottish Journal of Theology.³

Throughout his life, as we have seen, he took part in so many things and had links with so many people that it all but renders a summary impossible. During his 18 years as Professor of New Testament Theology at Basel, he was Dean of the Faculty several times, took an active interest in numerous academic societies, and showed equally great interest in adult

¹Homo Imago Dei im Alten und Neuen Testament. *ibid.* Vol.XV, 1947.

²Jerusalem als Urbild. *ibid.* Vol.XVIII, 1950.

³Scottish Journal of Theology. Vol.I, 1948. See p.333 below.

education classes to which on many occasions he gave lectures and addresses. Professor Cullmann records how frequently he would be the centre of a lively discussion among professors of several different faculties between lectures in the common room, interspersing learned academic points with vivid, humorous stories and anecdotes. But he would be equally at home conversing on the street-car on his way from his home in Riehen to the University, invariably seeing someone he knew and wanted to talk to.¹ All these other activities, of course, were over and above his regular editorial work, lectures and seminars.

It was in the midst of his work in 1952 that he was suddenly laid low by a brain haemorrhage during a seminar and, although in his usual optimistic fashion he never gave up hope of a recovery, because of his illness he had to retire from the University in 1953. His illness, indeed was much more serious than he thought or than most people realised, since he was little given to complaining or even mentioning his own health and only sought medical advice as a rule when something was acutely wrong. So, without being able to lecture again or write any more, he died in 1956 at the comparatively early age of 65, a great loss to his family and friends, to the University, and to theology.

¹op.cit. p.7.

From his son, Professor Martin Anton Schmidt, I learned that owing to the sudden stroke there were several plans and projects regarding some of his central theological concerns that he was unable to complete. He was not accustomed to making preliminary sketches and outlines, however, so that when he came to the point of actually writing down his thoughts, the draft was usually very close to the final form. What rough notes did exist, he destroyed before his death so that very few papers and unpublished materials were left. For the development of his thought, therefore, we are dependent upon what he published during his lifetime, and though it remains unfinished like so many of our human plans, he has left us a rich heritage of great relevance for the present-day situation.

A scholar, a born editor, a fighter, above all (I would say) a friendly man, a man of wide ecumenical interests and an inspiring teacher, he had small patience with those who would lightly dismiss the past and scorn the work of their predecessors or go to extremes in support of some passing, 'with it' theory. He was so closely in touch with real life that he was never an ivory tower professor but always kept his feet on the ground. And for him the real ground was the New Testament. At every turn he went back to the Scriptures. It may well be, as others have noticed, that the course of his own life and experience gave him a special interest in the

Church not only as ἐκκλησία but also παροιμία, in the Christian as being a stranger and pilgrim on earth. But in his turning to the New Testament, surely he was no stranger to the deeper experience that made the verses he loved from the second chapter of Ephesians both a personal possession and a bringing together of his Lord and His Church through the Holy Spirit. In the words of St. Paul:

So then you are no longer strangers and sojourners, but you are fellow citizens with the saints and members of the household of God, built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Christ Jesus himself being the cornerstone, in whom the whole structure is joined together and grows into a holy temple in the Lord; in whom you also are built into it for a dwelling place of God in the Spirit. (Eph.2:19-22).

The Ekklesia Article

Among the writings of Karl Ludwig Schmidt, one of the most important sources for tracing the development of his thought regarding the doctrine of the Church is obviously his long and detailed article on the word ἐκκλησία in the Kittel Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. This authoritative German dictionary which was projected by Gerhard Kittel in 1928, and which is still in process of being completed - Vol. VII on the Greek letter Σ appeared in 1964 - is also appearing in English and Vol. III (Θ - κ) containing Dr. Schmidt's article became available in 1965.¹ It was published separately under the title The Church in this country in 1950.² The article, together with his four Copenhagen lectures on The Problem of Early Christianity delivered in 1937,³ brought

¹Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament edited by Gerhard Kittel. English translation edited by Dr. G.W. Bromiley, published by Wm.B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, Michigan. After Kittel's death in 1948, Professor Gerhard Friedrich of Erlangen took over as editor for Volumes V, VI and VII. Vol. IV in English appeared in 1967.

²The Church. K.L. Schmidt. Translated and edited by J.R. Coates. 1950. (See Eranos Jahrbuch. Special Vol. XVIII. p.213).

³Published in French in the Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie religieuses, Strasbourg. Nos. 1 and 2, 1938.

up-to-date his work on questions regarding the Church about which he had begun to write ten years earlier in his The Church of Early Christianity, a study which appeared in a symposium honouring his former Berlin professor Adolf Deissmann.¹

As usual, Dr. Schmidt begins with a careful and detailed study of the etymology of the word itself, that is to say, a study of the formation and sense development of ἐκκλησία from its verb καλέω. From its general Greek usage meaning assembly or gathering, it came in Christian usage to bear the more particular meaning we give to the word church. One important step in this process was the strong connection the early Christians maintained with Jewish history and tradition, and particularly with what was, for them in pre- New Testament days, the Scriptures, the Old Testament, especially in its Greek form - the Septuagint.² From the ordinary meaning of 'an assembly duly called or summoned,' in the LXX the word is

¹Die Kirche des Urchristentums in Festgabe für A. Deissmann. 1927.

²It would be hard to over-rate the importance of the Septuagint, the 'Bible' of the early Christian Church. "It may be said to have created a new form of Greek, which contributed to the formation of the idiom in which the Gospel was preached and the New Testament written, and the oldest Christian liturgy and theology worked out. The New Testament is a supplement to the Septuagint, not to the Hebrew Bible." (The Early Christian Church. Archbishop Philip Carrington. 1957. p.10). "We owe a great debt to Alexandrian Judaism for the preservation of this literature."

used to designate the Jewish congregation and thence, in the New Testament, the Church as a body of Christians. This New Testament usage covers both the Church as the whole body of believers, as for example, Eph.5:30 - "That is what Christ does for his body, the Church. And we are all members of that body," - and the church as an individual congregation, as in 1 Cor.16:19 - "Aquila and Prisca, together with the church in their house, send you hearty greetings in the Lord."¹

Dr. Schmidt closes this section with the very important observation that in choosing ἐκκλησία as the word to designate church, the New Testament avoids using a cultic word and uses instead an ordinary, secular Greek word. This secular usage (as he points out later in his article), meaning "a popular assembly", indeed appears in the New Testament in Acts 19 where the word ἐκκλησία is used to designate, not the church, but an assembly of silversmiths and others in Ephesus.

From the writings of Thucydides, Plato, Xenophon and others, as well as from numerous inscriptions, this 'popular assembly' usage covers the normal gatherings of the people in Athens and most Greek cities. The citizens are the usually summoned and called together by a herald. So, for the New Testament writers the analogy of God calling together

¹TWNT. III. p.503.

his people in Christ out of the world would be a quite natural one, even though the much stronger influence of the Old Testament and LXX background and usage made the choice the obvious one.¹

In the Old Testament (LXX) ἐκκλησία is practically synonymous with συναγωγή, and both words can, on occasion, signify the meeting place as well as the meeting or assembly. In Proverbs 5:14, for instance, (AV. - "in the midst of the congregation and assembly"; LXX - ἐν μέσῳ ἐκκλησίας καὶ συναγωγῆς) Dr. Schmidt points out that here are two terms obviously meaning the same thing. The Jewish compilers of the LXX, however, mostly translate the Hebrew בְּרַב by ἐκκλησία and this usage was naturally followed by the growing numbers of Greek-speaking Jewish Christians and all who had contacts with the Hellenistic synagogues and knew the LXX.² A clear-cut distinction through which ἐκκλησία equals the Christian Church and συναγωγή equals the Jewish synagogue developed only in later centuries. Derived from the verb ἰκκαλεῖν, which does not itself occur in the New Testament, ἐκκλησία

¹ TWNT. III. p.514.

² ἐκκλησία occurs about 100 times in LXX and almost always for בְּרַב. This is, in Dr. Schmidt's words, "a wholly secular term, 'Assembly'" (cf. Dt.9:10; 18:16; 1 K.8:65) though it can be qualified to mean a particular kind of assembly (cf. 'of the Lord' - Dt.23:2f.; Neh.13:1; Micah 2:5). LXX also uses the verb form ἰκκαλεῖν - to gather (Lev.8:3; Num.20:8; Dt.4:10 etc.)

could be taken to include the sense of being 'called out,' 'called forth,' though, of course, Dr. Schmidt continues, too great stress cannot be laid on this aspect. It would be legitimate, however, to describe the ἐκκλησία as "the group of men called out of the world by God," even if the literal translation says no more than "assembly (of God)".¹

F.J.A. Hort had pointed out earlier that there is no foundation for the idea of being 'called out' in the word ἐκκλησία itself, though the sense of it is quite Scriptural.² At any rate, his evaluation of the importance of the word is certainly in line with K.L. Schmidt's. "'Ecclesia' is the only perfectly colourless word within our reach," Hort writes, "carrying us back to the beginnings of Christian history, and enabling us in some degree to get behind words and names to the simple facts which they originally denoted."³

George Johnston, however, claims the support of Hort against Schmidt. "If etymology is to suggest any part of our interpretation," he writes, "we must deny at the outset the view of Deissmann,⁴ followed by K.L. Schmidt, that as

¹ TWNT. III. p.516.

² The Christian Ecclesia. F.J.A. Hort. 1898. p.5f.

³ op.cit. p.2.

⁴ Light from the Ancient East. A. Deissmann. 1927. (E.T.) p.112.

ἐκκλησία the Church is a community called out of the world by God," a point which "was made long ago by F.J.A. Hort."¹ Although this meaning is not present in the word itself, he goes on, it can nevertheless be deduced from the New Testament usage of the word 'world.' He also adds the important observation that "what ἐκκλησία emphasises is the purposiveness of the assembled community."²

Johnston's view is followed by Professor Geddes MacGregor. "A very useful study of the word ἐκκλησία has been made by Karl Ludwig Schmidt in his now well-known article in Kittel's Theological Dictionary of the New Testament," he notes. "Schmidt follows, however, a view that Deissmann expresses in a misleading fashion when he asserts an analogy between the primitive Christian use of ἐκκλησία and the use of the word Versammlung for 'congregation' by the 'Pietistic' folk in the valley of the Dill, to the south of Giessen."³

Since Schmidt is always careful to qualify any sense of being 'called out' of the world as far as the etymology of ἐκκλησία is concerned, however, the analogy hardly seems to apply. For him it was a question of the wide range of the

¹The Doctrine of the Church in the New Testament. George Johnston. 1943. p.35.

²op.cit. p.36.

³Corpus Christi. Geddes MacGregor. 1959. p.110.

word seeming to require more than one English (or rather German) word to cover its meaning properly. Dr. Schmidt suggests "church community."¹ Our own word 'church, like the German word 'Kirche', is derived almost certainly not from ἐκκλησία but from κυριακός meaning 'of the Lord' (κύριος). κυριακός occurs only twice in the New Testament, once in reference to the Lord's supper (1 Cor.11:20) and once in reference to the Lord's day (Rev.1:10).

Hoskyns and Davey, on the other hand, maintain that this derivation goes a long way to making the translation of ἐκκλησία by 'church' fairly acceptable. "It may be noted that the reproduction of the Biblical word ekklesia by the word church is almost entirely adequate," is their view. "Etymologically it is derived from the Greek kyriakon, meaning 'that which belongs to the Lord'. The word therefore rightly emphasises the primary significance which originally attached to the word ekklesia, and describes the Christians as a corporate body, who are the peculiar possession of God in the world. Moreover since the word church is in English a peculiar word used to reproduce ekklesia in the Authorised and Revised Versions of the New Testament, it has acquired the proper associations

¹TWNT. III. pp. 503 and 531.

from its context in the New Testament.¹ The word is, in fact, misleading only inasmuch as it has gathered other associations from later ecclesiastical history. But these can easily be corrected by referring it afresh to its scriptural setting."²

More easily said than done. As Brunner pointed out in his book The Misunderstanding of the Church, a great many of the 'developments' in ecclesiastical history were in fact 'transformations' of the original New Testament ekklesia.³ It is precisely here that a good many of the problems regarding the nature of the Church originate, and it is here that K.L. Schmidt's work, in its thorough etymological study and its seeking to correct every theory by reference to the scriptural setting, is so valuable and necessary.

¹The Riddle of the New Testament. Sir Edwyn Hoskyns, Bart., and Noel Davey. 1958. From the meaning of the word itself in contemporary New Testament, as in classical, Greek, to express "a gathering of citizens summoned, by a herald, from their homes into some public place," Hoskyns and Davey observe that "it would seem that Tyndale and Cranmer rightly substituted for Wycliffe's 'chirche' the more literal 'congregacion': yet, so unsatisfactory did their decision prove, that, before very long, it was reversed by the translators of the Authorised Version." (p.20f.) While the phrase, the ekklesia, used absolutely "is never once found in secular writings," the Septuagint "abounds in references to an ekklesia of God, or of the Lord." (p.21).

²op.cit. pp.25-26.

³The Misunderstanding of the Church. Emil Brunner. 1952. p.101.

It is interesting to note the close parallels between Dr. Schmidt's approach and some of the recent Roman Catholic writing concerning the Church. On the ekklesia, Father Hans Küng, in his book Structures of the Church¹ and again in his subsequent, larger volume The Church,² begins like Schmidt from the verb 'to call' and the calling of God revealed in the gospel of the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ. "Thus Christians are simply the 'called' (cf. Rom.1:6,7; 8:28; 1 Cor.1:2,24; Jude 1; Rev.17:14). Everyone is called, not as an individual, however, but as a member of the one people, of the one body: called in one body (Col.3:15), one body and one spirit (Eph.4:4). Thus all Christians constitute 'a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a purchased people; that you may proclaim the perfections of him who has called you out of darkness into his marvellous light. You who in times past were not a people, but are now the people of God.' (1 Pet.2:9f). Thereby all Christians in the Church share in the royal, priestly and prophetic office of Christ.

"It is in this sense, Father Küng continues, "that the word must be understood. As is well known in the New Testament the word, even apart from its profane use, encompasses a

¹Strukturen der Kirche. Hans Küng. 1965 (E.T.)

²Die Kirche. 1967. (E.T. 1968).

manifold and complex content of religious meaning. It can designate both the whole community of the people of the New Covenant redeemed through Christ and the local Christian community, the Christian household community, and especially the community assembled for worship. In all these different ways, however, ek-klesia means the community of the new people of God called out and called together. One was hardly aware any longer of the etymology, the $\epsilon\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\iota\alpha$, in that context. After all, one thought primarily in terms of the Old Testament. In the Septuagint $\epsilon\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\iota\alpha$ was used for the translation of the Old Testament key word בְּהַר or הַר יְהוָה . After the Jews, however, in their unbelief had rejected the cornerstone, the youthful, primitive community had to regard itself as the true people of God of the last days, as the true people of the Covenant that God had gathered together in Israel. The Old Testament people of God were now legitimately succeeded by the people of the Covenant, summoned and gathered together through the word of the gospel of Jesus Christ. Thus, according to the testimony of the Acts of the Apostles, the original community in Jerusalem was first called ekklesia: there the individual community and the whole community, the individual Church and the whole Church coincided. But soon there was also mention of the ekklesia in Judea, in Galilee, and in Samaria. Finally people spoke of ekklesiai, in the plural. Each individual ekklesia was a copy of the original

community, each represented the whole ekklesia."¹

Father Küng adds the important comment that "in the history of theology the Church as the assembled community of the faithful has been too often neglected in favour of the Church as institution."² This echoes to some degree O. Linton's evaluation of Sohm's work on the concept of the ekklesia.³ For Sohm the word ekklesia stressed the idea of the People's gathering. This was so in the Greek city state. Similarly in the LXX it stood for the People of Israel assembled before God. It is the same in the New Testament, Sohm held. The People of God included the whole of Christendom but even a house Church was the ekklesia. Ekklesia, therefore, "is not a social concept . . . but expresses solely a dogmatic value judgment,"⁴ an expression Linton says Sohm took over from Emil Schürer.⁵

Throughout his careful etymological study of ekklesia Dr. Schmidt is at pains to emphasise the fact that the Christian

¹op.cit. p.11. He develops these points in much greater detail in Die Kirche. pp.99f.

²op.cit. p.12.

³Das Problem der Urkirche in der neueren Forschung. O. Linton. 1932. p.50f. Kirchenrecht. R. Sohm. Vol.I. 1892.

⁴Linton. op.cit. p.51.

⁵Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi. Emil Schürer. 1886.

faith was never a 'cult', of which there were so many in those days. Christianity indeed stood out against all the cults and against the whole pagan world. Unlike the common cultic practice, for example, no attempt was made to form a title from the name Jesus. Only gradually did the name 'Christians' for his followers become usual and the word *χριστιανός*, a Latin formation, appears only three times in the New Testament (Acts 11:26; 26:28; 1 Pet.4:16).¹

ἐκκλησία in the New Testament

Occurring three times in Matthew (16:18; 18:17), the word itself is not found in the other three Gospels nor in 2 Timothy, Titus, 1 and 2 Peter, 1 and 2 John, and Jude. Even when the word itself is absent, however, as Dr. Schmidt pointed out in his earlier work on the subject entitled The Church of Primitive Christianity, the substance is often present.² In 1 Pet.2:5,9,10, for instance, we find several of the descriptions used in the Old Testament of the *ἐκκλησία*, such as *οἶκος πνευματικός*, *λαὸς Θεοῦ*, *γένος ἐκλεκτόν*, *βασιλείον ἱεράτευμα*, *ἔθνος ἁγίον*, *λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν*. The use of such expressions both within and outside the Canon,

¹TWNT. III. p.516.

²Die Kirche des Urchristentums by K.L. Schmidt in the symposium Festgabe für Adolf Deissmann, 1927. p.268.

is further proof that the root of the description of Christian people as an ἐκκλησία goes back to the history of Israel as the People of God, the assembly of God, the קהל , the ἐκκλησία Θεοῦ.

Owing to the disputed nature of the St. Matthew verses and to the special problems they raise, Dr. Schmidt leaves them to be dealt with later in his article and proceeds to consider ἐκκλησία in the Book of Acts.

In Acts (which, as we might expect, contains the major number of references - 24 - though 1 Cor. runs it close with 22) the plural is also used on occasion (15:41; 16:5) though not nearly as frequently as the singular.¹ The congregation in different places is called ἐκκλησία without any sense of precedence or correlation. There is no suggestion anywhere of a sum of ἐκκλησίαι producing the one ἐκκλησία. Rather it is, in the words of Hoskyns and Davies, "of the order of infinity."²

The reason for this they ascribe to the new factor - Christ. "The name 'ekklesia' can be given indiscriminately to the whole body of Christians, to local bodies of Christians, and even to smaller bodies of Christians within the local bodies. The corporate sense of ekklesia has not been lost in the

¹In the New Testament as a whole, out of the some 115 instances of the use of the word, 36 are in the plural.

²op.cit. p.25.

emphasising of the idea of calling. The word has been transformed to denote a body of men and women in which the unity of every part corresponds to, repeats, represents, and in fact is the unity of the whole. So ekklesia has one more association, which cannot be explained by its Old Testament history. The part is equal to the whole, because each part possesses, not a fragment of the Christ, but the whole Christ, and consequently, in accordance with the mathematical definition, the ekklesia is of the order of infinity."¹

Schmidt goes on to point out that the same word ekklesia is used both for the Jewish Christian congregation and for the Gentile congregation at Antioch. The word is never ornamented with qualifying adjectives and the only attribute that is attached to it is τῷ Θεῷ . The special nature of the ἐκκλησία is never left in doubt even when it is not specifically so described. "The congregation or Church of God always stands in contrast and even in opposition to other forms of society."²

Acts 19 contains the three highly interesting instances of ἐκκλησία used not as 'church, congregation, parish (Gemeinde)', but simply as an assembly or gathering. Demetrius a silversmith in Ephesus had gathered fellow workers and others in similar trades to discuss Paul's success "in

¹ibid.

²TWNT. III. p.505.

changing the minds of a great number of people by telling them that gods made by human hands are not gods at all." (v.26). In the ensuing uproar people rushed into the theatre, some shouting one thing some another so that this ἐκκλησία (v.32) was in confusion. When the town clerk had finally calmed them down he reminded them that the courts and magistrates were available if they wished to bring charges against anyone and that if anything beyond that was required it would have to be decided in legal, or duly constituted, ἐκκλησία (v.39). Then he dismissed the theatre ἐκκλησία . (v.40).

If, then, we hold strictly to the plain meaning of the word we should render it 'assembly' or 'gathering'. It is obvious, however, that through the development of the word's more particular connotations, it would be impossible, even if desirable, just to banish 'Church' or 'congregation'.

The important point is always who assembles and why - hence the addition of τοῦ Θεοῦ . "The ἐκκλησία of God, which he obtained with his own blood" (20:28), is how Paul describes it in his farewell message to the elders of Ephesus, warning them to be on their guard both for themselves and "for every flock over which the Holy Spirit has made you overseers." There is always this side of God assembling His own, just as it is true that "to the ἐκκλησία belong all those who are His," as Dr. Schmidt puts it. "For the assembly of God's people, however, size is of no account. It is in being when God gathers His own. How many there are depends first on the

One who calls and gathers it, and only then on those who answer the call and gather together. 'For where two or three are gathered in my name, there am I in the midst of them.' (Mt.18:20)."¹

Paul

The use of the word in the Pauline Epistles is very similar to the usage in Acts. There is no differentiation between Jewish and Gentile ἐκκλησία. Singular and plural are interchangeable. Often the place is named - the ἐκκλησία at Cenchrea (Rom.16:1), the ἐκκλησία of God at Corinth (1 Cor.1:2), the ἐκκλησία (plural) of Galatia (Gal.1:2), of Macedonia (2 Cor.8:1), the ἐκκλησία of the Thessalonians in God the Father and in the Lord Jesus Christ (1 Thess.1:1), the ἐκκλησία of God in Judaea in Christ Jesus (1 Thess.2:14).

¹ TWNT. III. p.505. Tertullian describes the process as Apostles going out to establish churches in every city "from which the other churches borrowed the shoot of faith and the seeds of doctrine, and are every day borrowing them so as to become churches. It is because of this that these churches are reckoned as apostolic, as being the offspring of apostolic churches. Every kind of thing must needs be classed with its origin. And so the churches, many and great as they are, are identical with that one primitive Church issuing from the Apostles, for thence they are all derived. So all are primitive and all apostolic, while all are one. And their unity is proved by the peace they share, by the title of 'brethren', by the mutual bond of hospitality; privileges which have no other ground than the one tradition of the same revelation." De Praescriptione Haereticorum, 20-21, in The Early Christian Fathers. H. Bettenson. 1956. p.190.

Very interesting among all these references and usages is the case of the house church which, however small, is equally an ἐκκλησία. In Romans 16:4, for instance, Paul records his gratitude and that of "all the ἐκκλησία of the Gentiles" to Priscilla and Aquila, adding greetings to "the ἐκκλησία in their house." This house ἐκκλησία is referred to again in I Cor.16:19 when Paul is recording greetings from the ἐκκλησία of Asia. Then there is the scarcely known Nymphas and the ἐκκλησία in his (or her?) house (Col.4:15). The fourth reference is in the letter to Philemon and to the "ἐκκλησία in thy house" (v.2).

What stands out is that "each community, however small, represents the total community, the Church." (cf. I Cor.1:2; 2 Cor.1:1).¹ Several of the references apply to the Church as a whole not just the local congregation, on the subject of women speaking in the ἐκκλησία (I Cor.14:34f.) for instance, or I Tim.5:16, on the relief of widows.

For Paul there was no distinction such as we make in speaking of the Church of God but not of the congregation of God. He adds τοῦ Θεοῦ after ἐκκλησία both with the singular and with the plural. (Dr. Schmidt lists nine passages.) Even when the words τοῦ Θεοῦ do not appear, they are implied and, indeed, have on occasion been written in, as can be seen

¹TWNT. III. p.506.

from comparison of different manuscript readings. The usage is closely parallel to the use of the word βασιλεία. In the New Testament, βασιλεία always means βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ, unless some earthly kingdom is expressly mentioned. Similarly "the One who is at work in and with the ἐκκλησία is always God."¹ In 1 Cor.12 for example, where Paul is describing the different gifts of the Spirit and the organic unity of believers as the body of Christ, he continues - "In the ἐκκλησία God has appointed first apostles, second prophets, third teachers, then workers of miracles, healers, helpers, administrators, speakers in various kinds of tongues." (v.28).

Since God acts in Christ, it is not surprising to find τοῦ Χριστοῦ after ἐκκλησία in Rom.16:16, ἐν Χριστῷ in Gal.1:22, and even τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ τῶν οὐσῶν ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ in 1 Thess.2:14. The ἐκκλησία, in short, signifies not just 'Christian Church' but the 'assembly of God in Christ.'

"The new thing about the ἐκκλησία τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, i.e. the fulfilment of the Old Testament prophecy of the new covenant, is given with the fact that a specific number of selected disciples of Jesus experienced the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead and received special authorisation thereby," writes Dr. Schmidt. "The divine assembly of the

¹ TWNT. III. p.507.

new covenant which was first constituted by the resurrection of Jesus Christ did not derive its claim or commission from the enthusiasm of pneumatics and charismatics. It derived it solely from a specific number of specific appearances of the risen Lord."¹

Now while this, a New Testament view of the Church's commission, provides a clear and definite historical basis for its existence, some recent New Testament scholars seem to see in the Church itself a more reliable basis for faith than the life, crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus Christ. Dr. Knox, for instance, goes so far as to assert that - "We need now to see that the Church's priority is not only epistemological, but actual; that the basic, objective, historical reality underneath, and presupposed in, all primitive confession - picture, kerygma or whatever else - and the actual carrier of all the meanings being confessed was the early Church; and that, in consequence, the only adequate way to define the Event (i.e. what Bultmann called the 'Christ-event') is to identify it with the Church's beginning. . . . The historical Event to which all distinctively Christian faith returns is not an event antedating the Church, or in any sense or degree prior to it, but is the coming into existence of the Church itself."²

¹TWNT. III. p.507-8.

²The Church and the Reality of Christ. John Knox. p.22f.

C.H. Dodd had written earlier - "A true historical perspective suggests that it would be nearer the truth to say that the kerygma, or the facts and beliefs involved in it, created the community than to say that the community created the kerygma. The Church formulated it, no doubt, but except upon the hypothesis that something happened of which the apostolic preaching gives an account, we can assign no adequate reason for the emergence of the Church."¹ Professor E.L. Mascall also draws attention to the question of the proper starting-point. In a lengthy refutation of Knox's reductionist theology, he says "'Testimony' (or 'eyewitness') and 'tradition' are factors of even greater importance (i.e. than the notion of the Church's 'memory'). Knox's neglect of them is due to his determination to take as his starting-point for theological reconstruction the experience of the primitive Church rather than the person and teaching of Jesus."²

¹History and the Gospel. C.H. Dodd. 1938. pp.77-8.

²The Secularisation of Christianity. E.L. Mascall. 1965. p.265. An additional pointed protest against highly arbitrary and subjective selection of biblical evidence can be found in a 'lay' source in the words of C.S. Lewis when he wrote, in his essay on "Modern Theology and Biblical Criticism", - "A theology which denies the historicity of nearly everything in the Gospels to which Christian life and affections and thought have been fastened for nearly two millennia . . . if offered to the uneducated man can produce only one or other of two effects. It will make him a Roman Catholic or an atheist. What you offer him he will not recognise as Christianity." (Christian Reflections. C.S. Lewis. 1967. p.153).

In his review of the literature on the early Church, books from circa 1880 to 1930, O. Linton shows that Hatch¹ and Harnack,² and many scholars who followed their views, traced the gradual development of the Church from elements already present in human society and stressed the charismatic character of the Apostolate.³ Kattenbusch,⁴ he says, as against Karl Holl,⁵ traced the authority of apostles not to appearances but to roots in the life of Jesus where it concerned the Twelve.⁶ In the thirties, as has already been mentioned,⁷ Linton points to the growing centrality for New Testament scholars of the question of the Church, and the shift in

¹The Organisation of the Early Christian Churches. E. Hatch. 1881.

²What is Christianity? Lehre der zwölf Apostel, etc. A. von Harnack.

³op.cit. p.17f.

⁴Die Vorzugsstellung des Petrus und der Charakter der Urgemeinde zu Jerusalem in Festgabe für Karl Müller. F. Kattenbusch. 1922.

⁵Der Kirchenbegriff des Paulus in seinem Verhältnis zu dem der Urgemeinde. Karl Holl. 1921.

⁶op.cit. p.95. Flew, however, supports Holl's view of the Twelve as a localised hierarchy, against Sohm "who regarded legal authority as completely incompatible with the very nature of the Christian Church as a spiritual society, based on the divine revelation." (op.cit. p.185-6).

⁷See above, p.4.

emphasis to view it more and more as a creation from above, not merely explicable from man's side. It is the ecclesia of God, the body of Christ, the field of operation of the Holy Spirit. More and more the Church is regarded as a "cosmic-eschatological magnitude."¹ Among the scores of authors Linton mentions as having a part in this development, K.L. Schmidt is the authority he refers to most frequently.

Fuller in his review of "some trends in the years 1941-1962" in New Testament study,² specifically deals, in the main, with the Bultmann approach devoting, therefore, less attention to the work of such scholars as Jeremias, Kümmel, Schoeps, Taylor, Dodd, T.W. Manson and W. Manson.³ "The Bultmann school," he notes, "see the church as the outcome of the Easter event. Jesus envisaged only two things - the present in which he was involved, and its vindication in the coming of God's Reign."⁴ He adds that "the post-Bultmannians are divided on the authenticity of the Twelve within the lifetime of Jesus, but those who accept it would regard their number as a prophetic sign of the reconstitution of the people of God."⁵

¹op.cit. p.133.

²The New Testament in Current Study. R.H. Fuller. 1963.

³He gives his reasons for so doing in his preface.

⁴op.cit. p.52.

⁵op.cit. p.53.

The Apostolic foundation, as Dr. Schmidt makes clear, is the same doctrine that Paul sets forth in 1 Cor.15.

"For I delivered to you as of first importance what I also received, that Christ died for our sins in accordance with the scriptures, that he was buried, that he was raised on the third day in accordance with the scriptures, and that he appeared to Cephas, then to the twelve. Then he appeared to more than five hundred brethren at one time, most of whom are still alive, though some have fallen asleep. Then he appeared to James, then to all the apostles. Last of all, as to one untimely born, he appeared also to me." (1 Cor.15:3-8).

From what Paul himself says about his "visions and revelations" and of being "caught up to the third heaven" (2 Cor.12:1f.), he could well have claimed to be more pneumatic and charismatic than most. But this was not the basis of his apostle-ship. That was based on the fact - "he appeared to me." "From this standpoint," says Dr. Schmidt, "Paul had the same view of the Church as the primitive community at Jerusalem."¹

This is an important point to note, especially in view of how much is often made of the supposed divisions and differences between Paul (and the Hellenistic communities) and Peter (and the Jerusalem community). The same point is made in another

¹TWNT. III. p.508.

connection, that of the kerygma, by Professor Hunter.¹ After referring to C.H. Dodd's "classical discussion" of the kerygma,² Hunter writes - "Bultmann holds that the kerygma of the Hellenistic Church at Antioch differed radically from the Jerusalem Church's kerygma. Paul was completely unaware of this difference (1 Cor.15:11), for which Bultmann produces no satisfactory evidence."³ N.A. Dahl,⁴ indeed, complains that Bultmann has "little to say about the Old Testament in connection with Paul's thought,"⁵ and that he "reduces Jesus to a cipher."⁶ It is so 'unhistorical'⁷ that "we may ask whether Bultmann does not so absolutise his philosophical (i.e. existentialist) presuppositions that he decides already beforehand what the New Testament is allowed to say and what it is

¹Introducing New Testament Theology. A.M. Hunter. 1957.

²The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments. C.H. Dodd. 1932.

³op.cit. p.65.

⁴Theologische Rundschau n.f.22. 1954. N.A. Dahl. (a long review of Bultmann's Theology of the New Testament).

⁵Fuller. op.cit. p.72.

⁶Fuller. op.cit. p.76.

⁷"By 'unhistorical' Dahl means, locating the redemptive work of God exclusively in the existence of the individual and leaving little to be said about the people of God as an on-going factor within (though not of) history." - Fuller. op.cit. p.72.

not allowed to say."¹ Fuller, who here quotes Dahl, adds that this is "a similar criticism to Käsemann's charge that Bultmann makes Paul a good disciple of Rudolf Bultmann."²

Paul himself, Schmidt is at pains to make clear, recognised the special authority and privileges of the Jerusalem community and its leaders. One has only to think of the contributions gathered to help the brethren in Jerusalem and Judaea which Paul and Barnabas took there personally (Acts 11:30) or his concern, in addition to such contributions from the churches of Macedonia and Achaia, to serve the saints in Jerusalem. (Rom.15:25f.). It was an obligation felt towards the representatives of the first ἐκκλησία of God in Christ.³

When James, Peter and John in Jerusalem gave Paul and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship and suggested that they should not forget the poor, Paul writes, "which very thing I was eager to do." (Gal.2:10). Even when Paul, in Antioch, opposed Peter publicly (Gal.2:11), before he records this he tells the Galatians of his own efforts to destroy the ἐκκλησία τοῦ Θεοῦ (1:13), and ends the letter with a further allusion to the character of the ἐκκλησία as a creation of God and not

¹ibid.

²'Neutestamentliche Fragen von heute' in Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche. 54. Ernst Käsemann. 1957. (Here - Fuller. op.cit. p.72.)

³TWNT. III. p.508.

something within the control of man. "For neither circumcision counts for anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creation. Peace and mercy be upon all who walk by this rule, upon the Israel of God." (Gal.6:15,16).

Study of these references make it abundantly clear that here there is no conflict between Paul's so-called 'new view' of the Church and that of Jerusalem. The evidence, rather, shows how all disciples recognised that "the assembly of God stands or falls with its sole foundation and continuance in the Messiah Jesus, with its recognition of Christ alone as Lord."¹ Paul traces its roots back to God guiding Moses. "And all drank the same supernatural drink. For they drank from the supernatural Rock which followed them, and the Rock was Christ." (1 Cor.10:4).

In none of these Pauline references so far, however, can there be found any developed doctrine of the ekklesia, any more than a developed doctrine of it can be found in Acts. What can be said, Dr. Schmidt maintains, is that the key to the doctrine of the ekklesia is to be found in the emphasis on and understanding of the addition of the words τοῦ Θεοῦ.²

¹ TWNT. III. p.509.

² *ibid.*

Paul. Colossians and Ephesians

In these two Epistles an important development in statements regarding the ἐκκλησία comes to light. Indeed, in Dr. Schmidt's opinion, "a specific doctrine of the Church is to be found for the first time in these Epistles."¹

Here are to be found explicit, far-reaching statements about the ἐκκλησία . It is the σῶμα Χριστοῦ , the body of Christ. (Col.1:24). Christ is the head of this body, the ἐκκλησία . (Col.1:18). The same expressions occur more than once in Ephesians and in Eph.5 there is the lengthy comparison of the relationship between Christ and his ἐκκλησία on the one hand, and husband and wife on the other. Paul speaks of the ἐκκλησία subordinating itself to Christ (5:24), Christ's love for the ἐκκλησία , giving himself for her (v.25), to make her holy and blameless (v.27), and ending - "This is a great mystery, and I take it to mean Christ and the ἐκκλησία ." (v.32).

Since Paul is employing human statements in an effort to describe divine mysteries revealed by God, it is natural that his language is not always strictly logical and the exact relationship of the head and the body and the ἐκκλησία is not always made clear. What is clear is that here Christology and ecclesiology are very closely related and interdependent,

¹TWNT. III. p.509.

so that any doctrine of the Church can not properly be worked out without reference to Christology.

Human statements describing divine mysteries naturally used images drawn from the mythological language of the age. Paul speaks of Christ's presence as affecting the whole universe, and of His ascending and descending from "far above all the heavens" to "the lower parts of the earth." (Eph.4:9). He speaks of Christ creating "in himself one new man in place of the two, so making peace." (Eph.2:15). Christ is the "foundation-stone," the separate pieces of the building growing together into a temple consecrated to God. (Eph.2:20, 21). All the angelic powers are to see the "manifold wisdom of God" (σοφία τοῦ Θεοῦ),¹ being worked out through the ἐκκλησία . (Eph.3:10). The references to the marriage of Christ and his ἐκκλησία as a great mystery, (Eph.5:32), fit in here also.

Dr. Schmidt is at pains to point out that though expressions such as these may, quite naturally in the circumstances, have close parallels to expressions used in Gnostic writings, Paul's use of them is completely different from that of Gnosticism. When he speaks of σοφία , for instance, he is not speaking of "freely ranging speculations nor esoteric insights. In Ephesians the wisdom and knowledge of God are

¹cf. σοφία in Col.1:9; 4:5.

not theoretical. They are practical. They are a knowledge of the 'heart' (1:18) attained in obedience towards God, i.e. in faith."¹

The precarious situation in which the early Church found itself needs also to be kept in mind. False teaching which abounded had to be counteracted and corrected. Divisions between Jewish and Gentile Christians, and between groups within both, had to be dealt with and bridged. With so many problems and difficulties from without and from within to be faced, it can have been no easy task for an early Christian apostle to try to set down in words the relationship between Christ and the ἐκκλησία, to attempt to clarify the true nature and significance of the assembly of God in Christ.

From the start there was a constant struggle within the Christian community itself to keep the ἐκκλησία to what it is and should be. Taking sides, human desire for privileges, position and place for personalities, these and other failings were always in danger of corrupting its true nature. Hence this emphasis that the ἐκκλησία is ἄνωθεν, from above.

¹ TWNT. III. p.511. Dr. Schmidt notes that regarding his earlier work on the subject, Die Kirche des Urchristentums, H. Schleiermacher in his article on the idea of the Church in Ephesians, (Theologische Blätter. 1927), was wrong in supposing that he (Schmidt) had failed to see that the mythological elements in Ephesians were not being used for their own sake or for vain speculation, though he agreed with Schleiermacher that the expressions were the natural ones for the author and his hearers.

Immediately, however, this $\zeta\omega\theta\epsilon\nu$ has to be guarded from the other side against gnostic speculation which was just as prevalent and corrupting as any other failings.

Strong, even sublime, terms were needed to meet these dangers. Considering the evidence of these Epistles in the light of this, Dr. Schmidt found himself unable to share the certainty of those who hold that Paul could not have been the author of Colossians and Ephesians.¹ Indeed, traces of the same images are to be found in Epistles accepted as genuine - bride and husband (2 Cor.11:2), "we are one body in Christ," (Rom.12:4), "all the members . . . are one body; so also is Christ," (1 Cor.12:12), "you are the body of Christ," (1 Cor. 12:27).

The real core of Paul's thinking concerning the $\xi\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\iota\acute{\alpha}$ lies in fellowship with Christ.² For him, there was no way of reaching a true understanding or true doctrine of the $\xi\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\iota\acute{\alpha}$ merely by means of a historical, sociological or mystical approach. "In the face of all sociological attempts to understand the question of the Church," writes Dr. Schmidt, "it must be considered that in Paul, in his disciples, and then in the Fourth Evangelist, ecclesiology is simply Christology and vice versa."³ What we find in Col.3:11 -

¹TWNT. III. p.511.

²ibid. p.512. The "decisive point" for Paul, Schmidt calls it.

³ibid. p.512.

"Here there cannot be Jew and Greek, circumcised and uncircumcised, barbarian, Scythian, slave, free man, but Christ is all, and in all," is the same faith as we find in Gal.3:28, 29 - "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is neither male nor female; for you are all one in Christ Jesus. And if you are Christ's, then you are Abraham's offspring, heirs according to promise."

It is not enough, then, to say only that a proper understanding of the doctrine of the Church is intricately and inseparably linked to Christology. Both the ecclesiology and the Christology have a distinct and definite character far removed from any kind of Christian or Church mysticism. The new covenant goes back to the old covenant, for God established both, the same God Who speaks in Christ. So "the New Testament assembly of God in Christ is none other than the fulfilled Old Testament assembly of God."¹

As if to underline the very specific nature of the ecclesiology involved here, Dr. Schmidt adds - "A true conception of the Church, the community, the assembly of God in Christ, stands or falls with a true conception of justification. This is the point at issue, as it is in the whole conflict of Paul, whether against the Judaisers or Gnostics."²

¹ibid. p.512.

²ibid. p.512-13.

He did not go on to develop this point further for his doctrine of the Church, but in cautioning against over-exaggerating the figurative language of Paul regarding the body of Christ, he makes it clear that in Paul this body is never a natural growth, in human terms, but a divine creation emerging first from God's initiative and call and then becoming visible in human form through those who hear and obey that call. To be God's instrument, to be a part, a member, an organ, of that body necessarily depends upon listening to God and obeying Him.¹

The Body of Christ

In Colossians and Ephesians possibly the most outstanding single expression describing the ekklesia is σῶμα Χριστοῦ, body of Christ. The literature on this subject is so extensive that Dr. Schmidt could hardly be expected to deal with it in greater detail in the course of one article covering the ekklesia as a whole. It is nonetheless noticeable in his writings in general that he devotes very little attention to this important aspect of the doctrine.

Traugott Schmidt traces the original source of the idea back to a fable of Menenius Agrippa, appearing in story form

¹ibid. p.515 - "Gottes Organ sein heisst auf Gottes Ruf hören."

in Livy, Plutarch and Aesop,¹ though its true origins probably go back into the mists of antiquity. According to a leading French Catholic writer, L. Cerfaux, "Hellenism saw the notion of unity in the expression ἐν ὁμῶν . This came about principally through the fable of the body and its members, which was taken from Aesop and applied by Menenius Agrippa to the social order."² As to the origin of the Christian use of the expression, Cerfaux's view is that "it was first coined by the primitive church in connection with the institution of the Supper",³ which is traditionally called 'the breaking of bread' and is the "sacrament of unity".⁴ Some scholars like Käsemann⁵ and Bultmann,⁶ according to Best, have tried to show that Paul's use of the idea was strongly influenced by Gnostic sources. Best stresses K.L. Schmidt's opposition to such theories, and gives four reasons of his own for holding that "we cannot trace Paul's usage of it (ὁμῶν) to

¹op.cit. p.128.

²The Church in the Theology of St. Paul. L. Cerfaux. 1959. p.266.

³ibid. p.262.

⁴ibid. p.263.

⁵Leib und Leib Christi. E. Käsemann.

⁶Theology of the New Testament. Vol.I. R. Bultmann. 1952.

Gnosticism."¹ George Johnston also strongly supports K.L. Schmidt on this point. Paul combined realism and mysticism, he says, but if his language was sometimes fanciful or mystical it was certainly not Gnostic. Paul was not always consistent and we should beware of attempts to systematize his thought. In his review of $\tau\omega\mu\alpha$ Johnston refers chiefly to Dodd, Kasemann, W.L. Knox, T.W. Manson and Rawlinson, as well as to K.L. Schmidt. It requires Christology and the doctrine of the indwelling Spirit of Christ to explain the developed idea of the $\tau\omega\mu\alpha$.²

While the degree to which Paul may or may not have been influenced by the origins of the idea remain uncertain, the situation he had to deal with made a vivid picture of unity in diversity extremely appropriate. Traugott Schmidt points to the growing problem of unity between Jew and Greek, between rich and poor, as the Church's numbers grew.³ Hence "We who are many are one body (in Christ)" (1 Cor.10:17; Rom. 12:5) was a fundamental idea. T. Schmidt links this very closely with the Holy Spirit as the bond of unity of the Church. The Spirit is the inspiring, animating (beseelende) power of

¹One Body in Christ. E. Best. 1955. p.87.

²The Doctrine of the Church in the New Testament. George Johnston. 1943. p.84f.

³op.cit. p.131.

the body. "If we want to understand the thought content of $\Sigma\omega\mu\alpha \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\upsilon$," he says, "we must first be clear about the relation of the Ecclesia to the divine Pneuma."¹

The same link is noted by C.H. Dodd. "For Paul, the church is the Body of Christ, in which he dwells by his Spirit," he writes.² Cullmann also stresses the Body as a spiritual body. As the body of Christ on earth the Church is the body of the crucified (Col.1:24), he says. "On the other hand, it is also the body of the risen Lord, a spiritual body ($\sigma\omega\mu\alpha \pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\iota\kappa\acute{o}\nu$ - 1 Cor.15:44) since it was constituted by the $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$ at Pentecost; $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$ is its substance, and so everyone that is received into the Church in Baptism enters even now into a spiritual body, the only spiritual body that is already in existence, the Church, the earthly body of the exalted Christ."³ Professor Torrance views this a little differently. "The Church did not come into being with the Resurrection or with the pouring out of the Spirit at Pentecost," he writes. "That was not its birth but its new birth, not its beginning but its transformation into the Body of the risen Lord quickened and filled with his Spirit."⁴ The Church is at once a

¹ibid. p.134.

²'Matthew and Paul' in Exp.T. 1947. cf. also his "The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments. 1936. p.139f.

³The Early Church. Oscar Cullmann. 1956.

⁴Theology in Reconstruction. T.F. Torrance. 1965. p.204. See also p. 145 below.

corpus naturale and a corpus mysticum. As a living body it is also a corpus fidelium, the body of believers, actual people. Hence, just like an individual, it is at once justa et peccatrix, its true worth is visible only to faith, and in this world it has to work as a leaven, militant under the Cross.¹

Thornton considers the Body to be the Church's chief aspect. "The mystical aspect of the Church as Christ's Body must be held to be its primary aspect," he writes. "This fact has certainly not received adequate recognition in modern centuries. In the disintegration of western thought the Church has been treated as a sociological entity; its human, visible aspects have become separated in idea from its mystical and divine aspects. This dichotomy lies at the root of all our western divisions, and appears to be reproduced in them all."² He goes on to make clear that this Body is not a mere collection of individuals. "We are the Church because we are in Christ. He gives unity to his members. The members are the Church because in him they are one; but not otherwise."³ In other words, the unity of the organism resides not in the

¹Kingdom and Church. T.F. Torrance. 1956. p.56f.
(Dealing with the theology of the Reformation.)

²The Common Life in the Body of Christ. L.S. Thornton. 1941.

³ibid. p.256.

congregation but in the Messiah. So "the Body of Christ has two aspects, the Messiah and the ecclesia, the One and the Many."¹

Most authorities agree on the closeness of the bond between Christ and the Church. "Paul does not compare the Church to a 'body'," Best points out, "but to the 'body of Christ' (1 Cor.12:27)," a very great difference.² It is equally important, however, to note that "the Church is not identified with Christ."³ On this point Welch strongly refuted Robinson's identifying the resurrection body of Christ with the Christian community - a "crude sort of identification," Welch calls it.⁴ At the same time, where the emphasis is on the unity between the body and Christ, the language often seems like identification unless immediately qualified. Bishop Nygren, for instance, writes - "The Church is Christ as he is present and meets us upon earth after his resurrection." This is the New Testament conception of the Church."⁵ He adds - "It is the unanimous view of the New Testament that the Church is the

¹ibid. p.341.

²op.cit. p.83.

³ibid. p.113.

⁴The Reality of the Church. Claude Welch. 1958. p.184.
The Body. J.A.T. Robinson. 1952.

⁵op.cit. p.96.

body of Christ," and that even where it is not specifically so named, the substance of this is everywhere present.¹ But while it is a concrete reality, nowhere in the New Testament is the body of Christ a sociological phenomenon, an organisation like other organisations, a form of human community. Neither is it a quantitative concept. "Just as Christ is present in all his fullness in the local congregation, so also the local congregation represents the body of Christ in all its fullness."² Similarly Mascall says - "Like the sacramental Body of Christ in the Eucharist, the mystical Body of Christ which is the Church is not divided into portions by its extension in space and time; it is tota in toto, et tota in aliqua parte."³

The unity, rather than the distinction, between Christ and the body is also stressed by Mascall.⁴ After referring to Mersch's "great work" on the historical development of the doctrine of the Mystical Body in scripture and tradition,⁵

¹ ibid. p.97.

² ibid. p.99.

³ Corpus Christi. E.L. Mascall. 1965. (first published in 1953). p.20.

⁴ Christ, the Christian and the Church. E.L. Mascall. 1946.

⁵ Le corps mystique du Christ. E. Mersch. 1933. (E.T. - The Whole Christ. 1938).

Mascall says - "The relation of Christians to Christ is not one of external juxtaposition; it involves even more intimacy and interpenetration than exist between the head and the body of a man. The Christian is re-created into Christ. Christ's life becomes his life, and Christ's sonship his sonship. In the order of supernature he is identified with the Saviour in everything except his indestructible and inconvertible personal individuality; Christianus alter Christus."¹ He goes on to quote St. Thomas Aquinas. "Just as a natural body is one whole, composed of many members, so the whole Church, which is the Mystical Body of Christ, is reckoned as one person with its Head, who is Christ."² He also quotes Father de Lubac on the same point which we have already noted from Best, namely that Paul does not say "the body of the Christians," but always "the body of Christ."³

In St. Paul's writings, Mascall notes that "we find a double conception of the Body. In some passages Christ is spoken of as the Head, and the Church as the Body which belongs to it. (Col.1:18; Eph.5:23). In other places Christ is the Body itself and the individual Christians are his members

¹ op.cit. p.111.

² Summa Theologica. III. xlix, lc.

³ Catholicisme. H. de Lubac, S.J. 1938. Best. op.cit. p.83.

(1 Cor.12:12)."¹ In spite of the element of metaphor, however, he holds that "the description of the Church as the Body of Christ is to be taken ontologically and realistically." It is worth while observing, he continues, how "the way in which the conception that a man will form of the nature of the Church is determined by his view of the relation of the Christian to Christ," giving here two examples by Father Congar from extreme Protestantism and Eastern Orthodoxy.²

This relationship of adoption into Christ's sonship, Mascall maintains, "is ontological and not merely legal." The New Testament knows nothing of a Christian outside the Church. "Becoming a Christian and becoming a member of the Church are synonymous; faith and baptism are conjoined. This is not, moreover a merely arbitrary prescription either of Christ or his followers; it arises out of the very nature of Christian adoption. For if we are each of us really and not merely by imputation united to Christ, we are by that very fact united to one another. If our adoption into Christ's sonship is ontological and not merely legal, so is our brotherhood with one another. If we are each of us members of Christ, then we are collectively his body."³

¹ op.cit. p.110.

² op.cit. p.112. Divided Christendom. J.M. Congar. 1939.

³ ibid. p.109-10.

Many interpreters, Best says (naming Lohmeyer, Dibelius, Käsemann, Knox), argue that in these Epistles we have quite a new conception of the Church presented.¹ Indeed, Schlier held that the body of Christ in Ephesians was in such contrast to the earlier Epistles that it cannot come from the same source.² After examining these views, however, Best concludes that the expression, the body of Christ, is "not something new but a natural and legitimate development of the usage of the earlier Epistles."³

Each different aspect of the ekklesia, it will be seen, opens to view the complexities inherent in combining the roots in the past, the historical development, and the new factor in Christ. In Headlam's words - "As employed by Christianity the word ecclesia embodied a new conception for which the world was ready, which was the spiritual fulfilment of principles innate in Judaism, and awaiting development; which only came into being in the new life and revelation through Jesus Christ."⁴ Johnston, who quotes Headlam, underlines the

¹op.cit. p.115.

²ibid. p.155f. Christus und die Kirche im Epheserbrief.
H. Schlier. 1930.

³ibid. p.156.

⁴The Doctrine of the Church and Christian Reunion.
A.C. Headlam. 1920.

unique contribution of St. Paul in this development. "It was a Christian Jew who first drew out the implications of the word and formulated a clear conception of the Church. To St. Paul we are indebted for a doctrine which rightly emphasises both the continuity of the Old and New Covenants of God with men, and also the universality, oneness, and novelty of that society on earth which is God's ἐκκλησία in Christ."¹

The Ekklesia Article continued

The remaining references to ἐκκλησία in the New Testament add nothing new to what K.L. Schmidt has already brought out. The ἐκκλησίαι of seven towns are mentioned (Rev.1:11) and the plural is used 13 times in the Book of Revelation. 3 John has three references, the first without the article though used similarly to the latter two with the article. James (5:14) mentions it in his advice regarding healing. "Is any among you sick? Let him call for the elders of the ekklesia and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord." The Epistle to the Hebrews uses the word (2:12) in quoting Ps.22:22 where again ἐκκλησία is the translation of the Hebrew בָּנָיִם. Here the English rendering is not 'church' but 'congregation'.² The second

¹ op.cit. p.45.

² So RSV.

reference (Heb.12:23) occurs in the great vision of the heavenly Jerusalem - "But you have come to Mount Zion and to the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to innumerable angels in festal gathering, and to the assembly of the first-born who are enrolled in heaven, and to a judge who is God of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus, the mediator of a new covenant, and to the sprinkled blood that speaks more graciously than the blood of Abel." Here the RSV renders ἐκκλησία as 'assembly', where the AV has 'to the general assembly and church of the first-born'.

There are in addition numerous other passages in the New Testament which obviously refer to the Church though without using the word 1 Peter, for example, speaks of 'living stones', a 'spiritual house', a 'chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, God's own people', (2:5,9), 'now you are God's people'. (2:10). In Romans Paul speaks of the 'children of the promise' being reckoned as descendants of Abraham, the true Israel depending 'not upon man's will or exertion, but upon God's mercy', (Rom.9:6f.), and quotes Hosea - "Those who were not my people I will call 'my people' . . . they will be called 'sons of the living God'." (9:25-26).¹

¹Schmidt also lists Gal.6:16; 1 Cor.10:18; Gal.3:29; Heb.2:16 as similar passages. TWNT. III. p.513.

Matthew 16:18 and 18:17

These verses, containing as they do the only three occurrences of the word ἐκκλησία in the Gospels, are of special importance and special difficulty. In his detailed consideration of them, K.L. Schmidt argues cogently for their authenticity, although this is a subject upon which the authorities are extremely divided.

Other questions as well as that of authenticity make consideration of these passages extremely complex. What Semitic equivalent lies behind ἐκκλησία here? What do the verses mean? Furthermore, 16:18 and 18:17 do not seem to correspond exactly, the former pointing more to the world-wide entity, the latter to the individual congregation, although the same word is used for both senses. One thing is clear, however. No objection can be made to these verses on textual grounds. No significant manuscript omits them.

MacGregor makes a good deal of the apparent difference in meaning between the two passages. "As Schmidt recognises," he writes, "if both passages are accepted as authentic there remains a serious difficulty in view of the indisputable fact that the word ἐκκλησία cannot easily be interpreted as meaning the same thing in both cases,"¹ seemingly overlooking a major point in Schmidt's analysis that "each community,

¹op.cit. p.123.

however small, represents the total community, the Church."¹ MacGregor, however, takes this, together with the problem of the future tense in 16:18 and the difficulties of the exegesis, as not diminishing "the suspicion of the authenticity of these passages."² But Matthew, as Dodd notes, uses ἐκκλησία "in the two senses which have been distinguished in Paul," i.e. a local congregation (18:17) and the catholic Church, the new Israel (16:18). Dodd also adds that "there was at one time a local congregation which was also the whole congregation of Christian people in the world - the Church of Jerusalem."³ The Jerusalem Church is referred to later (Acts 18:22) simply as ἡ ἐκκλησία. "It may be, then," Dodd continues, "that we should read Mt.18:17, which ostensibly refers to a local congregation, with the idea of the Catholic Church, or the new Israel, as an unexpressed extension of meaning. I believe that the passage as a whole, 18:15-20, which is a kind of rudimentary 'Church Order', demands such an extension."⁴ Cullmann sees the future tense (in 16:18) as a natural expression of the tension between present and future in which the

¹See above p. 72.

²ibid.

³"Matthew and Paul" in New Testament Studies. C.H. Dodd. 1953. p.57.

⁴op.cit. p.58.

Church shares. "The Church already belongs entirely to the end and still belongs entirely to the present," he maintains.¹

The main argument against the authenticity of Mt.16:18, Schmidt says, is that it is not found in the parallel passages in Mark and Luke. Some critics therefore argue that verses 17-19 are a later interpolation into the Mt. text, a suggestion Schmidt calls "too crude to be taken seriously" in view of such extremely important verses.² Others argue that Matthew (or a predecessor) must have inserted them into the more original Mark/Luke version. This is not cogent, Schmidt asserts, since added verses can also be based on genuine tradition. What is more, these particular verses are so thoroughly Semitic in character that they could most naturally be supposed to be rooted in the Palestinian community or in Jesus himself.

Even Bultmann who says flatly - "The saying about the building of the 'Church' (ἐκκλησία) Mt. 16:18 is, like the whole of Mt.16:17-19, a later product of the Church,"³ - admits that the passage is definitely Palestinian in character,⁴

¹The Early Church. O. Cullmann. 1956. p.119.

²TWNT. III. p.519.

³The Theology of the New Testament. Vol.I. p.10. cf. Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition. pp.147-150.

⁴Fuller. op.cit. p.52.

and Linton who mentions Harnack, Resch, Grill, Guignebert, Schnitzer, Baldensperger, Dell and others, as well as Bultmann, as holding that Mt.16:18 is not a genuine saying of Jesus, stresses that just as many scholars oppose this view, K.L. Schmidt, J. Jeremias, and Roman Catholic theologians such as Karl Adam, Geiselman, Lagrange, prominent among them.¹

T.W. Manson maintained that the Mt.16 passage was not a genuine saying of Jesus, though he also added - "It is however of Palestinian origin."² "The strongest point against the passage," he wrote, "is the fact that it is not mentioned by the Fathers of the 2nd century. But this argument from silence loses much of its weight when we reflect that the matters with which these men were concerned were, for the most part, matters in which the assertion of the primacy of Peter would not be specially relevant."³ Other arguments against the passage include: 1. Mark knows nothing of it (nor Q in its parallel to Mt.18:17); 2. Jesus and his disciples expected the Kingdom so he cannot have founded the Church as a long-term institution; 3. Peter did not have authority of the kind mentioned in the saying; 4. Peter was not a rock.

¹op.cit. pp.160f.

²The Sayings of Jesus. 1949. (first published as Part II of The Mission and Message of Jesus. 1937). p.203.

³ibid. p.202.

"It might be suggested that 'live wire' would be a more apt description than 'rock'."¹ 5. There was no primacy for any individual in the Kingdom. Jesus said it was not in his power (Mk.10:35f.).² His view was that the passage probably belonged to M, Matthew's special source. Streeter, on the other hand, attributed the "Thou art Peter" to the local traditions of Antioch, not to M, though he considered the Mt.18:18 saying which confers the power to "bind and loose" upon the Ecclesia did belong to M.³

The verses, of course, as Schmidt shows in detail, raise fundamental questions about the relationship of Jesus and the ἐκκλησία, and about the position of Peter in primitive Christianity. These two main questions each raise two subsidiary questions - (a) the statistical questions, Why does the word ἐκκλησία occur only in these two passages in the Gospels?; (b) the eschatological question, Could Jesus, the preacher of the Kingdom of God, have founded an Ekklesia?; (c) the historical question, Had Peter this authoritative position in early Christianity?; (d) the psychological question, Was the man Peter in fact a rock?

¹ibid. p.203.

²ibid.

³The Four Gospels. B.H. Streeter. 1936. p.259 (first ed. 1924).

The argument from statistics proves nothing, Schmidt holds. As in 1 Peter where the word ἑκκλησία itself never occurs, so too in the Gospels the reality it stands for is very much in evidence. Like the Old Testament ἑκκλησία, the People of God, Jesus and his company of disciples stand out as a group in contrast to the Pharisees and scribes. After the institution of the Lord's Supper (which Schmidt describes as "an act in establishment of the Church"),¹ Jesus quotes from the Old Testament - 'I will strike the shepherd and the sheep of the flock will be scattered.' (Mt.26:31). The picture of the flock occurs again in Jn.10:16 and at the end of the Fourth Gospel Jesus says several times to Peter, "Feed my lambs, feed my sheep." (Jn.21:15f.) Luke also mentions the "little flock" in his Gospel (12:32) and in Acts - "to all the flock, in which the Holy Spirit has made you guardians, to feed the church of the Lord." (20:28). The symbolic significance of the Twelve is another factor that should not be ruled out though the lists of the Twelve may vary. The evidence shows, in short, that Mt.16:18 is not an isolated incident but one that fits into the whole picture. Cullmann, who supports Schmidt's position, points out that the Cross never occurs in Romans although the whole Epistle is an exposition of the atoning death of Christ.²

¹TWNT. III. p.521. See also p.150 below.

²Peter. O. Cullmann. E.T. 1953.

The answer to the eschatological question is to be found in Jesus as Messiah. "The question of the founding of the Church by Jesus Himself," Schmidt says, "is really the question of His Messiahship."¹ Jesus' use of the title 'Son of Man' has for its background the Book of Daniel and in it the Son of Man is no mere individual but One who has the task of representing the People of God, the ἑκκλησία, before the Ancient of Days, a son of man to whom "was given dominion and glory and kingdom, that all peoples, nations, and languages should serve him; his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom one that shall not be destroyed." (Dan.7:14). If Jesus viewed himself as Son of Man in this sense, "new vistas are opened up as regards the nature and significance of His founding of the Church."²

As representative of the saints of the Most High, the people of God, the ἑκκλησία, Jesus' institution of the Lord's Supper is therefore "shown to be an act in establishment of the Church," and these two elements belong together.³ "It is also important, however, that this view of the complex Jesus, Messiah, Son of Man, Disciples, Community, Lord's Supper, leads directly to the Pauline and deutero-Pauline

¹ TWNT. III. p.521.

² ibid. p.521.

³ TWNT. III. p.521.

understanding of the ekklesia, which is Ἐκκλησία on the one hand and yet also ἐκκλησία Χριστοῦ on the other, just as Christ is both exalted on the one hand and yet also present in the community on the other."¹ This is why the question of the founding of the Church by Jesus Himself is so closely bound up with the question of His Messiahship. "The detailed problems of when and where, which by their very nature the Gospel records do not solve, are subordinate to this main question."²

For Schmidt, the eschatological events of the self-witness of Jesus as Son of Man and the institution of the Lord's Supper prove that the ekklesia is also an eschatological entity.³ This fits in with the eschatology of the Kingdom of God Jesus preached and the primitive community also. The basileia and the ekklesia are not one and the same. The primitive community regarded itself as the ekklesia but went on preaching the basileia. Similarly, they are not the same in Jesus' preaching. He promises the basileia to his ekklesia, i.e. to the ekklesia founded by him. "In this sense the post-Easter ekklesia, too, regarded itself as eschatological. In this sense the individual is to be understood eschatologically as a justified sinner."⁴

¹ ibid. p.521.

² ibid.

³ ibid. p.522.

⁴ ibid. p.522.

Bultmann misses these points, Schmidt claims, since he "fails to answer the question how the kingdom and the Church are distinguished in the primitive community as eschatological magnitudes."¹ Linton, in his many references to K.L. Schmidt's views, emphasises this point that Church and eschatology belong together. Far from the preaching of the Kingdom providing proof that Jesus could not have founded the Church, the Church is necessary precisely because the end is threatening.² A.M. Hunter underlines the same points. "When men say (as they said not long ago) that Jesus never intended to create a church, they show that they do not understand what the Kingdom of God means. The idea of the Ecclesia has deep roots in the purpose of Jesus. His message of the Kingdom implies it. His doctrine of Messiahship involves it. His ministry shows him creating it."³ Hunter also points to the symbolic importance of the Twelve - "It is the number of the tribes of Israel. To a Jew of any spiritual penetration this acted parable must have said, 'This is the Messiah and the New Israel'."⁴ - and to the institution of the Lord's Supper as

¹ *ibid.*

² *op.cit.* p.172.

³ Introducing New Testament Theology. A.M. Hunter. 1957. p.34.

⁴ *ibid.* p.35.

implying "the creation of a new People of God." Even without the two Ecclesia passages in Matthew, "our conclusion stands firm. The Kingdom of God implies the creation of a new Israel."¹

Cullmann again gives powerful support to K.L. Schmidt's exegesis. "As Messiah Jesus must have had in view a community," he writes.² The idea of the ekklesia is not a "Christian creation." It belongs to the Jewish sphere. Moses, for instance, is spoken of in the Book of Acts as being "in the ekklesia in the wilderness," (Acts 7:38), and the word occurs about 100 times in the LXX. It stands for the qahal of God, the People of Israel. This is the ekklesia reconstituted by Jesus as Messiah. "In the creation of this new People of God built upon this basis consists his specific work on earth. . . . In this Jewish sense there is an 'ecclesiology' even in the thinking of Jesus, and it is solidly anchored in his 'Christology.'"³ However, as Bornkamm brings out, where Cullmann feels the authenticity of Mt.16:17f. cannot seriously be questioned, von Campenhausen equally strongly feels that the founding of the Church on Peter is unthinkable in Jesus' mouth, and in spite of new attempts to save it, should not be

¹ibid. p.36.

²op.cit. p.190.

³op.cit. pp.187f.

entertained.¹

Bultmann had earlier argued against Cullmann's views in a review which went into all the discussion pro and con up to 1941.² Fuller brought this up to 1962 in his review which shows the Bultmann school's position that the Mt.16:18 is a creation of the post-Easter church.³ Dahl⁴ had maintained that "insofar as the kingdom of God, the end time, implies a people of God to enjoy it, the notion of a reconstituted, eschatological community was implied as a part of Jesus' hope."⁵ But for the post-Bultmannians a qualification must be added, Fuller says, i.e. that "Jesus did not look for a continuing people of God in history, as the church turned out to be. He did not think in terms of an ecclesiastical organisation, still less did he legislate for it. In that sense, the church is the end-result of his work, rather than

¹"Enderwartung und Kirche im Matthäusevangelium." G. Bornkamm. Part II No.12 in The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology. Davies & Daube. 1956. p.254. Cullmann. op.cit. (1952). Kirchliches Amt und geistliche Vollmacht. H. von Campenhausen. 1953.

²"Die Frage der Echtheit von Matth.16:17-19." Theologische Blätter. 1941.

³op.cit. p.52.

⁴Das Volk Gottes. N.A. Dahl. 1941.

⁵Fuller. op.cit. p.52-3.

his deliberate intention."¹ Fuller goes on to survey subsequent developments in the work of Fuchs, Ebeling, Braun and J.M. Robinson who tend to orient faith toward the historical Jesus, and in the work of Käsemann, Conzelmann and Bultmann himself,² who orient faith on the kerygma.³ Against Bultmann Fuller argues for a solution which does justice both to the continuity and the difference between Jesus and the kerygma - "The kerygma presents us not merely with the historical Jesus who is in process of accomplishing his work. It presents us with a risen Christ who has accomplished his earthly work."⁴

On the question of the historical position of Peter, Schmidt in his article says that those who argue that Peter could not have been the rock on which the ekklesia was founded, point to passages like 1 Cor.3:11 where Paul writes - "For no other foundation can anyone lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ," and 1 Cor.10:4 where he writes - "for they drank from the supernatural Rock which followed them, and the Rock was Christ."

¹ op.cit. p.53.

² Especially his Das Verhältnis der urchristlichen Christusbotschaft zum historischen Jesus. 1960.

³ op.cit. pp.54f.

⁴ ibid. p.67.

From the New Testament record, however, it is clear that Paul regarded Peter as having a special position. The simplest explanation for this would be that it rested on a saying of Jesus. If Peter's position had been seriously questioned by the Pauline or the Johannine tradition, that would have made it all the harder for Mt.16:18 to have been inserted at a later date. Its presence in all the texts, in spite of the many problems involved, argues for its authenticity on the grounds of its being the lectio difficilior.¹

That Peter was of acknowledged moral authority in the early Church, Flew says, is not in doubt.² The problem about his position depends a good deal on the meaning of the 'power of the keys'. This is not at all the same thing as the right to admit and exclude from the Church, Flew argues. Nor does it confer absolute administrative authority which Peter clearly did not have. It is more like the "key of knowledge" in Lk.11:52, and the parallel passage in Mt.23:13, which speaks of shutting the kingdom of heaven and of hindering others from entering. Furthermore, 'binding and loosing' reflect the Rabbinic phrase 'forbidding and allowing' regarding conduct and should probably be connected with preaching, 'binding' meaning to reject the message, 'loosing'

¹TWNT. III. p.523.

²op.cit. p.127.

to hear and accept. Flew admits that doubts regarding the authenticity of Mt.16:17-19 will probably remain since it is hard to give a satisfactory reason why Mark should omit them, if he knew of them. However, having carefully considered all the arguments, he concludes - "The question whether Jesus Himself founded the Church may be answered in the affirmative, not only in the dogmatic sense but in the historical sense."¹

Schmidt quotes Kümmel on the point of the keys, - "It is finally inconceivable that Jesus should have committed to a man control over admission into the kingdom of God."² - but answers that "it is even more inconceivable that Mt.16:18 should be a creation of the community."³

The psychological argument against authenticity is probably the weakest of all the arguments. Attempts to apply psychological solutions to New Testament texts are always very risky. To argue that Peter in fact did not prove to be a rock is to misunderstand the nature of the ekklesia. Peter was chosen by Jesus just as Israel was chosen by God. Psychology is powerless to explain why. Both proved stubborn,

¹ ibid. p.136.

² "Die Eschatologie der Evangelien." (Th.B1. 1936.) in Heilsgeschehen und Geschichte. W.G. Kümmel. 1965. p.57.

³ TWNT. III. p.523.

both failed, but both remain chosen. Peter indeed presents a striking paradox, but one that finds an echo in every Christian in his own experience.¹

Although Schmidt does not say so, the very fact of the paradox might be taken as a further proof of authenticity. As William Manson makes clear, there is much in the tradition that no Church would have invented. It was Origen who pointed to such stories as Peter's denial and the disciples being 'offended' at Jesus, as signs that they were "lovers of truth" not "compilers of fiction."² Writing on the promise to Peter in Mt.16:16 Origen also comments - "When the light from the Father in heaven has shined in our hearts, and we become Peter, then to us may be said, 'You are Peter'. For every disciple of Christ is a rock, after drinking of 'that spiritual rock which followed'; and on every such rock is built the whole principle (logos) of the Church and the corresponding polity."³

The verses are strongly Semitic in character throughout. Behind the word ekklesia, as Schmidt has shown, lies the Old Testament קהל and its Aramaic equivalent קהל.⁴ In

¹ ibid. The idea is also found in Una Sancta. W. Leonhard. 1927.

² Jesus the Messiah. Wm. Manson. 1943. p.29.

³ Comm. in Matthaeum. xii.10. In The Early Church Fathers. p.339.

⁴ See above. p.63.

Rabbinic literature, however, neither Talmud nor Midrash use כּתב or קהל (for synagogue, mainly) very much. The usual Rabbinic word for synagogue, for the Israel of God, is (kenishta). The Syriac versions use their equivalent of kenishta for both ekklesia and synagogue. So Schmidt suggests, an "attractive suggestion", Flew calls it,¹ that kenishta may have been the very Aramaic/^{word}that Jesus Himself used. It was a significant term for "the community of God is embodied in the synagogue of Jesus the Messiah. In the apparent paradox of this pars pro toto arrangement lies the very essence of the genuine synagogue and of the genuine community of Jesus Christ. The founding of the ἐκκλησία by Jesus at Mt.16:18, to which appeal is so often made, consists solely and simply in this process of separating and concentrating His band of disciples."² While official Judaism often looked on the primitive Christian community as a sect within Judaism, the Christian view was that it was a synagogue with a special claim to represent true Judaism, the true Israel. To distinguish it from ordinary Jewish synagogues, "K.L. Schmidt is doubtless right in suggesting it was Greek-speaking Jewish Christians who, even before St. Paul's time, first began to use ἐκκλησία," as Richardson puts it.³

¹ op.cit. p.125.

² TWNT. III. p.526.

³ An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament. Alan Richardson. 1958. p.285. Hunter suggests this may have taken place at Antioch. (op.cit. p.78).

This link clarifies the inter-relation between vv.16:18 and 18:17, since the latter would then refer to the synagogue, the Old Testament community which Jesus does not deny but affirms and which "He and He alone fulfils."¹

Against the view of a special kenishta helping to authenticate Mt.16:18 Johnston says - "But surely such a saying would have gained wide currency through Aramaic-speaking circles and through those who knew both Aramaic and Greek? It is surprising that no trace of the logion or of the foundation plan granted to Peter appears except in the Greek Gospel according to Matthew."² Mark and Luke would never have omitted it if it had been known to them. It is a "safe inference" that Mark knew nothing of a promise to Peter as the foundation-rock and there is no evidence that Jesus gathered his followers into a close society. He did not baptise, as far as we know. Furthermore, lexicography provides no proof of this 'special' synagogue. On the other hand, Johnston adds, "it is possible to argue that a genuine saying does lie behind Mt.16:18."³

What is clear is that, in the words of Bishop Nygren, "Christ and Church belong inseparably together."⁴ While it

¹ TWNT. III. p.526.

² op.cit. p.43.

³ op.cit. p.50.

⁴ op.cit. p.13.

is true that only Matthew has the v.16:18 saying, it is also true that only Matthew preserves many other sayings of Jesus, and these are not in doubt. This particular saying raises no textual difficulties. The fact that many scholars still question the authenticity of the passage, the Bishop feels, "raises the suspicion that the difficulty lies less in the text than in the presuppositions with which the exegete approaches it."¹ It is important, however, that what we constantly need to abide by is the New Testament conception of the Church, not our own.

Brunner made it clear that this is by no means easy to do, and he placed emphasis on the new life in Christ and the new factor of fellowship of those sharing the New Covenant through Christ. It was "indisputable," he held, that "Jesus did not 'found' the Church," but also that he did unquestionably gather disciples specially related to him and equipped them and sent them out in his service.² For this reason it is idle to look for a 'doctrine of the Ekklesia' from Jesus, just as he did not announce the Messiah but was the Messiah. So any 'doctrine' of the Church had to be 'secret' until after Easter. Then Christ the Lord is present through the Spirit and, therefore, the Ekklesia "is in any

¹ ibid. p.16.

² op.cit. p.23.

event rooted in Him and interpenetrated by Him, since He is the head of the body which is the Ekklesia." ¹

The main arguments in the TWNT Ekklesia article for Mt.16:18 being a genuine saying of Jesus, had been anticipated to a certain extent by Schmidt's article "Jesus Christus" in RGG a few years earlier. ² Mt.16:18 says that Jesus the Messiah founded the Church, and neither textual nor literary nor exegetical criticism can refute its being a genuine saying of Jesus, Schmidt maintains in the RGG article. This is clear when we go behind ἐκκλησία to ἕπρ. "ἕπρ is the people of God in the framework of eschatology which is peculiar to all statements regarding the people of God from the prophets onward. . . . The community represented by Jesus and his disciples is Israel, precisely Israel, only Israel, the remnant of Israel, the Israel of the final consummation." ³

The records show that Jesus picked a definite small band out of the mass of the Jewish people and the idea of the Twelve is also part of the primitive Christian community. "In what Jesus said and did eschatology - i.e. the view that the approaching Kingdom of God is intended for the remnant and core of the people of God, - has become acute. With Jesus

¹op.cit. p.24.

²RGG. III. 2nd. Ed. 1929.

³ibid. col.148.

himself the claim of the Kingdom of God has been given. . . . So he points to the constitution of the Messiah-Jesus-Gemeinde, i.e. the Church."¹ The two aspects of this are that, on the one hand, he was out to win the nation, all Israel. On the other hand, he withdrew with a few loyal souls, a remnant, who finally represent all Israel. The difficulties presented by the special position of Peter are no greater than the special position of Israel. Peter is chosen, singled out, is obdurate, fails, but nonetheless remains chosen and the foundation of the Church, just as Israel is chosen, singled out, is obdurate, fails, but remains chosen since a remnant repents and is converted.²

The two articles deal with different subject matter in the main and therefore do not lend themselves to comparison in detail. It is interesting to note the almost complete difference in approach in the Ekklesia article, however, both in regard to its "lexical conclusions" and investigations, and its developments along the lines of biblical theology.³ In this TWNT article, as Schmidt says himself, he "digs deeper", and few would deny that he uncovered facts and evidence of lasting value for our understanding of the New

¹ ibid.

² ibid. col.149.

³ TWNT. III. p.503.

Testament Church. Whether one accepts his arguments for the authenticity of these Matthew passages or not, many questions must, of course, remain open. What Jesus really said to Peter and how his words are to be interpreted, are not questions "to which we are likely to find an answer with which everybody will be convinced," as Streeter commented.¹

Post-canonical Developments

The transition from primitive Christianity to Catholicism "is nowhere so palpably clear as in the conception of the Church," Schmidt writes. "It took place already in the sphere of early Christian writings outside the New Testament canon. Speculations increased even to the point of Gnosticism."² Where the New Testament writers for the most part added only τῷ Θεῷ to the word ἐκκλησία, laudatory adjectives and descriptions become frequent and even extravagant in later writings, and speculations regarding the Church, its pre-existence, how the empirical is related to the ideal, theories of the Church visible and invisible, became rife.

Although Schmidt does not go on to give instances, the writings of the Church Fathers illustrate very markedly the development from the New Testament writers' restraint.

¹The Four Gospels. p.258.

²TWNT. III. p.534.

Ignatius, at the beginning of his "To the Romans", describes the Church in Rome in such terms as "worthy of God, worthy of honour, worthy of congratulation, worthy of praise, worthy of success, worthy in purity, having the chief place in love, keeping Christ's law, bearing the Father's name."¹ Irenaeus speaks of "the great and glorious Body of Christ," referring to the Church.² Clement of Alexandria says - "the ancient Catholic Church is the only Church", and "There is one mother, who is a virgin; this is my favourite description of the Church", and even speaks of the "pre-eminence of the Church."³ Cyprian writes of the Church as "the spouse of Christ . . . undefiled and chaste", who "preserves us for God".⁴

Speculation of this kind, Schmidt maintains, brought on the step from primitive Christianity to early Catholicism, "a step which, rightly understood, denotes the cleavage between Protestantism and Roman Catholicism."⁵ It was "a latent, and often acute, Platonism," he says, that "split up the which as a corpus mixtum ought not to have been divided. The

¹The Early Christian Fathers. H. Bettenson. 1956. p.61.

²Adv. Haer. IV. xxxiii. 7.

³Stromateis. VII. xvi, 107 and Paedagogus. I. vi. 42.

⁴De Catholicae Ecclesiae Unitate. 5/6.

⁵TWNT. III. p.536.

Church is never triumphant. It is always militant, i.e. under pressure. Triumphant it would be the βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ and no longer the ἐκκλησία. Moreover, this Ekklesia as the assembly of God in Christ is not invisible on the one side and visible on the other. The Christian community, which as the individual congregation represents the whole body, is just as visible and corporeal as the individual man."¹

Henderson draws attention to Augustine's role in this development. "It was St. Augustine," he says in his Baird lectures, "who gave the impulse for the use of the phrase 'the Church Invisible'; but he was a Platonist to the last, and the Reformers were not interested in his idealism."² But Henderson continues - "It is curious to find Karl Ludwig Schmidt attributing to Protestantism 'this unrealist Platonism', and one is reminded of Melanchthon's plain statement: 'We never have dreamt that we were a Platonic state, as some in their wickedness scoffingly allege'."³

It does not seem that here Schmidt could have been referring to the Reformers, however. Indeed he states very clearly that Luther did not accept Platonism.⁴ Luther even

¹TWNT. III. p.534.

²Church and Ministry. G.D. Henderson. 1951. p.76.

³ibid. p.77.

⁴TWNT. III. p.535.

tended to avoid using the word 'Church', preferring, in his translation of the Bible, such expressions as 'the congregation of the saints, the people or company of God.' This was a return to Old Testament and Pauline usage, and against such later developments as the glorification of the ekklesia, the splitting of the ekklesia into visible and invisible parts, and the identifying of the ekklesia with the βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ. There are Protestants, it is true, as Mascall observes, "who hold that the Church is entirely invisible."¹ There are also Catholics who reject the Platonic dualism in much the same terms as Luther (and K.L. Schmidt) did. "There are not two Churches, one visible and one invisible. Nor is the visible Church (as 'material' - earthly) - in a kind of Platonic dualism or spiritualism - the image or copy of the real, invisible ('spiritual' - heavenly) Church. Nor is the invisible the true essence and the visible merely the outward form of the Church. No, the one Church is in essence and form, always, at one and the same time, both visible and invisible."²

Regarding the visible New Testament community, Schmidt adds the point that "δικαιοσύνη and ἁγιότης are ascribed both to the community and to the individual without any implication that righteousness (justification) and holiness

¹Corpus Christi. p.1.

²Die Kirche. Hans Küng. 1967. pp.53-54.

(sanctification) belong either to the ἐκκλησία or to the κλητός as qualities."¹

¹TWNT. III. p.534.

THE CHURCH OF EARLY CHRISTIANITY

K.L. Schmidt and Deissmann

It was quite early in his career as a New Testament scholar that Karl Ludwig Schmidt began to turn his attention more and more to the subject of the Church, especially the Church of New Testament days. As has already been mentioned, his work in line with the development of Formgeschichte, Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu, was published in 1919, and in 1921 he became Professor of New Testament at Giessen.¹ His work as editor of, and contributor to, Theologische Blätter, his articles on the place of the Gospels in the general history of literature and on the place of the Apostle Paul in early Christianity, which appeared in 1923 and 1924 respectively, and his two major articles, "Jesus Christus" and "Abendmahl", in RGG in 1925, further enhanced his reputation as one of the foremost of New Testament scholars. It was in 1926 that he wrote his "lexikographische und biblisch-theologische Studie", The Church of Early Christianity,² and it was this study which formed the basis of the later ἐκκλησία article in TWNT. Naturally enough a good deal of the material in the two articles

¹See pp. 16, 35 *above*.

²Published in 1927.

is largely similar - questions of etymology, the nature of the earliest ἐκκλησία, the kenishta, the post-apostolic development of the Church, for example - but a comparison of the two can show how his thought on the Church developed and deepened as his studies continued, and while the ἐκκλησία article is, by far, the more definitive statement of his views, The Church of Early Christianity, as Kümmel brings out,¹ took the "far too complicated formulation of Kattenbusch's theories" and, while building on the tracing back of the early Christian Church consciousness to the preaching of Jesus, (Kattenbusch's view), took up at the same time the question of unity in early Christian thought regarding the Church, stressing, on the one hand, "the Gentile-Christian Church joining itself to the primitive community as the bearer of the Christ-tradition and, on the other hand, the Pauline protest against the over-emphasis of human features in the primitive community's thought regarding the Church."²

Schmidt's Rahmen had been dedicated to Adolf Deissmann, his former professor and mentor in Berlin, whose major book Licht vom Osten appeared in 1908, ran through many editions,

¹Das Neue Testament. Werner Georg Kümmel. 1958.

²op.cit. p.506. cf. Der Quellort der Kirchenidee. F. Kattenbusch. 1921.

and is still well known today,¹ For Deissmann's 60th birthday in November, 1926, Dr. Schmidt organised a 'Festgabe', a symposium of longer and shorter articles, some fifteen in number, including two by such noted contributors as Martin Dibelius and Archbishop Nathan Söderblom, and one by Professor George Milligan of Glasgow University on "An Early Scottish Lexicon of the Greek New Testament" by an Andrew Symson in 1658. For this Festgabe Dr. Schmidt wrote the foreword and his article on "The Church of Early Christianity."

Deissmann's intensive work with inscriptions and papyri had shown the closeness of the language of the New Testament to the Koine, the widely used, colloquial Greek of the day, and he had stressed the need for an up-to-date dictionary of the New Testament which would take note of the wealth of new discoveries in the field of New Testament studies, one which would be less dogmatic and more scientific than the existing dictionaries. Gerhard Kittel had already launched his

¹For example Deissmann's famous description of the New Testament - "A book from the ancient East, and lit up by the light of dawn - a book breathing the fragrance of the Galilean spring, and anon swept by the shipwrecking north-east tempest from the Mediterranean - a book of peasants, fishermen, artisans, travellers by land and sea, fighters and martyrs - a book in cosmopolitan Greek with marks of Semitic origin - a book of the Imperial age, written at Antioch, Ephesus, Corinth, Rome - a book of pictures, miracles and visions - book of the village and the town - book of the people and the peoples." Light from the Ancient East. (E.T.) p.392.

project for publishing just such a dictionary, and it finally took shape as the monumental Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament.¹ Whether Dr. Schmidt knew at this stage that his would be one of the major articles contributed, is not known. What is certain is that in writing "The Church of Early Christianity", he laid the foundations and built a good part of the building of his final Ecclesia.

Etymology

Under this section he notes that, from literature, from the common spoken language, and from inscriptions, the ordinary Greek word ἐκκλησία usually meant a regularly summoned political gathering. In New Testament usage, however, it stood not just for a single gathering or congregation (Gemeinde) but for the whole congregation, in other words, what we would mean by the Church. But it is not as if this 'whole congregation' (or Church) simply equals the sum of the single congregations. There is no suggestion of a growth of the Church in that sense. Indeed, often when a single congregation is referred to, the whole congregation is meant.

Where the ἐκκλησία is qualified, it is usually by the addition of the words, τοῦ Θεοῦ, or, less frequently τοῦ

¹See p. 56 above. These discoveries brought to light the many-sidedness of early Christianity and the close relationship of many New Testament ideas with both Jewish and Hellenistic thought. They needed to be systematised and made available for a better understanding of the New Testament. cf. Vielhauer. *op.cit.* p.203.

Χριστοῦ .¹ Nowhere (in the New Testament) is the ἐκκλησία coupled with titles, adjectives, or other descriptions.²

It is clearly a word with a special claim. It is almost like a name, parallel in some ways to God's 'name'. Nonetheless, in its own right it is a secular, worldly expression and precisely not a 'cult' word.³

The corresponding word in the Old Testament is בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים . Here again there might have been a choice of word open. In Hebrew בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים and קָהָל both mean a gathering, people's assembly. In Greek, קָהָל usually equals συναγωγή and בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים is nearly always rendered ἐκκλησία , though there are some instances where בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים is also translated as συναγωγή . The fact that many Jewish synagogues already existed and were associated with different localities may have been one factor in the minds of the first Greek-speaking Jewish Christians who chose to use ἐκκλησία . From the Greek language point of view it is also a word of greater weight. Whatever the reasons "it gives food for thought that an expression like ἐκκλησία as the self-chosen description of the Christian community finally and completely won the day."⁴

¹Both occur in 1 Thes.1:1.

²Festgabe. p.263.

³Many 'cult' words could have been possibilities. cf. ibid. pp.266-7.

⁴ibid. p.265.

This relation to the Old Testament is of much greater importance than the etymology or the Hellenistic parallels. The nature of the ἐκκλησία is inseparably linked to its roots in the בַּתְּרָא , and it is primarily from the similarity between the Old Testament and the early Christian evidence, that the word ἐκκλησία got its specific importance, Dr. Schmidt maintains.¹ The questions it raises as to the contrast between the new and the old, as to how far the old is superseded by the new or how far the old continues through the new, questions as to the relationship between Jewish Christianity, and Gentile Christianity, relations between Peter and Paul - all this shows how "semantics lead to biblical theology."²

For non-Greek speaking Christians the choice between בַּתְּרָא and תַּבְּרָא cannot have been immediately self-evident. As we have seen, both mean a gathering or assembly, and both are closely linked to the People of God, the Israel of God. However, the Jewish translators of the Old Testament into Greek always used ἐκκλησία for בַּתְּרָא , never for תַּבְּרָא which they always rendered συναγωγή . From this we can deduce that the Urgemeinde, the primitive Christian community in Jerusalem, would call itself בַּתְּרָא or use, in addition, the Aramaic אַבְּתָרָא .

¹Festgabe. p.264.

²ibid.

Jesus and his Disciples

Jesus and his disciples spoke Aramaic and many direct traces of this are extant in the Gospels. But as Jews, from upbringing, from the Scriptures, from synagogue and Temple worship, they would also know Hebrew and no doubt freely mixed Hebrew and Aramaic expressions.¹

The Jewish Rabbis (in Talmud and Midrash) make very little use of either קהל or עדה. There the more usual expression is כנסת ישראל but only the verb stem of this, כנס - to gather, appears in the Old Testament. In any case there is very little difference in substance between כנסת and קהל and עדה. In the Targums (i.e. Aramaic translations of Hebrew texts) the usual word for these is כנישתא (kenishta).

The Syriac translations are of great interest in this connection. The Syra Curetoniana and the Peshitta versions (both 5th century or earlier) have ἐκκλησία for the Christian Church and kenishta for the Jewish synagogue. But Syra Sinaitica (4th or perhaps even 3rd century) has kenishta for both ἐκκλησία and συναγωγή.²

¹In the New Testament, 'Hebrew' is used to denote both Hebrew and Aramaic. The Greeks erroneously called Aramaic, Syriac or Chaldee. "Biblical Aramaic differs from Hebrew chiefly by its preference of dentals to sibilants, its larger vocabulary which includes many loan-words, its greater variety of conjunctions, and its development of an elaborate tense-system through the use of the participle with pronouns or with various parts of the verb 'to be.'" Companion to the Bible. T.W. Manson. 1939. p.20.

²Festgabe. p.277.

So it is more than likely that kenishta was the Aramaic word Jesus used.¹

Now, seen from the outside, this kenishta, this בֵּית, this ekklesia, would look like a synagogue, a part of Judaism. It would hold to Jewish customs, keep its links with the Temple, everything, indeed, that constituted the Assembly of God.

But for the early Christian community an event had taken place that had brought about a fundamental transformation. The promised Messiah had come in Jesus of Nazareth. So even if the primitive community had called itself a synagogue, it was not just a synagogue, a part of Judaism. It was, potentially, the whole of Judaism. For it was the true Israel, the remnant in which alone the בֵּית, the ἐκκλησία τῶ θεοῦ, the Assembly of God, was now visible. "In the Messiah-Jesus-synagogue alone was the Congregation of God."²

The kenishta, then, is a very special kenishta. It is the Messiah-Jesus-synagogue, the בֵּית, the ekklesia, the Church.

Ekklesia in St. Matthew

It is important at every point not to read our current meaning of words back into the New Testament. As soon as we

¹ibid.

²ibid. p.280.

say 'church' the true meaning of ekklesia tends to be obscured. New Testament history is not the history of an old religion and church being superseded by a new. It is not the story of Christianity replacing Judaism. There is difference, but there is also continuity. In the words of the Epistle to the Hebrews - "In many and various ways God spoke of old to our fathers by the prophets; but in these last days he has spoken to us by a Son, whom he appointed the heir of all things, through whom also he created the world." (1:1,2).

The vast literature and widely differing conclusions as to the authenticity or non-authenticity of the Mt.16:17-19 verses, has already been discussed in the chapter on the Ekklesia article.¹ In this Festgabe article Schmidt had set out some of the arguments for holding the verses genuine. Although they occur only in Matthew's Gospel, no text we have lacks them. The verses have a very strongly Aramaic pattern of expression. The blessing at the outset is distinctly similar to Old Testament usage, just as the use of the father's name is distinctively Semitic. Binding and loosing is also typical of Rabbinic phraseology. In Greek Πέτρος and πέτρα lose a little of the Aramaic play on words, since the Greek for 'rock' involves a change in gender. But in Aramaic one word כֶּפָּא (Cephas) stands for both. All this points to

¹See p.99 f. above.

attributing the verses to the earliest days of the primitive Christian movement.¹

Bultmann, who held that the verses did not represent a genuine saying of Jesus, had also considered Mk.8:27-30 fragmentary, requiring some comment from Jesus on the confession He had elicited.² All this Schmidt strongly criticised, calling Bultmann's view "a psychologising petitio principii which does not fit into the pictorial, essentially pericope character of the oldest Jesus tradition."³ His conclusion was that, from the literary and textual point of view, Mt.16:17-19 must be considered just as genuine as the surrounding verses, Mt.16:13-16 and 20.

To understand the passage correctly, however, it has to be seen in the perspective of Jesus' whole attitude towards his people. Schmidt says - "Jesus' so-called founding of the Church does not stand or fall by Mt.16:18. It is not an isolated act which is spoken of there but one to be understood out of Jesus' overall attitude towards his people, among whom, for whom and in opposition to whom, he gathered a council of

¹Festgabe. p.282.

²Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition. p.157. In the Mt. verses Bultmann held that it was obviously the Risen One speaking, and that "the Easter experience of Peter was the birth of the Messiah-faith of the Urgemeinde." (p.157).

³Festgabe. p.282.

Twelve as a special אֲבֵנֵי-אֶבֶן , and commissioned them to represent the יְהוָה בְּהַר ."¹ Variations in the lists of the Twelve in no way invalidate the evidence that Jesus did gather such a symbolic Twelve into a special kenishta and "in the time of the Urgemeinde it was more important that Jesus had the Twelve around him than that something definite was known about each one."²

So it is "with the disciples that the הַר יְהוָה is constituted", and it is for the ἐκκλησία , the remnant and kernel of the people of God, that the βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ or τῶν οὐρανῶν is intended.³ Indeed, the fact of this constituting receives its meaning "first through the reference to the coming and mysteriously already dawning kingly rule of God in His βῆμα . The question whether Jesus made his disciples into the ἐκκλησία must be answered in the affirmative."⁴ To understand how this happened requires not only that we avoid treating Mt.16:18 in isolation but also that we take into account the tradition complexes dealing with "the so-called Messiah consciousness and the so-called institution of the

¹ ibid. p.292.

² ibid. p.291.

³ ibid. p.293.

⁴ ibid. For further discussion of Basileia and of eschatology see pp. 242 f., 169 f. below.

Last Supper."¹

In this article Schmidt deals only briefly with these two complexes, relying heavily on Kattenbusch's view that if Jesus knew himself to be the Messiah and took to himself the Daniel 7 prophecies regarding the Son of Man, this is a concept not of an individual but the representative of the 'saints of the Most High' who were to receive the kingdom, and it is out of the idea of this λαός that the ἐκκλησία comes.² Schmidt quotes Kattenbusch further - "In his instituting the ἐκκλησία, a 'congregation' in his name, through the Last Supper, he (Jesus) was not leaving out of account his self-description according to the Daniel vision (including the Isaiah prophecy as the meaning of the kind of 'Son of Man'), but rather emphasising this as strongly as possible. . . . The Last Supper was the act of founding his ἐκκλησία, his congregation (Gemeinde) as such."³ He adds that he would find Kattenbusch's conclusions cogent, "did I not feel compelled to hold Lk.22:15, 16,18 is the oldest attainable account of the institution of the Last Supper, against his view that 1 Cor.11:23ff. is the oldest and most reliable account."⁴

¹Festgabe. p.293.

²ibid. p.294.

³Der Quellort der Kirchenidee. Here p.295. "No more recent study of the question of the Church in early Christianity deals with such important matters as are contained in Kattenbusch's study," notes Dr. Schmidt.

⁴Festgabe. p.295.

The Institution of the Last Supper

A year or so earlier¹ Schmidt had written an article for RGG specifically on the Last Supper in the New Testament and primitive Christianity, his being the first of six sections, other contributors dealing with the subject from the point of view of dogmatic history, present-day significance, liturgical history, liturgy, ecclesiastical rules and regulations.² It was in this article he had argued for the Lucan account of the Last Supper being basically older than Paul's account (in 1 Cor.11), even although, in actual time of writing Paul's version is the earlier by 20 years or so. One of his main reasons is that while Mark, Matthew and Paul all interpret Jesus' institution of the Supper as a Heilstatsache (a 'salvation fact'), the Lucan verses speak only of the coming of suffering and of the Kingdom of God. As regards the date of the Supper, which Paul did not specify, Schmidt prefers the Johannine chronology, following which the Supper would not be a Passover, rather than the Synoptic chronology which, setting the events one day later, would make the Supper fall on the Passover. He is quick to add, however, saying that it must be underlined, that nothing in Jesus' life and attitude

¹ i.e. in 1925, according to Cullmann. Th.Z. Jan/Feb. 1956. p.3.

² "Abendmahl" in RGG. 2nd. Ed. 1927. Vol.I.

precludes the possibility of his having spoken of his death in the context of a 'salvation fact' and that it is important to keep this perspective in mind in any consideration of the institution of the Last Supper.

Then he writes - "Jesus did not in fact found the Last Supper with our current words of institution, any more than he founded baptism and the Church. But, just as the early Christian community meaningfully baptised in the name because they understood themselves to be the Church, the congregation (Gemeinde) of God, the Body of Christ, so the memory of Jesus' last meal with his closest friends was for them an ever-recurring, lasting reminder of the suffering, cross and resurrection of the Lord, and thereby a link to the above mentioned 'salvation fact' was forged."¹

From this it will be apparent that in the Festgabe article there has taken place a considerable change and development in his thought, even though he still opposes Kattenbusch's view on the priority of 1 Cor.11. In the Ekklesia article there is a still further advance, especially along what William Manson calls the 'length' and 'breadth' dimensions of research, the language, grammar, philology, sources, texts, on the one hand, and comparative religion, the parallels in Judaism, Hellenism, Gnosticism, mysticism and the like on the

¹ibid.

other.¹ However, in dealing with Heilsgeschichte which he calls 'sacred history', Manson points to the need for a third dimension, a "depth dimension", "depth-soundings", "depth exegesis", into the theological substance.² Whether or not Schmidt has been equally successful in the matter of this third dimension will need to be weighed later. At any rate his view of the Last Supper is not endorsed by the majority of scholars nowadays. Jeremias, whose authoritative work on The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, shows the complexity of the problem and gathers together and sifts all the evidence, does find that Luke is more original than Paul on one or two points, but his main conclusion is that "Mark leads us still farther back, since he has preserved at any rate with regard to language a considerably older form of the tradition than Paul and also than Luke."³

In Jeremias' view the meal was a Passover and to support this he marshalls 14 points, including much new evidence and an extensive bibliography, and, in addition, refutes 11 objections to his view. After a minute examination of the long and short texts of the Lucan version, he holds that

¹Jesus and the Christian. 1967. p.32 (From a New College lecture in 1925).

²ibid. p.33.

³Die Abendmahlsworte Jesu. Joachim Jeremias. 3rd. German Ed. 1960. (E.T. 1966). p.188.

important arguments favour the long text here.¹ He deals in detail with astronomy and chronology for the years 27,30,31,33, 34 A.D., and with the varied possibilities and probabilities that surround the dates 13th, 14th, and 15th Nisan, concluding that the weight of evidence supports the view that the Supper coincided with the Passover.² In his opinion, Mark, standing linguistically nearest to the original tradition,^{reproduces} a tradition belonging to "the first decade after the death of Jesus."³ However, he goes on to give examples of how the other versions here and there "preserve elements which are older than Mark," citing Schürmann's minute and careful investigation of Lk.22: 19-20 which led Schürmann to find "the oldest text of the words of interpretation in Luke rather than Mark."⁴ Jeremias himself observes (in his Preface) that "I no longer consider this (the Markan) account as the oldest form of the tradition; rather I should prefer to think that in the earliest times we have to reckon with quite a number of parallel versions behind which the Urform lies hidden."⁵

¹ op.cit. p.159.

² ibid. pp.36-41.

³ ibid. p.189.

⁴ Der Einsetzungsbericht Lk.22:19-20. H. Schürmann. 1955. Jeremias notes (p.190) that Schürmann, in a letter to him of March 1959, had somewhat modified this view.

⁵ op.cit. p.7.

The four New Testament accounts of the Lord's Supper which have come down to us, E.F. Scott pointed out,¹ fall broadly into two groups - the Pauline/Lucan passages which stress the aspect of the Supper as a memorial feast, and the Mark/Matthew account in which the Supper is thought of "not as a memorial feast, but as an anticipation of the future Messianic banquet."² Scott held this latter view was the more original and that it is very closely linked with Passover ideas. "Before the Hebrews entered Canaan," Snaith writes, "they had one great festival in the year, that of Pesah (Passover). It goes back to pre-Mosaic times, but received new meaning with the exodus. To this day the Jew eats the Passover lamb, simulating that same haste with which his fathers hurried from the land of bondage."³ Scott draws attention to the words from the beginning of the Jewish Passover service, words probably much the same as those in use in Jesus' days on earth, - ". . . This year servants, next year sons of freedom" - holding that this supports the idea of the 'future Messianic banquet'.⁴ All four accounts agree on the link between the cup and the New Covenant, so that these two

¹The Kingdom and the Messiah. E.F. Scott. 1911. Mk.14:17f.; Mt.26:20f.; Lk.22:14f.; 1 Cor.11:23f.

²op.cit. p.237.

³N.H. Snaith in A Companion to the Bible (Ed. by T.W. Manson). 1939. p.439.

⁴op.cit. p.238.

elements were doubtless in Jesus' mind in instituting the Last Supper.

Burkitt indicated one problem in connection with the Passover link with the Last Supper in the Markan account when he wrote - "The second Evangelist is the chief authority for identifying the Last Supper with the paschal meal, an identification which seems to contradict all the other traditions about the date of the crucifixion, including that which served as the foundation of the Second Gospel itself, and to be exceedingly improbable historically."¹ This is because Mk.14:12 - "And on the first day of Unleavened Bread, when they sacrificed the passover lamb . . ." - is "practically a contradiction in terms" (since the first day of unleavened bread was the 15th of Nisan but the Passover lamb was sacrificed on the 14th of Nisan), and Burkitt adds that many scholars maintain no Jew could have said this. He suggests that the verse is perhaps due to the influence of the Roman practice of celebrating the Easter Eucharist on a Sunday.²

For Schmidt, as for Kattenbusch, the institution of the Last Supper is closely bound up with the origin of the Church, as Johnston points out.³ Of the four alternatives which

¹The Earliest Sources for the Life of Jesus. F.C. Burkitt. 1922. p.87.

²ibid. p.88.

³The Doctrine of the Church in the New Testament. p.66.

Johnston lists as the proposed answers to the question as to when the Church began - 1. the call of the first disciples; 2. the confession of Peter; 3. the Last Supper; 4. Easter or Pentecost - he claims the support of K.L. Schmidt for No. 3.¹ Flew who largely agrees with Schmidt's position, though, according to Johnston, seeming to combine Nos. 1 and 3, says that F.J.A. Hort may have been historically accurate in maintaining that "the Twelve sat that evening (i.e. at the Last Supper) as representatives of the Ecclesia at large."² Kümmel, on the other hand, is quite against any notion of a small, closed group, arguing that Jesus called the whole nation of Israel, the whole city of Jerusalem, the whole people of God, even though they were unwilling.³ Besides the Twelve there were many more disciples, followers, hearers - crowds of them even (Lk.6:17; 19:37). Jesus, if he thought of himself as Messiah, did not thereby necessarily have to have a present Heilsgemeinde belonging to him.⁴ The Church exists through the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, and this was the

¹ ibid.

² Hort. op.cit. p.30. Flew. op.cit. p.27.

³ "Jesus und die Anfänge der Kirche" from Studia Theologica (No.7. 1953) in Heilsgeschehen und Geschichte. W.G. Kümmel. 1965. p.295.

⁴ op.cit. p.291.

early Christian view, Kümmel asserts. The idea of Jesus starting a Church in his lifetime goes against this.¹ The common meal continues, however, as the disciples await his return. Johnston had expressed a similar view earlier. Ekklesia in Matthew "is an anachronism", he held. The disciples are potentially the Church but "they become the Church through the baptism of the Spirit. Without the Cross and the Resurrection there is no Church."²

Traugott Schmidt had earlier argued strongly for the existence of a small, inner core, a special community, within Israel in the Diaspora. "The young Christian congregation formed a circle like this within the people," he wrote. "They considered themselves to be the community which, according to eschatological expectation (expressed very clearly in the imagery of the Book of Enoch), the Messiah would gather around himself. Thus, as the congregation of the Messiah, whom they believed had appeared in Jesus, they made the claim to be the kernel of the People of God, the true Israel."³ Oepke, as Kümmel mentions, claimed that 'Jesus as Messiah must have willed the Church', and even goes on to say "that a Church was there the moment Jesus appeared."⁴ A still longer view

¹ibid. p.299.

²op.cit. p.56.

³op.cit. pp.121-2.

⁴Heilsgeschehen und Geschichte. Kümmel. p.294. Der Herrnspruch über die Kirche Mt.16:17-19 in der neuesten Forschung. A. Oepke. 1948/9.

is taken by Professor Torrance who says - "The Church had its earthly beginning in Adam for then it began to subsist in the human society formed by God for immediate communion with Himself."¹ The majority of commentators, however, see Pentecost as the actual beginning of the Church.² Kümmel mentions Barrett, Cullmann, Johnston, Nelson, as holding that the Church exists through the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ.³ Bonhoeffer's view was that the Resurrection makes the Church real but not yet actual. The actual founding of the Church was Pentecost, the reality of the Church being established by God. "Not religion, but revelation," he adds, "not a religious community, but the church: that is what the reality of Jesus Christ means."⁴ Richardson, too, held that the Church came into being with the pouring out of the Holy Spirit by the risen and ascended Lord, though he also held that Jesus did intend to 'found' the Church.⁵ Brunner, in reviewing the various theories, and also the summaries of Linton and Kümmel, mentions Nelson's view that the Church was

¹Theology in Reconstruction. T.F. Torrance. 1965. p.193.

²See pp. 266 f. below.

³op.cit. p.299.

⁴Sanctorum Communio. Dietrich Bonhoeffer. (1927) E.T. 1963. p.112.

⁵op.cit. p.310.

ecclesia designata until Good Friday and Easter, and Edwin Lewis' view that there was no Church until Christ had finished his work of conquering sin and death.¹ He describes Kümmel's summary as 'most up-to-date and comprehensive'.² His own view was that the Ekklesia in the strict New Testament sense did not begin until Easter and became definite at Pentecost. He does add, however, that many serious critics hold the view that the Messiah Jesus on earth formed the nucleus of a Messianic people, and among these he names Dobschutz, Cullmann, Fridrichsen, Flew, Kattenbusch.³ He also registers his objection to Craig's saying that Jesus 'redeemed the already existing Church.'⁴ Having carried the original beginning back to Adam, Professor Torrance goes on to say - "The Church did not come into being with the Resurrection or with the outpouring of the Spirit at Pentecost. That was not its birth but its new birth, not its beginning but its transformation into the Body of the risen Lord quickened and filled with

¹The Misunderstanding of the Church. p.25f. Kümmel - Kirchenbegriff und Geschichtsbewusstsein in der Urgemeinde und bei Jesus. 1943. J.R. Nelson - The Realm of Redemption. 1951. E. Lewis - The Ministry and the Sacraments.

²op.cit. Note on p.120.

³ibid. p.26.

⁴The One Church in the Light of the New Testament. C.T. Craig. 1952.

his Spirit. Jesus Christ had already gathered and built up the nucleus of the Church round himself, but because he loved it he gave himself for it that he might cleanse it and change it through the mystery of union with himself in death and resurrection."¹

Brunner regards the Last Supper primarily (in the early Church) as an act of fellowship rather than as a 'sacred meal' which soon developed into being considered the "essence of salvation itself" the more a sacramental idea of the Church ousted the New Testament conception which had nothing to do with the Church as an institution.² As emphasis on the sacramental increased, 'correct celebration' of the Last Supper became more and more important. House churches had to go. The bishop became central. The difference between 'those who give' (priest) and 'those who receive' (laity) increased. Sacramental unity gradually replaced spiritual unity.³ All this happened, Brunner stresses, in spite of the fact that "not only the word, but even the concept 'Sacrament' is unknown to the New Testament."⁴ The Last Supper as an act of fellowship was not created by the fellowship but instituted

¹op.cit. p.204.

²op.cit. p.75.

³op.cit. p.75f.

⁴Dogmatics. Vol.III. p.64.

and commanded by Christ. In the New Testament, nevertheless, it was non-cultic, a common meal resembling the Jewish Chabura, the customary daily supper in a pious Jewish family in which bread was broken and the 'cup of thanksgiving' was passed round.¹ Brunner, indeed, presses his non-institutional understanding of the Church so far that he can write - "The fundamental thesis of Rudolph Sohm, that the essential nature of the Church (he means the Ecclesia) stands in antithesis to all law, is indisputable whether, as in the Catholic churches, this law is conceived as sacred or whether, as in the Reformed churches, it is interpreted on secular lines."² Mascall, although he takes quite a different view of the sacramental, also draws attention to the taking, blessing and giving of bread and cup as not appearing to "derive from any deliberate prefiguring of the Passion by our Lord at the Last Supper, but from the normal ceremonial of a Jewish religious meal," and he continues - "What Christ deliberately added, and what invested the meal with a sacrificial significance, was not anything that he did but certain words that he said, his declaration that the bread was his body and that the cup was

¹ ibid. p.63.

² The Misunderstanding of the Church. p.107. Brunner gives further reasons for this support of Sohm's view in his Dogmatics. Vol.III. p.47. Linton (op.cit. p.50f.) outlines Sohm's position.

the new covenant in his blood, and his command that the rite should be repeated as his anamnesis."¹

The complex nature of the problems involved in study of the Last Supper, Messiah-consciousness, salvation facts, the origins of the Church, is very clear in all the vast literature dealing with the subject. V. Taylor draws attention to Jeremias' summary of the numerous arguments pro and con regarding the Last Supper, for instance, and supports Jeremias and Dalman in holding it to be a Passover meal.² But he also mentions many other scholars including Box, Oesterley, Macgregor, Lietzmann, Otto, as favouring various other types of meal.³ It is possible to exaggerate the importance of the point, he observes. Whether the Last Supper was a Passover meal or not, Paschal ideas and associations were obviously in Jesus' mind then.⁴

This complexity and divergence of opinion need to be kept in mind in tracing the development of K.L. Schmidt's thought. His two RGG articles obviously do not represent his most mature writing. There is a clear advance and development from them

¹Corpus Christi. p.123.

²Jesus and His Sacrifice. Vincent Taylor. 1937. p.115.
Jeremias. op.cit. Dalman. Jesus-Jeshua.

³op.cit. pp.115-6.

⁴ibid. p.116.

to this present Festgabe article, and an even more marked development can be noted in the Ekklesia article. In it he deals in much more detail with the connection between the sense in which Jesus regarded himself as Son of Man and the sense in which he instituted the Lord's Supper. If, as the evidence seems to show, Jesus viewed himself as Messiah in the sense of Daniel 7, this, Schmidt says, opens up "new vistas" as regards the nature and significance of his founding of the Church. Indeed "in this light the so-called institution of the Lord's Supper is shown to be an act in establishment of the Church."¹

"It is also important, however," he continues, "that this view of the complex Jesus, Messiah, Son of Man, Disciples, Community, the Lord's Supper, leads directly to the Pauline and deutero-Pauline understanding of the ἐκκλησία which is ἄνωθεν on the one hand and yet also σῶμα Χριστοῦ on the other, just as Christ is both exalted on the one hand and yet also present in the community on the other. The question of the founding of the Church by Jesus Himself is really a question of His Messiahship."²

Cullmann, who generally supports Schmidt, writes - "The Messianic consciousness must lead to the founding of the Church",

¹TWNT. III. p.521.

²ibid. p.521.

but adds that, since for Jesus this consciousness involves the necessity of his death, therefore the death of Jesus "is the real starting point of the new people of God."¹

These two latter articles of Schmidt's give very strong support for the view that the founding of the ekklesia and the institution of the Lord's Supper are traceable back to Jesus' own word and deed, however truly, in addition, the early Christian community in the post-resurrection period may have kept to the intention and Spirit of their Lord.

The Post-Resurrection Ekklesia

In the Festgabe article Schmidt deals only briefly with the special position of Peter as the Rock and in the main follows Kattenbusch here also. Like Kattenbusch, and in this instance like Bultmann too, he considers Mt.18:15-17 a concern of the post-Easter community and not a saying of Jesus.² Jesus' word to Peter, however, simply does not make sense as a later invention, Schmidt maintains, nor can it be a vaticinium ex eventu for there is no evidence that the rest of the Twelve depended on Peter in their faith in the Risen

¹Petrus. p.197.

²op.cit. p.296. Kattenbusch. Der Spruch über Petrus. p.109f. Bultmann. op.cit. p.85.

One, while there is evidence, Galatians 2 for example, not only of Paul but also of 'men of the Urkreis' opposing Peter. At the same time Peter has precedence over the others as a witness to the resurrection and the best solution of the presence of the saying is that Jesus did single out Peter in this fashion.¹ As the locus classicus for Papal supremacy, the passage has been attacked and interpreted in many different ways, by Luther and the Reformers, but, however true it may be that the Church is built in the Spirit and on the rock of Christ, Schmidt points out, it is quite wrong to conclude from that, that Jesus is not here addressing Simon, who is for that very reason called Peter. Not that this bestows any hierarchical claim upon Peter, and nothing is said about any hierarchical succession.² "The Apostle Peter," writes Cullmann, "in the first period after the death of Jesus, leads the Primitive Church in Jerusalem; he then leaves Jerusalem, where the leadership passes over to James; and from then on, by commission of the Primitive Church and in dependence on it, he stands at the head of the Jewish Christian mission."³

¹ op.cit. p.297. Here again Schmidt follows Kattenbusch, Die Vorzugstellung des Petrus, who (successfully, in Schmidt's opinion) argued against Holl's views.

² ibid. p.298f.

³ Peter. (E.T.) p.55.

Basic agreement about the ekklesia is what stands out in early Christianity in spite of all that has been written about disagreements between Peter and Paul, Jewish Christianity and Gentile Christianity, the different kinds, development and relationships between the rapidly increasing number of churches, together with the very real problems of day to day life in the Christian faith and way.

"When the primitive community in Jerusalem felt itself to be, and represented itself as, the ἐκκλησία τοῦ Θεοῦ constituted through the events of the Resurrection," Schmidt says, "it strongly emphasised two things thereby - first, the special authority of the first disciples to make the valid decision in all questions that arose and that concerned the Church outside Jerusalem as well; and second, together with that, the primacy of Jerusalem. Authoritative personalities and a holy place formed the centre of the Church."¹

A page or two further on Dr. Schmidt underlines these points, but with a cautionary addition.² "Without the first Apostles (the 'Urapostel') and without Jerusalem there is no ἐκκλησία: with the Apostles and in Jerusalem the ἐκκλησία was constituted. That must remain constitutive. But it would be misleading for the first disciples ('Urjünger') to

¹Festgabe. p.302.

²ibid. p.304.

claim that they as persons and Jerusalem as a place were binding."¹

The ἐκκλησία , in other words, had been erected by God through the resurrection of Jesus, but it was secured by chosen, still living personalities who had their commission from Christ. Its being constituted depended, not on hosts of pneumatics and charismatics, but on some definite, limited appearances of the Risen One to certain few people.² The first Apostles clearly enjoyed special status and were clearly linked to Jerusalem, only Peter appearing to make missionary journeys. From the Acts of the Apostles we see that they claimed rights, claimed maintenance, picked deacons for special tasks. All this is further borne out by Paul's letters, even when he strongly opposes any over-emphasis on the personal (i.e. the original apostles as permanent authorities) and the local (i.e. Jerusalem as the only centre).³

Even when Paul had to oppose Peter publicly for being "plainly in the wrong" regarding withdrawing from eating with Gentile Christians out of fear of Jewish Christians (Gal.2:11f.), faith in Jesus Christ and their common experience of Christ held them in a unity in spite of all differences. The Spirit

¹ibid. p.304.

²ibid. p.303.

³ibid. p.304f.

provided the answer both to the personal and the local limitation. The individual to whom Christ had spoken (Paul included himself in this) was important. But the ἐκκλησία as the Body of Christ was more than a mere collection of individuals. It was pervaded by Christ, who is its Spirit and Lord. So, while Jerusalem, the holy city, was also of special importance, the true centre of the ἐκκλησία lies not in a place but in the Lord Christ.¹ The Body of Christ does away with all local limitation, even the Temple itself. With the Spirit of Christ the constitutive factor in the experience of the individual Christian and in the building of the ἐκκλησία Paul at the same time recognised the early Jerusalem community as the place where decisions should be arrived at, collected money for the poor at Jerusalem,² and went out of his way to move together with them wherever possible.

"Looking at the whole, the essential, the decisive thing," writes Dr. Schmidt, "the Jewish Christian and the Gentile Christian communities had, and Peter and Paul had, the same view of the Church."³ He thus opposes Holl's view that by protesting against any obligation to the Law and by defending his own apostleship, Paul was, at the same time, creating a

¹ ibid. p.305.

² Schmidt makes the point that it was not for the poor at Jerusalem but for the poor at Jerusalem. p.306.

³ ibid. p.310.

new idea of the Church.¹ Paul's concept of the Church as the $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$ $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\upsilon$ is at the centre of this argument since it seems to embody a more sacramental idea of the Church than is to be found in the expressions used by the primitive community.² "In Christ Jesus you are all sons of God, through faith," Paul writes to the Galatians. "For as many of you as were baptised into Christ have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is neither male nor female; for you are all one in Christ Jesus." (Gal.3:26-28). Writing to the Corinthians about the one body and its many members he says - "For by one Spirit we were all baptised into one body - Jews or Greeks, slaves or free - and all were made to drink of one Spirit." (1 Cor.12:13). Christ "is the head of the body, the church." (Col.1:18). Colossians and Ephesians especially, seems to range into the realms of mythological speculation.

It must be noted, however, that even when Paul speaks of $\sigma\omicron\phi\iota\acute{\alpha}$ and $\gamma\nu\omega\sigma\iota\varsigma$, for him it is never a matter of free-ranging speculation or esoteric understanding but a confrontation of Greek wisdom by the foolishness of the Cross, not a theoretical knowing of the divine but a practical obeying of God, "having the eyes of your hearts enlightened." (Eph.1:18).³

¹Der Kirchenbegriff des Paulus in seinem Verhältniss zu dem der Urgemeinde. Karl Holl. 1921. p.941.

²Festgabe. p.312.

³ibid. p.313.

The Christian faith was fundamentally different from the mystery cult, of which in those days there were many, for it has a firm, unyielding basis in history. "The Christusmysterium is the σταυρός, the execution of a man who actually lived, not a myth of the dying and rising again of a god symbolising some general truth."¹ Whatever speculative or sacramental aspects can be discovered in Paul's thought, they all bear the prefix or key signature that "the σῶμα Χριστοῦ is one and the same as the Old Testament ἐκκλησία τοῦ Θεοῦ."² No sooner has Paul said "You are all one in Christ Jesus," than he adds, "And if you are Christ's, then you are Abraham's offspring, heirs according to promise." (Gal.3:28,29).

What Paul opposed was the attributing of holiness to the individual or the institution. Holiness is imputed to the ἐκκλησία and to the κλητός but it is never their own possession. In other words, Schmidt says, "the true understanding of what the Church is stands or falls by the true understanding of what justification is."³

Changes in the New Testament view of the Church began taking place already by the second century A.D. One of these stressed the difference between the visible Church in which

¹Festgabe. p.314.

²ibid.

³ibid. p.315.

the good and evil are mixed, and the ideal Church to which only the saved belong, a distinction which has given rise to various forms of Platonism, especially in Protestant interpretation.¹ This in turn has given rise to many false theories of how the Church has 'developed' historically. Certainly the early Christian documents show the decrease in importance of pneumatics and charismatics and the increase in importance of presbyters and bishops, but they also show that even in the earliest days there was no pneumatic, spiritualistic kind of ekklesia in the earliest days of Christianity.² It was the growth of theocratic, hierarchical notions that marked the road away from the New Testament ekklesia. Schmidt sees this not so much as a clearly distinguishable development from one stage to another, but rather as due to the dynamic interaction of the elements inherent in the situation. Daniel-Rops drew attention to this dynamic factor when he wrote - "Christianity began to expand from the moment of its birth: its expansion has never ceased, and never will. This expansion is the most striking characteristic of its whole history. The Church is no fixed thing, defined and marked out once and for always; she is a living force which continues

¹Luther had no part in this kind of Platonism, Schmidt claims, although he did become caught up in the division between the visible and the invisible Church. p.316.

²Festgabe. p.318.

to grow, a human reality which develops within society according to what may be called an organic law."¹ The real problem was how to keep this development faithful to the New Testament fundamentals. It would be wrong, Schmidt says, for Protestantism to try to diminish Peter's role, just as it has a duty to uphold the Pauline awareness that "the Church present herself as the people of God and not as the hierarchy of men."² To guard against both Roman Catholic and Protestant error, as Barth points out, two things need to be said. "The Church is not divine revelation institutionalised", i.e. not an organisation into whose possession God has resigned His will and truth and grace;³ and "The Church is not a religious society", i.e. not a voluntary association for the cultivation of impressions, experiences, impulses from divine revelation and formed into rules and customs and morals.⁴

On the division of the Church into visible and invisible aspects, Claude Welch terms this a "favourite Protestant solution" of the general divisiveness that mars the catholicity of the Church and refers to Brunner's The Misunderstanding of

¹The Church of Apostles and Martyrs. H. Daniel-Rops. 1948. (E.T. 1960). p.22.

²Festgabe. p.319.

³God in Action. Karl Barth. 1936. p.21.

⁴ibid.

the Church in which the latter emphasises the non-institutional character of the New Testament Ekklesia and condemns as false the idea that today's Church (or churches) represents a true 'development' from the Ekklesia, and the idea of a Church divided into visible and invisible aspects.¹ This is not the New Testament way, Welch maintains.²

The close link between the institutional and the visible/invisible 'solutions' stands out clearly in Brunner's definition of the New Testament Church. "When a man in the street today hears about the church - be he Catholic or Protestant or what not - he thinks of an institution, a something that similarly to the state (even though in a different way) hovers over the individual, which has its own law and its own importance . . . This concept of the church as an institution roots in an objectivistic thinking that had already begun in the early days of the church and finally led to the complete transformation of what in the New Testament is called ecclesia. To state this from the start in an entirely clear, unmistakable way: The New Testament knows nothing of a church as institution. In the New Testament 'church' means only one thing: the people of God, the community of the holy, the elected, the gathering of believers, believers gathered together. Not even the

¹The Reality of the Church. p.184. Brunner. op.cit. p.6.

²Welch. op.cit. p.193.

slightest abstraction has any part in what the apostles called church. Church is a concept understood purely and without exception as personal. Church is never anything else than the persons who through Christ, through fellowship with the living Lord, are themselves bound together into a living fellowship."¹ The replacing of the personal understanding of faith by the intellectual, he calls "probably the most fatal occurrence within the entire history of the church."²

Augustine had included the three classical definitions of the Church, the coetus electorum, the corpus Christi, and the communio sanctorum, in his view of the Church invisible, the visible Church being the Catholic world church of his day.³ According to Harnack, "Augustine, following Optatus, formulated his doctrine of the Church upon the basis of Cyprian's conception, excluding, however, the Donatistic elements of Cyprian and moderating the hierarchical."⁴ Already by the middle of the third century A.D. Cyprian could write - "The Church is established on the foundation of bishops, and every act of the Church is directed by those same presiding officers. Since this has been laid down by divine institution . . . etc."⁵

¹Truth as Encounter. 1964. p.168.

²ibid. p.165.

³Dogmatics. Vol.III. Brunner. p.26f.

⁴Outlines of the History of Dogma. A. Harnack. 1893. (E.T. 1957). p.354.

⁵Epistle.xxxiii.1.

Or again - "You should know that the bishop is in the Church, and the Church in the bishop, and that if anyone is not with the bishop he is not in the Church."¹ Augustine, however, was not wholly consistent and included many contradictory ideas in what he wrote. Often he seemed to identify the Church with the City of God, yet the true Church was visible, a corpus permixtum, though nevertheless secure from all unholiness. Its place was properly in heaven, yet it was a civitas on earth. It existed from the beginning, yet it was first instituted by Christ.²

Such theories are inconsistent with the New Testament view of the Church, in Brunner's opinion. "The Church is neither a numerous electorum, a totality of believers, nor is it a sacred institution, but it is the Body of Christ, consisting of nothing but persons: of Him who is the Head and of those who are members of His Body."³ So he can quote with approval K.L. Schmidt⁴ - "Ecclesiology is Christology and Christology Ecclesiology" - and Bonhoeffer - that the decisive factor regarding the Ekklesia is that "the vertical character of Christology and the horizontal character of human

¹Epistle.lxvi.7. (Early Christian Fathers. p.367f.)

²Harnack. op.cit. p.357f.

³The Misunderstanding of the Church. p.11.

⁴Dogmatics. Vol.III. p.40.

fellowship are inseparable."¹ Bishop Nygren goes so far as to say - "a Christology that does not include an ecclesiology is false", i.e. it would be just a 'Christ-idea'.²

To divide the human, visible aspects of the Church from its mystical and divine aspects creates a division that reaches farther than is generally recognised. Indeed Thornton says that "this dichotomy lies at the root of all our western divisions, and appears to be reproduced in them all."³

From this Festgabe article, "my first real study on the Church", as Schmidt calls it,⁴ the steady process of correcting his theories by closer examination of the New Testament evidence, attempting to set aside any pre-judgments and assumptions, can be observed in the development of his thought on the Church. In contrast to the more sceptical tendencies of his Formgeschichte colleagues, his researches uncovered the unyielding historical roots in the sources and the closeness of the link between ecclesiology and Christology. Obviously the scope of the article could not be presented in a single sentence, but he summed up the heart of it when he wrote - "With Jesus Christ and his first followers the Church was constituted for all time."⁵

¹Sanctorum Communio. p.88.

²op.cit. p.31.

³op.cit. Preface. See p. 91 above.

⁴Die Erbauung der Kirche. 1946. p.25.

⁵Festgabe. p.317.

THE UPBUILDING OF THE CHURCH

Dr. Schmidt on "the development of my work."

Another very important source for the development of Dr. Schmidt's thinking regarding the Church, is the lecture he gave before a conference of ministers of the Swiss Reformed Ministerial Association, which took place in September, 1946, in Romanshorn, on the theme - The Upbuilding of the Church with its members as 'Strangers and Pilgrims on the Earth' (Heb.11:13).¹

In this talk he very soon stressed the point that the Church is both ἐκκλησία and Παροικία², and went on to examine the question of the indwelling of God in our hearts through the mediation of Christ as the Head of the ἐκκλησία, the relation of the Church as the Body of Christ to the Temple of God and yet its remaining a corpus mixtum. He also stressed the decisive and primary part of God and Christ in

¹Die Erbauung der Kirche mit ihren Gliedern als den 'Fremdlingen und Beisassen auf Erden' (Heb.11:13). From - Verhandlungen des Schweizerischen reformierten Pfarrvereins vom 23-25 Sept., 1946, in Romanshorn, published in Zürich in 1947. The overall theme of the Conference was - "Wesen und Aufgabe der Kirche in der Welt."

²See p. 42 above.

this 'upbuilding' of the Church, the human side being secondary and subsidiary, the visible Church as being always ecclesia militans, the existence of the Christian Congregation as signifying a via viatorum whose goal is the heavenly Polis, the heavenly Jerusalem. The conclusions he drew were for him like the two sides of the one coin, one side telling us that the 'building of God' is the sole foundation, the other that, as 'strangers and pilgrims on the earth' we strive towards the goal set by God. This entails 1. the Christian congregation as the People of God, over against human society and the worldly State, being on its guard for the honour of God Who will bring about His future; 2. carrying out this role in praise and prayer to God and in intercession for the rest of mankind; 3. realising that this worship of God can only, and must constantly, be supported by the battle for God's righteousness on earth.¹

These elements in his thinking about the Church need to be examined more closely after we have looked at his own account of the development of his thinking.

Towards the end of this Romanshorn lecture where he is quoting with approval the observation of Dr. Philipp Vielhauer that it should be the business of the Church's proclamation to see to it that the New Testament concept of οἰκοδομή

¹Erbauung. p.29.

(i.e. upbuilding, edification) should again be understood in its whole theological depth and fulness, "not as the upbuilding of the individual homo religiosus but as the building of the Una Sancta Catholica,"¹ Dr. Schmidt goes on to say - "That the Church as the already-built, and the to-be-built, house of God in this aeon, as the οἶκος or οἰκοδομή of God, is at the same time a sojourning and a pilgrimage in this world, is a παροικία of sojourners and pilgrims, this in no way involves a μετάβασις εἰς ἄλλο γένος but is the actual content of what the nature of the Church as the οἶκος τοῦ Θεοῦ really means. In line with that, I can and must quite briefly express myself on this other aspect of our theme for personal reasons. Other reasons come in, too, which are connected with the development of my work and concern over the last 20 years regarding this double-sided character of our subject. In 1926 I wrote my first real study on the Church, which was then expanded in my article 'ἐκκλησία' in the Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. In 1936 I gave my inaugural lecture on The Opposition of Church and State in the Congregation of the New Testament, and followed that up with the lecture on The Polis in Church and World for the Basel Rektoratsprogramm in 1939. In 1946 I wrote an article

¹ibid. p.25. Oikodome, Das Bild vom Bau in der christlichen Literatur vom Neuen Testament bis Clemens Alexandrinus. P. Vielhauer. 1939. p.174.

on Israel's Attitude to the Strangers and Pilgrims and Israel's Knowledge of its own Condition of Sojourning and Pilgrimage for the periodical Judaica of 1st January of that year. From these studies which all deal with the problem of 'Church and State', 'Church and Society', I would underline a specially significant linguistic point. As pastors we are responsibly in custody of a pastorate, a parish, a paroecia, i.e. a παροικία. A congregation as a parish (eine Gemeinde als Parochie), in which the Church exhibits itself, - the reciprocal relationship of Church so-called and Congregation so-called, describing a pars-pro-toto process which is neither episcopal-hierarchical nor presbyterial-congregational - is in the world as neither more nor less than a pilgrimage because its true home, its real country (State), its proper Polis lies in heaven, i.e. in the future. One needs only to recall Phil.3:20 - 'But our commonwealth is in heaven', which is a specifically eschatological saying, since it goes straight on - 'and from it we await a Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ.'"¹ To this he adds the early Christian warning - "Pass the time of your sojourning in fear," (1 Pet.1:17)² and frequent references to the Church as a pilgrim in Polycarp, 1 Clement, and to Christians as sojourners in 2 Clement and other Early Fathers.

¹Erbauung. pp.25-26.

²In the German the reference is wrongly printed as 1 Pet.1:7. (op.cit. p.26).

The formulation of the subject, The Upbuilding of the Church with its Members as 'Strangers and Pilgrims on the Earth', draws attention to the need to consider the eschatological aspect of the nature of the Church. At the start of his lecture Dr. Schmidt underlined this by quoting, with approval, from Emil Brunner's contribution to the debate, in which Brunner pointed out that the eschatological side of the problem is usually left too much in the background. The Epistle to the Hebrews, Brunner had noted, made it soberly clear that the problem was one of "transcendental uneasiness over becoming deeply rooted in the earthly-political, the earthly-social."¹ "Church," Brunner had said, "arises through the up-rooting of this deep-rooting. . . . Congregation arises through up-rooting. To say that is to say something of tremendous importance, I would almost like to add of tremendous threat, to us modern men. . . . Where does anyone preach about eternal life beyond - except at funerals?. . . . Being bound to Christ is the up-rooting out of being bound to the world, and the ingrafting and the being made at home in the heavenly world."²

¹Erbauung. p.5.

²ibid.

The Importance of Eschatology

Brunner is no doubt right in feeling that insufficient attention has been paid to the eschatological side of the problem, especially as it affects the doctrine of the Church. From Schweitzer's famous The Quest of the Historical Jesus,¹ and more particularly through the work of Professor C.H. Dodd, eschatology in relation to Jesus and to the Kingdom of God has in recent years been given a more central place. Later, when considering K.L. Schmidt's Basileia article,² further reference will need to be made to this aspect of eschatology, but it is important at this point to include it as a factor of great significance in the whole picture of the Church. As William Manson pointed out, "Church, Spirit, life in Christ, are eschatological magnitudes."³ Welch was equally clear that "the Church as the New Community, as the true Israel, as being in Christ, is an eschatological community, a people defined not only by recollection but by expectation, having 'tasted the goodness of the word of God and the powers of the age to come', (Heb.6:5), and called to a hope (Eph.1:18) of possession of the inheritance (Eph.1:13)."⁴

¹ In German - Von Reimarus zu Wrede. Eine Geschichte der Leben-Jesu-Forschung. Albert Schweitzer. 1906.

² See p. 242 below.

³ S.J.Th. 1952. p.6. (Also in Jesus and the Christian. p.189).

⁴ op.cit. p.139.

Schweitzer who, according to Lundström, was "the first to attempt to interpret the whole teaching of Jesus in exclusively futuristic terms",¹ defined eschatology as "simply 'dogmatic history' which breaks in upon the natural course of history and abrogates it."² Mt.16:18 he considered to be a genuine saying of Jesus but he viewed the Church as "a pre-existent entity, which is to be revealed at the end of time and is completely synonymous with the Kingdom."³ The basis of this view can be summed up in a sentence from his earlier work, Sketch of the Life of Jesus, which presents the alternative - "Jesus thought either eschatologically or uneschatologically, but not both together."⁴ This has given rise to the expression "consistent eschatology", or better, and more usually, "thorough-going eschatology", to describe Schweitzer's position.⁵ Lundström considers the alternative a false one.⁶ Zahrnt points out that though Schweitzer demonstrated the

¹The Kingdom of God in the Teaching of Jesus. Gösta Lundström. 1963. p.69.

²op.cit. p.340.

³Lundström. op.cit. p.74.

⁴Skizze des Lebens Jesu. 1901.

⁵German - 'konsequente Eschatologie'. cf. Das Neue Testament. Kümmel. p.299f.

⁶op.cit. p.75.

historical untenability of the historical Jesus of the then current liberal theology, he put forward "basically the same ideas as the liberal scholars with whom he finds fault - with one difference, that he does not attach them to the historical Jesus."¹ He (Schweitzer) ends up with a 'Jesus-mysticism'. In a way Bousset's Kyrios Christos followed on from this, seeking to show that "Jesus became 'Kyrios', 'Lord', only on Hellenistic soil and under Hellenistic influences, and that this took place in a way analagous to the pagan worship of cult deities."² Cult, in other words, ousted history. Demythologising brings another stage of the same process so that Bultmann can write - "I do indeed think that we can now know almost nothing concerning the life and personality of Jesus, since the early Christian sources show no interest in either, are moreover fragmentary and often legendary; and other sources about Jesus do not exist", and he goes on to praise Schweitzer's Quest.³

Such theories give added point to the need of finding an adequate answer to Holl's penetrating question - "What was there about Christianity that led it to triumph over the other religions? I regard it as the most serious deficiency

¹The Historical Jesus. H. Zahrnt. 1963. p.53.

²ibid. p.58. Kyrios Christos. 1913. W. Bousset.

³Jesus and the Word. 1926. (E.T. 1958).

of the present investigation by the History of Religions School that it neglects this simple question almost completely."¹ Those of this 'school', writing at that time, include Heitmüller, Gunkel, Bousset, Troeltsch, Wernle and Wrede, though their several theories developed in different ways from Schweitzer and Johannes Weiss, the two real initiators of the 'school'.²

Weiss, as Linton shows, rejected the Ritschlian notion of the Kingdom of God as 'an ethical organisation of humanity' in favour of the view that for Jesus the rule of God was a supernatural, eschatological entity, no work of man but the action of God.³ Two lines of argument then arose from this regarding the Church. Since the Church is an earthly entity, the Church and eschatology are in opposition and since Jesus preached the Kingdom he could not have willed a lasting, earthly institution like the Church. The second line of argument was to transfer to the Church categories belonging properly to the Kingdom of God.⁴

T.W. Manson singles out two scholars as being particularly prominent in answering these hypotheses - F.C. Burkitt, whom

¹Gesammelte Aufsätze zu Kirchengeschichte. Vol.II. Karl Holl. 1928. p.7f.

²So Zahrnt. op.cit. p.56f.

³Linton. op.cit. p.120. J. Weiss - Die Predigt Jesu vom Reich Gottes. 1892. (New revised ed. 1900).

⁴ibid. p.121.

he calls "one of England's greatest New Testament scholars", and who provided the real answer to thorough-going eschatology;¹ and C.H. Dodd to whom we are indebted for the concept of 'Realised Eschatology' the essential proposition of which, in Manson's words, is that "the Ministry of Jesus is not a prelude to the Kingdom of God: it is the Kingdom of God."² Along with Form-Criticism, he considered Realised Eschatology to be one of "the two most outstanding developments of our own day" and that it is "the logical sequel to Johannes Weiss and Schweitzer."³

"The rediscovery of the importance of eschatology within the New Testament has been one of the most outstanding achievements of historic theology," writes N.A. Dahl in his essay "Christ, Creation and the Church".⁴ "It is also one of the factors which has led to a new understanding of the New Testament Church; we have learned to see the Church as an 'eschatological community'. This does not only mean that the Church has an eschatological hope for the future, but also that the very existence of the Church is due to what Professor

¹In Davies & Daube. op.cit. p.217. cf. Burkitt - The Earliest Sources for the Life of Jesus. 1922.

²ibid. p.218.

³op.cit. p.212.

⁴The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology.
Part II. No.22. 1956.

Dodd has called 'Realised Eschatology.'. The Church exists in the interval between Christ's death, resurrection and heavenly enthronement and his final revelation as Lord, Judge and Saviour; and not only his parousia but also his birth, death and resurrection are seen as messianic, 'eschatological' events, happening 'when the fullness of time was come', 'in these last days'."¹

Dodd's epoch-making book, The Parables of the Kingdom,² "the most consistent attempt to present the Kingdom of God as a wholly present entity",³ renders Mk.1:15 as "The Kingdom of God has come," instead of the more usual "The Kingdom of God is at hand", presenting the ministry of Jesus as "realised eschatology", the forces of the world to come intervening in this world. "The eschaton has moved from the future to the present," he writes, "from the sphere of expectation into that of realised experience."⁴ Other scholars, J.Y. Campbell, K. Clark, and G. Lundström for example, have attacked Dodd's attempt to eliminate all futuristic elements from the parables, and Kümmel's whole book, Verheissung und Erfüllung, sets out

¹ op.cit. p.422.

² Published 1935.

³ Lundström. op.cit. p.113.

⁴ op.cit. p.50.

to show, among other things, that Dodd's thesis is untenable.¹ In his survey of New Testament research Kümmel does note, however, that Dodd himself later suggested "inaugurated eschatology" or "sich realisierende Eschatologie" (Jeremias' phrase)² as being less open to misinterpretation than "realised eschatology".³ The phrase nonetheless, as Professor Hunter observes, "contains essential truth."⁴ Cadbury interprets it as stressing that "what has happened and is happening for the first Christians seemed to be of the quality of the end. In them eschatology had been 'realised'."⁵ William Manson prefers what he calls the "essential bi-polarity in Christianity", that, in other words, both statements - 'The End has come! The End has not come!' - are true at the same time. "There is a realised eschatology," he writes. "There is also an eschatology of the unrealised. There can be no such thing under any imaginable conditions as a fully realised eschatology in the strict sense."⁶ This view is echoed by

¹Kümmel. op.cit. pp.13f., 17f., 20f., 51f., 76f., 120f., 137f.

²Die Gleichnisse Jesu. 1952.

³Das Neue Testament. Note 459. p.555. cf. Dodd. The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel. 1953.

⁴op.cit. p.27.

⁵Acts and Eschatology. H.J. Cadbury. In Davies & Daube. p.314.

⁶S.J.Th. Occasional papers No.2. 1952. p.7.

Schnackenburg in one of the most comprehensive recent surveys of the whole problem.¹ After reviewing seven different main trends of interpretation, he finds the first two of these, Schweitzer's 'thorough-going eschatology' and Dodd's 'realised eschatology', "take violent liberties with the texts" and are "one-sided",² though he also acknowledges the "permanent contribution" made by Dodd, especially for his interest in the actual, living setting of, for example, the parables.³ He insists, however, that "under no circumstances must the gospel and challenge of Jesus be made to indicate a wholly realised or a purely future eschatology."⁴ Of the beginnings of the ekklesia he holds much the same view as Schmidt. "There is little doubt," he writes, "that he (i.e. Jesus) began early to gather disciples", and formed an inner group of twelve, though he notes that this view has recently been challenged again by Vielhauer.⁵

What raised the subject of eschatology for K.L. Schmidt, as for example in his Ekklesia article, was the question whether

¹God's Rule and Kingdom. Rudolf Schnackenburg. 1963.

²op.cit. p.116.

³ibid. p.144.

⁴ibid. p.142.

⁵ibid. p.215. cf. Gottesreich und Menschensohn in der Verkündigung Jesu. Philipp Vielhauer. 1957.

Jesus, the preacher of the Kingdom of God, could have founded an Ekklesia, and he answered this by consideration of Jesus as Messiah, as Son of Man, and of his instituting the Lord's Supper. This background, he maintained, proves that "the ekklesia is also an eschatological entity."¹ He also distinguishes very clearly between the ekklesia and the basileia, a distinction which will be taken up later in considering his basileia article.² In the meantime it may be best to follow Dr. Schmidt's own outline of the steps in the development of his thought on the Church and turn our attention to his two articles of 1936 and 1939 respectively, before returning to the present article in which he pays further attention to eschatology.³

Church and State

In the 1936 article, The Opposition of Church and State in the Congregation of the New Testament, the word 'opposition' (das Gegenüber) is used more in the sense of contrast than in the sense of conflict. Indeed, Dr. Schmidt says, at a later point in the development of his argument, that "the nature of

¹ See p. 106 above.

² In TWNT. I. See p. 242 f. below.

³ See pp. 166 f. above.

the Church is not outward might but inner demand."¹

Beginning with an etymological study of the word *πολίτευμα* as used, for example, in Phil.3:20,² he goes on to emphasise two points. First, that Congregation and Church are identical. "As used in the Bible, Congregation and Church are perfectly equal. One cannot underline it enough, that in the whole of the New Testament no difference, linguistic, concept-wise, factual, is made between Church and Congregation. It is always the same word *ἐκκλησία*, ecclesia, that is used."³

The second point is that Church and State exist in their natures on different levels. As far as the Church is concerned, the disparity can be seen at its widest in Ephesians, where the thinking regarding the nature of the Church circles about its being a mystery. Not that this ever, in the New Testament, goes on to provide an escape into spiritualism or "enthusiasm". Even in Ephesians the statements are factual and real and sober in comparison with the later flights of fancy, and other Epistles abound with very earthy pieces of advice for Christian living. "So then let us not sleep, as others do, but let us keep awake and be sober." (1 Thess.5:6). "But, since we belong to the day, let us be sober, and put

¹Theologische Blätter. January 1937.

²An eschatological saying. See p. 167 above.

³Th.Bl. Jan. 1937.

on the breastplate of faith and love, and for a helmet the hope of our salvation." (1 Thess.5:8). "Stand fast in all you are doing, meeting whatever suffering this may involve. Go on preaching the Gospel, fulfilling your service." (2 Tim. 4:5). "Brace up your minds, be sober, . . . as obedient children . . . be holy in all your conduct." (1 Pet.1:13f.). "The end of all things is at hand therefore keep sane and sober for your prayers." (1 Pet.3:4).

The *πολίτευμα*, (properly 'that which one does as a citizen') may denote the citizenship or franchise enjoyed by the individual citizen, or it may denote that State itself, the whole community of citizens. The basis of its rule, however, as opposed to the inner demands of the Church on its members, is might or power.¹ As St. Paul points out in Romans 13, all legitimate authority is derived from God's authority and should for that reason be obeyed. Every Christian should be a law-abiding, honest citizen. The civil authorities should preserve public order and the general well-being. "Give everyone his legitimate due, whether it be rates, or taxes, or reverence, or respect!" the Apostle advises.²

¹Das Gegenüber. p.25f.

²Rom.13:1,3,4,7. (Phillips Translation.)

The difference between State and Church is very marked in that while many theories about the State and its nature may exist, in practice what the State is always appears clearly in its exercise of might or power. On the other hand, in theory the Church is clearly God's foundation in the world, but in practice, in men's hands, it is always a 'mixtum compositum' and depends not on might but on inward claim, inner compulsion.¹

There remains a further, basic point of difference. The Church of God in Jesus Christ in this world lives in the State but "is nevertheless in opposition to the State because she herself is the true State."² This, however, is a truth regarding the nature of the Church which lies in eternity. It bears the truth of a prophetic statement, in the same sense that it can be stated - God is King. It therefore gives no basis for the kind of "enthusiasm" or fanaticism that would strive for a separation of the Church from the worldly State here and now in an effort to replace the worldly State by the Church, to compel the bringing about of heaven on earth now.³ The nature of the Church is invested always with a dual role -

¹Das Gegenüber. p.31f.

²ibid. p.37.

³ibid. p.39.

that of being called together by God in Christ and that of living in this world as an alien, a stranger, a pilgrim, whose real citizenship is in heaven. The New Testament Church is always ἐκκλησία AND παροικία.¹

The same point is also made very emphatically in the TWNT article on παροικός and παροικία, written in collaboration with his son, Professor Martin Anton Schmidt.² "The Church of the New Testament is ἐκκλησία and παροικία, or, rather - as ἐκκλησία it is therefore also παροικία."³

In classical Greek παροικός appears as both adjective and noun, meaning either neighbour or a non-citizen, whereas παροικία appears only in biblical and church use. However, in ἐκκλησία and παροικία we find the Church using two technical, legal-political terms to describe itself, almost opposing terms indeed, but applicable according to whether one's view is directed to God or to the world.⁴

Again the links between the Old Testament and the New are very close. Indeed, "in all the New Testament references there is either quotation of the Old Testament or allusion to

¹ ibid.

² See p. 42 above

³ TWNT. V. p. 850.

⁴ ibid. (E.T.) p. 842.

it."¹ In the Old Testament there are frequent references to the People of Israel as παροικίος and there are almost exact parallels in Stephen's words (Acts 7:6f.), Paul's references, and the Epistle to the Hebrews. What was valid for the old Israel, the Apostles applied to the new Israel, the Church of God in Jesus Christ. True, they were strangers and sojourners on the earth, but this was temporary, not final. Abraham had looked for a city "whose builder and maker is God." (Heb. 11:8). God has prepared this heavenly city for them. "So then you are no longer strangers and foreigners, but fellow citizens with the saints and members of the household of God." (Eph. 2:19).²

Polis in Church and World

The Polis article follows a rather different course. Obviously written in style for the Kittel dictionary, it should by rights have taken its place alongside the other definitive articles on βασιλεία and ἐκκλησία.³ Like them it starts off with a careful study of the word, πόλις and its various

¹ ibid. p.851.

² ibid. p.849.

³ As late as 1938 Dr. Schmidt fully expected it to do so. In his Copenhagen lectures on "Le problème du Christianisme primitif" he mentions in the fourth lecture on "Royaume, Eglise, Etat et Peuple" where he is dealing with the word πόλις that his article on that word would be appearing in the TWNT. (Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie religieuses, Strasbourg, March/April. 1938. p.156.)

meanings and uses. It then goes on to consider the use of the word in the New Testament, its use by the Church Fathers and in Greek and Jewish literature, and finishes with consideration of the legal, (or political), philosophical, eschatological and Christological implications.

In the New Testament the word occurs some 160 times as well as in various derivatives. In discussing one of these, the συμπολίται or fellow-citizens of Eph.2:19 which is preceded by the words ξένοι καὶ παροίκοι and followed by the description οἰκέιοι τοῦ Θεοῦ, he underlines again that the Church is both the οἶκος Θεοῦ and the παροικία.¹

A few verses earlier, in Eph.2:12, there is the interesting use of the word πολιτεία, the body of citizens, citizenship, citizen-rights. This is rendered conversatio in the Vulgate, which, however, uses the proper, ordinary Latin equivalent civilitas in translating Acts 22:28 where Paul tells the Roman centurion he was born a Roman citizen. Conversatio is also used to render πολίτευμα (Phil.3:20) and the A.V. follows the Vulgate - "Our conversation is in heaven."² To give πολιτεία and πολίτευμα this wholly "unpolitical", general sense seems to derive from misunderstanding the salvation setting, the eschatological context, and it would certainly be

¹Polis. p.14.

²But RSV - "our commonwealth is in heaven."

wrong to attempt in the translation to render the words in a more ethical, or even psychological, way. πολιτεία in Eph.2:12 is immediately qualified by the words τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ. In other words "it derives from the origin, existence and future of Israel as the People of God, which as the true Israel is to be identified with the Church and thereby points to the Kingdom of God."¹ It is through Christ alone that Jew and Gentile "both have access in one Spirit to the Father." (Eph.2:18). Similarly, the πολίτευμα in Phil.3:20 ('Our citizenship is in heaven') is immediately followed by "from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ." Whether or not, therefore, an original more general meaning of 'way of life' or 'conversation' lies behind the more politically directed 'State', 'citizenship' or even the more specific 'colony', the proper translation in the context must convey the meaning given by Dibelius's version - "We have our home-land in Heaven and, here on earth, are a colony of citizens-of-Heaven."² Heaven is the Christian's fatherland.

¹ ibid. p.20. The same points were made by Dr. Schmidt in his Eranos address "Jerusalem als Urbild und Abbild", where, in further examination of Eph.2:12, he writes: "Naturally a true understanding of the admonition depends not on the word 'commonwealth' (politeia) but on the addition of 'of Israel'. This is to be taken as part of the salvation history, i.e. out of the origin, appearance and being of Israel, the People of God, which, as the true Israel, is the same as the ekklesia, thereby pointing to the Kingdom of God, the heavenly polis." (Eranos Jahrbuch. 1950. Special Vol.XVIII. p.210.)

² ibid. p.24. Cf. An die Philipper. M. Dibelius. 1925. Similarly Moffatt - "We are a colony of heaven."

This leads naturally to a consideration of the use of πόλις in the Epistle to the Hebrews, especially Heb.13:14 - "For here we have no lasting city, but we seek the city which is to come," and the passages in the 11th chapter - "(Abraham) looked for a city which has foundations, whose builder and maker is God," (verse 10), and the linking of country and city (in verses 14-16). This idea of a lasting, future city is presupposed all through Hebrews, and indeed throughout the New Testament.¹

In Judaism there was also to be found the idea of a heavenly Jerusalem which would eventually replace the imperfect, earthly Jerusalem, holy though Jerusalem was, and the roots of this idea go back to Isaiah. The early Christian community, regarding itself as the true Israel of God, also regarded Jerusalem as holy and also looked for its replacement by the heavenly Jerusalem. Both Jewish and Christian usage is linked, not to the Greek ἱερὰ πόλις, but to the Scripture based ἁγία πόλις.² The early Christian use of this idea differs in many respects from the Jewish Jerusalem, and has very little to do with the Greek use. "The goal to which the Church, the ἐκκλησία, the People of God called in Christ, is to bend its efforts has been marked out for eternity by God

¹ Polis. p.25.

² ibid. p.35.

Himself and that sets for eternity her field of operation.

The beginning and end rest in the Messiah Jesus, who, as the One sent by God, is A and O. The new, the holy, the heavenly City of God above is the goal and, at the same time, also the ground of the whole salvation history for ever and ever.

When this, not something else, is what the New Testament witness is, then it lies, so to speak, in the nature of the matter that theological reflection in line with that witness, with its concentric circles of Christology, ecclesiology and soteriology, emerges ultimately, and that means first and foremost, as a hymn to the mighty acts of God."¹

For Schmidt, then, eschatology is bound up with this - "the beginning and end rest in the Messiah Jesus." "In what sense is this holy City, which is usually explicitly referred to as the heavenly, the future, the coming-from-above, City, the here now City?" he asks. "This question concerning the present and (or) future character of the Kingdom of God, whose identity with the heavenly Jerusalem will have become apparent from our study so far, can only be answered thus: the in-breaking Kingdom of God has come into time and into the world in the messianic Person Jesus of Nazareth. What for Christians is and remains future, something they long for, is

¹Polis. p.37.

in Jesus Christ, and only in him, a 'Today' (cf. Lk.4:21 - **σήμερον**)."¹

* The picture of the Polis is one which occurs very frequently in the writings of the Church Fathers, but a study of this usage shows that there is a tendency for the sharp distinction between the Christian interpretation and the Greek interpretation to become blurred, to merge, and indeed finally for the Greek view to predominate.² In the Shepherd of Hermas, 1 Clement, Polycarp, Diognetus, Justin Martyr, Tatian, the biblical-eschatological understanding of the Christian **πολιτεία** is still present but showing clear signs of being overlaid with a more ethical, political interpretation in the direction of Platonic philosophy. Still more in Clement of Alexandria, who uses **πολιτεία** frequently, the 'way of life' meaning predominates until what remains can only be described as "a mythological-philosophical conception going back to Homer, Heroditus, Plato and the Stoics, and decorated with Biblical texts."³ By the time of Origen it is taken for granted that

¹Polis. p.39. It suggests Origen's term **αὐτοβασίλεια** (Comm. on Mt.18:23), Schmidt says. His argument was also intended as an answer to Das Buch von den Engeln by E. Peterson (1935). Peterson, he held, made too much of the nature of the Church being dependent on existing between the earthly and the heavenly Polis.

²ibid. p.40f.

³ibid. p.59.

the true πόλις, the heavenly city of Jerusalem, is identical with the ἐκκλησία. "The city of the great King, the true Jerusalem, or the Church, built out of living stones," Origen writes in his 'Commentary on St. John', and in other writings identifies the 'City of the Lord' with the 'Church of the living God,' and says that Jerusalem can be translated 'the Church'.¹ Jerusalem has become allegorised.

Some passages in Origen, it is true, retain something of the opposition between Church and State which is present in New Testament Church usage. He refers, for instance, to the need to understand the Christian congregation as "congregations of God (ἐκκλησία τοῦ Θεοῦ) which are sojourners (παροικύουσαι) with the congregations of citizens in every city."² Usually, however, this eschatological view is lacking in Origen.³ Indeed, he answers the question as to the relationship between the Church of God as the People of God and the Roman Empire, a burning issue for the early Church, with words of praise for the Pax Romana, in spite of the theoretical doubts and practical hesitations he must have had in view of the situation regarding the martyrs. It is a long way from the New

¹Commentary on Jn.4:19f. (Polis. p.67); Homily on Joshua 8 (VII, 344, lf.); Homily on Jeremiah 34:4-6. (Polis. p.68). Origen's identification of the Church with the City of God, and the tendency to regard the "ecclesia invisibilis" as a kind of "civitas Platonica", are further documented in Dr. Schmidt's Eranos address "Jerusalem als Urbild und Abbild", (Eranos Jahrbuch. 1950. Special Vol.XVIII. pp.213f.

²Polis. p.75.

³ibid. p.76. i.e. in the sense in which it is found in Phil. 1:27,28 together with Phil.3:20.

Testament view. Even though 1 Peter recommends obedience to the emperor (2:13f.), Rome is referred to by the derogatory pseudonym Babylon (5:13).¹ In the New Testament national differences are abolished eschatologically. In Origen there is the possibility and the necessity of abolishing the differences between nations progressively more and more here on earth, and thereby bringing about a state of peace, by establishing relations with the political state of the Roman Empire. This developing relationship envisages the Church of the future as the divine World State.²

Before Origen, Philo had also identified the πόλις of God with Jerusalem as the City of peace, explaining away on psychological and philosophical grounds the Biblical realism of Jewish apocalyptic in speaking about the heavenly Jerusalem.³ Josephus, on the other hand, kept more closely to a historical-political understanding of the origin and

¹ cf. Rev.17:5 where Babylon is called "the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth."

² Polis. p.81. Contra Celsum. viii.68. In this way, as Harnack pointed out, the early Christian hope has been reversed and the Church now appears as "the purifying and uniting power which will create a unified State for mankind here on earth." Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten. Vol.I. 1923. p.279.

³ ibid. p.84.

existence of his people, and saw the decisive difference between worldly states and the Jewish State as resting in the power and dominion of God. He was thus the originator of the word "Theocracy" though he did not go on to develop this into a theology of the State nor did he regard the idea of theocracy as eschatologically determined, i.e. as depending on the hope of the Messiah and of the Kingdom of God.¹

All this serves to highlight the close parallelism in the New Testament between Polis and citizenship on the one hand, and the Kingdom of God and the Church on the other. In the New Testament they are all eschatological-Christological matters, so that any reference to the heavenly city means the city prophesied in the old covenant and fulfilled as a Christ-event in the new covenant. This emphasis on eschatology is what makes Biblical theism so different from Stoicism, Platonism, pantheism.² It provides the key that sets men free from the vicious circle of man. For citizenship in the heavenly Polis embraces both the Kingdom of God and the Church. This Polis is the Kingdom, and "in so far as Christians live on earth as citizens of heaven, the heavenly Polis is represented by the Church, for which the Kingdom of God that she proclaims is destined."³

¹Polis. p.95f.

²ibid. p.109.

³ibid.

This hope is underlined in the New Testament both positively and negatively. Christians are the temple, the house, the household, the building of God. On earth they are also pilgrims, non-citizens, strangers.

"The Kingdom of God will be there when there are no longer any States. The Church, to which this Kingdom is promised, finds itself in opposition to States because she herself points to the true State, the heavenly Polis."¹

The "Judaica" Article

In 1946, as already noted,² Dr. Schmidt contributed a lengthy article on Israel's Attitude to the Strangers and Pilgrims and Israel's Knowledge of its own Condition of Sojourning and Pilgrimage to the new periodical Judaica.³ This was actually Dr. Schmidt's second article for the magazine. The very first article in its first issue was also by him, The Trial of the Messiah Jesus, and in it he examined the question of the responsibility of the Jews, Gentiles and Christians, for the crucifixion of Jesus Christ.⁴

¹Polis. p.110.

²See p. 167 above.

³Israel's Stellung zu den Fremdlingen und Beisassen und Israels Wissen um seine Fremdling- und Beisassenschaft. Judaica, Vol.I. 1945/46.

⁴Der Todesprozess des Messias Jesus. ibid. Vol.I.

The article on "Israel's Attitude" is of special interest, not because it adds materially to what we have already gathered concerning the development of his thought on the Church, but because, writing to quite a different circle of readers, he underlines his point about the Church being both called by God and being a sojourner, or pilgrim, upon earth.¹

The article stresses the divine background Israel had, and has, whatever her present human conditions in the world may be. From the Ten Commandments, from the Law, it is clear that for Israel, faith in God consists in obedience to God.² In this as in many other parallels, there is a very close connection between the Old Testament and the New.

To say, rightly, that the Church of the New Testament is ἐκκλησία and, at the same time, παροικία, is to use two seemingly contradictory, regular, legal, technical terms, words which go back to Hebrew roots. ἐκκλησία has already been examined in detail. The exile, or stranger, (ξένος in LXX) may go back to the Hebrew toschab, i.e. one who has come from afar to live and who is accorded some rights, or more likely and more frequently to the Hebrew ger meaning, roughly, 'guest'.³ The Old Testament and Rabbinic usage provide countless examples.

¹op.cit. p.269.

²ibid.

³ibid. pp.271; 278f.

The parallels in the New Testament to Abraham's being chosen by God and equally Israel's being chosen, are striking. The Old Testament Congregation clearly fore-shadows the New Testament Congregation.¹ "If you are Christ's, then you are Abraham's offspring, heirs according to promise." (Gal.3:29).

The article closes with a consideration of the effects of the Diaspora and the growing numbers of Jews who became "sojourners" outside the land of Palestine, and of the place of Jerusalem as the holy city.²

Sojourning and Upbuilding

Returning now to the Romanshorn lecture, we find again the underlining of the continuity and close connection between the Old and New Testament in the conception of the Church as the People of God.³ The Old Testament patriarchs are recalled (Heb.11) as patterns and examples for the Christian life, and their confession to being "strangers and pilgrims on the earth" echoes Abraham's description of himself, "I am a stranger and a sojourner with you," (Gen.23:4), when he is asking the sons of Heth for a burying-place for Sarah. The same thought is

¹ibid. p.285.

²ibid. pp.293-4.

³Erbauung. p.8f.

attributed to David in 1 Chron.29:15 - "For we are strangers before thee, and sojourners, as were all our fathers" - and again in Ps.39:12. It is ineluctably present in the hope that faith brings, the main theme of this Heb.11 chapter.

When this prevailing sense of παροικία (sojourn) is coupled with the theme of the upbuilding of the Church the result is a peculiar, dialectical, paradoxical inter-relationship. "The Church as the people, the assembly, the gathering of God is ἐκκλησία and παροικία, or, better and more properly, the Church qua ἐκκλησία is at the same time παροικία. The Church thus uses two termini technici, drawn from constitutional law and in themselves contrary to one another, to describe herself according to whether one's attention is turned towards God or towards the world."¹ The Church has to understand herself as the 'building, the house, the household, the temple of God' on the one hand, and as 'sojourning' on the other hand. Church members are only 'at home' (in God, in Christ) in that they are 'not at home' (in the world).

ὄικος (or the more strictly Attic form οἰκία) in the New Testament, (as for example, "My house, a house of prayer," (Mt.21:13 and parallels in Mk. and Lk.), "the house of God," (Mt.12:4), "the house of my Father" (Jn.2:16), "Solomon

¹Erbauung. pp.9-10.

built a house for God" (Acts 7:47)), can mean the Temple in Jerusalem. The close connection of the New Testament to the Old on this point is evident from the LXX quotations (of Is. 56:7; 1 K.6:1; Is.66:1) which lie behind the foregoing passages. But a wider meaning than the Temple is also visible in both Old and New Testaments.¹ Claiming "confidence to enter the sanctuary by the blood of Jesus," Hebrews (10:21) speaks of "having a great priest over the house of God," in a way reminiscent of Moses, "he is entrusted with all my house," (Num.12:7). In 1 Peter, however, Christians are not only "holy priests" but "living stones . . . to be built up into a spiritual house of God," (1 Pet.2:5), and in 1 Timothy (3:15) the house of God is the $\xi\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha$ of the living God, the pillar and bulwark of the truth."

This collective sense of household or family, rather than merely 'house', is deepened when Christians are referred to (Heb.3:6) as the house of Christ, the house whose founder is God himself.² "So then you are no longer strangers and foreigners, but fellow citizens with the ~~san~~ts and members of the household ($\delta\acute{\iota}\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\iota$) of God." (Eph.2:19).

The problem of how God dwells in his house or household is one which is answered in different ways in the New Testament.

¹Erbauung. p.10f.

²ibid. p.11.

Even in the Old Testament, although the actions and revelations of God are firmly anchored by definite time and place in history, God is never limited to one place, even the Temple.¹ In Acts 7 Stephen reminds the Jews of this. "But Solomon built him (God) an house. Yet the Most High does not dwell in houses made with hands; as the prophet says, Heaven is my throne, and earth my footstool; what house will you build for me? says the Lord: or what is the place of my rest? Did not my hand make all these things?" (vv.47-50). Paul tells the Athenians - "God who made the world and everything in it, being Lord of Heaven and earth, does not live in shrines made by man," (Acts 17:24), and adds - "He is not far from each one of us." The indwelling is through Christ and the Holy Spirit. Paul prays the Father that He would grant the Ephesians "to be strengthened with might by his Spirit in the inner man; that Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith." (Eph.3:16-17). Of God's indwelling he says - "In him (Christ) the whole fullness of deity dwells bodily. And you have come to fullness of life in him, who is the head of all rule and authority." (Col.2:9-10).

"It is with such indwelling of God through the mediation

¹"Loyalty to the holy dwelling-place of God becomes loyalty to the historical will of God" until the historical revelation is freed from all holy places by its fulfilment in the Messiah Jesus, who said of himself - "A greater than the temple is here." (Mt.12:6). *ibid.* p.14.

of Christ as the Head of the ἐκκλησία that we as Christians have to do."¹ The use of other derivatives of οἶκος serve only to underline this. "Built (ἐποικοδομηθέντες) upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the corner stone, in whom all the building (οἰκοδομή) is joined together and grows into a holy temple in the Lord, in whom you also are built together (συνοικοδομῆσθε) for a dwellingplace (κατοικητήριον) of God through the Spirit." (Eph.2:20-22). The eschatological nature of this dwelling, this building (οἰκοδομή) comes out very clearly in Paul's words to the Corinthians - "For we know that if the earthly tent we live in is destroyed, we have a building (οἰκοδομή) from God, a house (οἰκία) not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." (2 Cor.5:1).²

Temple and Church

From the association of this 'building' or 'upbuilding' with the Temple in Jerusalem, and then with Christians as a 'temple', it would be easy to fall into the error of postulating a progressive, philosophical spiritualisation of the temple concept whereby, in more or less Platonic style, the earthly, outward, visible temple is changed into the true, inward,

¹Erbauung. p.15.

²ibid. pp.15-16.

'heavenly' temple. This kind of mixture is like trying to combine Greek 'theology' with the Christian proclamation of the Gospel, an impossible thing because of their opposing views of God and man. Instead of this, eschatology is what sets the keynote and provides the proper perspective for an understanding of 'temple', just as eschatology also provides this proper perspective with reference to the Kingdom of God and to the Church.¹

Seen in that perspective, "the message of salvation, given in this present world, is fulfilled in glory in that future world, after having been made visible in the coming of Jesus Christ, whose Body Christians, as the Church, are."² Hence, in the heavenly Jerusalem, "I saw no temple in the city, for its temple is the Lord God the Almighty and the Lamb." (Rev. 21:22). This Lamb, Jesus Christ, as the Logos of God become flesh, will build through his resurrection the temple not made with hands. (Mk.14:58 etc.). The Fourth Gospel makes it clear that he spoke of "the temple of his body." (Jn.2:21). We Christians, Dr. Schmidt says, are, and are to be, this $\sigma\hat{\omega}\mu\alpha$, the gift of the Spirit being God's guarantee (2 Cor.5:5; Eph.1:14). "Do you not know that you are God's temple and God's Spirit dwells in you?" (1 Cor.3:16f.). "Do you not

¹Erbauung. p.16.

²ibid. p.17.

know that your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit within you, which you have from God?" (1 Cor.6:19). This temple can make no pact with 'idols'. "For we are the temple of the living God." (2 Cor.6:16).

"In this way all that the New Testament says about the true, new Temple of God is theologically, Christologically, soteriologically, ecclesiologically, eschatologically stamped. God is the Temple, as Christ also is, and then also Christians are as the Church, the Body of Christ, that Temple which is prophesied and fulfilled in the transition from the Old to the New Covenant, that Temple which, in Christ, was present and which, in him, is still present, even while Christians wait and long for this Temple as the heavenly Temple, until the day they are brought to glory in it as the Temple of God."¹

This said, however, it is necessary to add that "the Church in this aeon is and remains a corpus mixtum which does not possess of itself the quality of divinity or holiness but only has this attributed to it (this, and not otherwise, is how justification operates). For that reason the Church will come to an end in the future aeon when God is all in all and when the Kingdom of God alone is present. It cannot be emphasised enough that Church and Kingdom of God are two different things."² As Welch put it - "The kingdom is present

¹Erbauung. p.18.

²ibid.

in the church, but the church is not the kingdom."¹ Flew points out that while Jesus' deeds anticipated the coming of the Kingdom, "this may be described as 'realised eschatology', if we allow that the full realisation of God's Rule is still reserved by Jesus for the future", (as, for example, in the Lord's Prayer - "Thy kingdom come").² So the Church is not to be identified with God's Kingly Rule nor made a later substitute for the kingdom. Whatever influence the thought-forms of contemporary Apocalyptic may have had on New Testament eschatology, it should be remembered that at the centre of that Apocalyptic "lies the distinction between two ages or aeons, the present age and the age to come. Jesus reaffirmed this distinction."³

There is also a difference between the Kingdom of Christ and the Kingdom of God, Schmidt says. Both the Church and the more far-reaching Kingdom of Christ will one day cease, when the end comes and God is "all in all." (1 Cor.15:28).⁴ Cullmann, in his article on "The Kingship of Christ and the Church in the New Testament", brings out the same distinction.⁵

¹op.cit. p.209.

²Flew. op.cit. p.31.

³ibid. p.41.

⁴Erbauung. p.18.

⁵The Early Church. O. Cullmann. 1956. See pp. 232 f. below.

While there is a very close connection between the Regnum Christi and the Church of Christ in the New Testament, the two terms are not interchangeable, he maintains.¹ Both belong, however, to the same limited period of time, unlike the Kingdom of God which is future (referring here to Schmidt's Ekklesia article).² The time of the Church "has a beginning and an end, and its duration coincides with the same phase of the end of time as that of the Regnum Christi," Cullmann writes. "It was initiated by the same central act of the death of Christ. For the Church of Christ the cross is also the terminus a quo. Only the cross makes the existence of the Church possible, though a church already existed in the Old Testament in the form of God's chosen people and then as the 'remnant' of Israel which turns back and which, according to the prophets, God has chosen to save. . . . According to the Acts of the Apostles the only chronological difference between the beginning of the Regnum Christi and that of the Church is that the Regnum Christi was born at the ascension and the Church at Pentecost."³ For the Church there is always a tension between present and future. It "belongs entirely to the

¹ op.cit. p.107. He cites Col.1:14f.; Eph.1:22; Heb.1:14; Rom.8:21f.; Mt.28:18.

² TWNT. III.

³ Cullmann. op.cit. p.116.

end and still belongs entirely to the present."¹ Since its sphere of influence is confined to the earthly world it is narrower than the Regnum Christi but not therefore subordinate. Rather "the Church is the heart and centre of the Regnum Christi", for the Church, in New Testament language is 'the body of Christ'.²

God is the Builder

As far as the 'building', or 'upbuilding', of the Church is concerned, in Schmidt's view the initiative rests with God and with His Christ.³ Upbuilding from the human side can only take place as a secondary and derived initiative. Unless this order is carefully noted the whole conception of 'upbuilding' can be misunderstood from the start. Jesus' quotation from Psalm 118 (v.22) stands as a warning to human 'builders'.⁴ "Have you never read in the scriptures: 'The very stone which the builders rejected has become the head of the corner; this was the Lord's doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes.'?" (Mt.21:42). This is the true Christological

¹ ibid. p.119.

² ibid. p.123.

³ Erbauung. p.19.

⁴ Ps.118:22 is quoted twice more in the New Testament (Acts 4:11 and 1 Pet.2:7), Schmidt notes.

order. Only God, only Jesus Christ, can build the Church. Only he can say "On this rock I will build my church" (Mt.16:18), an outreach of his Messiahship, and it is through him that the Church, built by God, builds itself up, and will continue to be upbuilt.¹ For Paul, as he tells the elders of the Ephesus ekklesia, it is God's word of grace "which is able to build you up." (Acts 20:32). He may use the words "if I build up" (Gal.2:18) but he immediately goes on, "it is no longer I who live, but Christ who lives in me." (2:20).

The same order applies to Christians in the upbuilding of one another.² It is out of God's destined life with Him that Paul then continues - "Therefore encourage one another and build one another up, just as you are doing." (1 Thess.5:9f.). "'Knowledge' puffs up, but love builds up," (1 Cor.8:1) he says, speaking about the love of God. Love of God builds up the house of God, the Church, the congregation, the Body of Christ - not just the individual. "'All things are lawful', but not all things build up. Let no one seek his own good, but the good of his neighbour," (1 Cor.10:23-24), he says, the point being "whatever you do, do all to the glory of God." (10:31). A little later he adds a warning about 'tongues'. "The speaker in a 'tongue' builds up his own soul,

¹Erbauung. p.19.

²ibid. p.20.

but the preacher builds up the Church of God", prefacing this with the words - "Make love your aim". (1 Cor.14:1,4). The emphasis is always on the building up of the Church (14:12) and of the "other man" (14:17), believer or non-believer.

"The object of the upbuilding is not primarily the individual but the whole, the Church, which is basically the subject."¹

Christ's gifts that "some should be apostles, some prophets, some evangelists, some pastors and teachers" were "for the equipment of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the building up of the body of Christ", (Eph.4:11-12) and "speaking the truth in love, we are to grow up in every way into him who is the head, into Christ, from whom the whole body . . . makes bodily growth and upbuilds itself in love". (4:15-16). Even where precedence seems to be given to human endeavour, as for example in Jude v.20 - "build yourselves up on your most holy faith" - the verse before warns against those who divide because they are led by human emotions, not by the Spirit. In every case, in the final analysis, God is the Upbuilder.² The household of God "built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Christ Jesus himself being the corner-stone, in whom the whole structure is joined together, grows into a holy temple in the Lord; in whom you

¹Erbauung. 4.20.

²ibid. p.22.

also are built into it for a dwelling place of God in the Spirit." (Eph.2:20-22).¹ "The deciding factor is that the meaning of the word and concept 'upbuilding' (Erbauung) in both Old and New Testaments is based on the action of God, of Whom it is written: "Thus says the Lord God, 'Behold I am in laying Zion for a foundation a stone, a tested stone, a precious cornerstone, of a sure foundation: He who believes will not be in haste.'" (Is.28:16).²

With this weight of Biblical evidence, Dr. Schmidt is seeking to free the word 'Erbauung' from the all too common interpretation of 'edification' in the sense of moral self-improvement or pious injunctions. Professor Mascall says much the same thing in his study, Christ, the Christian and the Church, when he writes - "Being a Christian is an ontological fact, resulting from an act of God."³ This is very different from what "is almost universally assumed today that becoming a Christian means in essence the adoption of a new set of beliefs or the initiation of a new mode of behaviour."⁴

¹Here, Schmidt says, the strong Christological-ecclesiological emphasis shows that such upbuilding is not the work of man. p.21.

²ibid. p.24.

³E.L. Mascall. op.cit. p.77.

⁴op.cit. p.77.

Dogma and ethics are important, but Mascall goes on to point out that "to define the essence of Christianity in terms either of belief or of practice involves the neglect of two principles that are fundamental to all sound theology. The former of these is that the act of God precedes and is presupposed by the acts of man:¹ . . . The second is that what a being is precedes what it does; our actions are a consequence of what we are, operari sequitur esse".² In other words, "the Christian is a man to whom something has happened, something moreover which is irreversible and which penetrates to the very roots of his being; he is a man who has been re-created in, and into, Christ."³

Vielhauer, in his detailed survey of Oikodome,⁴ had stressed upbuilding as a concern of the Church as a whole in the New Testament, to which Schmidt adds the further characteristic - παιδεία . The Church, the congregation, the People of God, the true Israel, though one, has two sides like a coin. One side tells us - the 'building of God' (i.e. what God builds) is the sole foundation, and in His

¹1 Jn.4:10; Gal.4:9.

²Mascall. op.cit. p.77.

³ibid.

⁴op.cit. p.174. See

purpose the decision as to the goal that lies before us has already been made. The other side tells us - as 'strangers and exiles on the earth' we strive towards the goal set by God. The final decision still has to be made.¹ The burden of being strangers and exiles in the present world has as its reverse side the guerdon of being citizens of heaven. The fact that God is the Builder is our comfort, our security, our faith. A revaluing of all values has taken place through the coming of Jesus Christ, from his birth through his public ministry in the Holy Land to his resurrection and ascension. Strangely enough, even the foes of the Christian Church never seem to be able to shake off Christ. Everyone at some point is faced with the question of this 'building of God' in Christ. Anyone who allows himself to be 'built into' this household of God is no longer all at sea but is pointed to a definite, clear hope, the hope of the coming again of Christ, Christ who was once present and who in the 'building of God' is present. To live in that perspective gives life and work, here and now, direction and force.²

For the common life of mankind this perspective involves important ethical conclusions: the role of the Christian community as the guardian of God's honour, the place of worship

¹Erbauung. p.28.

²ibid. p.29.

and intercession, the ceaseless battle for God's righteousness on earth, including social and political action.¹ Since God will finally establish His righteousness, anyone who fails to take that righteousness into account is not only an atheist but a foolish self-deceiver whose folly can divide and destroy human society and fellowship. The whole weight of the biblical proclamation is directed towards attacking this kind of folly. Faith rests not "in the wisdom of men but in the power of God", a "secret and hidden wisdom which God decreed before the ages for our glorification. None of the rulers of this age understood this; for if they had, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory." (1 Cor.2:5-8). To fight against God's Son, His Messiah, is the work of Antichrist and his demonic satellites who lead and mislead earthly rulers. Physical death is the final and decisive sign of human smallness, inferiority, disarray, sin. It is the sign that man, peoples, States, must all finally give way to God, a cause for joy to all whose view of the future is, like Paul's, one in which the last enemy, death, is destroyed by Christ when he delivers the kingdom of God the Father, so that God may be all in all. (1 Cor.15:28).²

¹Erbauung. p.19. See also p.165/^{above} p.428 f. below.

²ibid. p.30.

KINGDOM, CHURCH, MINISTRY

The Problem of Primitive Christianity

In the preface to his 'Polis' study, Dr. Schmidt refers to one of his Copenhagen lectures on "Kingdom, Church, State and People in their Relationships and Contrasts", given two years earlier, in 1937. This was one of a series of four lectures under the general title The Problem of primitive Christianity and ranging over a wide field - 1. "The Basis, Aim and Limits of the so-called 'Formgeschichte' Method as applied to the Gospels"; 2. "Jesus of Nazareth, Messiah and Son of Man"; 3. "The Trinitarian God, Subject and Object of Faith"; and 4. "Kingdom, Church, State and People: Relationships and Contrasts."¹ These lectures, delivered in Copenhagen University on 21st to 24th September, 1937, were published (in French) in Strasbourg University's Protestant Theological Faculty's Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie religieuses in the first two issues of that periodical for 1938.²

¹See p. 47 above.

²Le problème du Christianisme primitif. Four Lectures on the Form and the Thought of the New Testament. 1. Fondement, but et limites de la méthode dite de la "Formgeschichte" appliquée aux Evangiles. 2. Jésus de Nazareth, Messie et Fils de l'Homme. (Revue - Jan./Feb. 1938). 3. Le Dieu Trinitaire, sujet et objet de la foi. 4. Royaume, Eglise, Etat et Peuple: relations et contrasts. (Revue - March/April 1938). ~~See also Chapter 2,~~

In issue No.4 in 1937, the periodical had published another article by Dr. Schmidt - "The Ministry and the Ministries in the Church of the New Testament" - and, as can be seen from the bare titles, these five essays are likely to provide a great deal of material for Dr. Schmidt's thinking about the Church.¹

For one who had achieved such eminence as a New Testament scholar, it is only natural to find that the main source and foundation of all Dr. Schmidt's thinking regarding the Church is the New Testament, together with its essential and close links with the Old Testament. What is quite noticeable in his writings is how the problems and questions regarding the Church very soon began to occupy more and more of his attention and study. Even in the Copenhagen Formgeschichte lecture the subject of the Church comes in prominently. There may, no doubt, be a legitimate place, for instance, for sociological investigation of the early Christian community, but this sociological approach, in Dr. Schmidt's opinion, can only lead to error when the attempt is made to apply it to the ἐκκλησία Θεοῦ, the ἑὼς Χριστοῦ.² This is an entity which eludes the grasp of sociological investigation. Even the writing of

¹Le Ministère et les ministères dans l'église du Nouveau Testament. Les données bibliques et celles de la tradition. (Revue - No.4, 1937). The lecture was given before a ministerial assembly at Liestal near Basel on 19th April, 1937, in German under the title Amt und Ämter.

²Revue. 1. p.19.

the Gospels is affected by this fact. In the Church the relationship between the individual and the community is invested with a very special character. "The individual Christian, even if writing a Gospel, does not lead a life which is entirely his own affair. He cannot be, nor does he desire to be, anything other than an agent of the Church of Christ in whose bosom and for whom he is editing his work."¹ This applies equally to the 4th Gospel and to the Apostle Paul. When the latter speaks of his Gospel, he is referring to the one and only Gospel. The New Testament canon never speaks of Gospels in the plural. It is always singular - 'The Gospel according to St. Matthew' etc.²

In a much earlier work, his article on The Position of the Evangelists in the general History of Literature written in 1922, Dr. Schmidt had drawn attention to Franz Overbeck's conclusion that the earliest Christian literature was a form that died out and has nothing in common with Patristic literature.³ With this conclusion Schmidt agrees in the main,

¹Revue. 1.

²ibid.

³"Die Stellung der Evangelien in der allgemeinen Literaturgeschichte." in Eucharisterion (a Symposium edited by Hans Schmidt in honour of the 60th birthday of Hermann Gunkel). 1923. Part 2. p.133.

though pointing out that Overbeck's attack on St. Luke is hardly justified since St. Luke was not writing a "Life of Jesus" in his Gospel nor following it with the "personal history of the different apostles" in Acts.¹ Indeed the Christian Urliteratur is quite unique, not properly literature or biography, but 'popular' books (Volksbücher) of tradition that had arisen out of historical facts, out of a religious movement. The evangelists were not 'authors' in the modern sense. They were largely in the hands of the tradition they had received. It would be wrong, therefore, according to Overbeck, to regard the Acts of the Apostles as the first written history of the Church.³ Eusebius, the first great Church historian, clearly did not think of himself as continuing the form and style of Acts or the Gospels. The theme of the Gospels, Schmidt says, is really Christ, Christ born in the person of Jesus of Nazareth, and all four Gospels end with the story of the resurrection. Acts is the story of this same Christ after the resurrection. This common Christological characteristic of the Gospels and Acts can be summed up thus:

¹Revue. 1. p.8. cf. Overbeck's Christentum und Kultur. 1919. pp.80f.

²Eucharisterion. p.125f.

³Ueber die Anfänge der patristischen Literatur". Franz Overbeck. Historische Zeitschrift. 1882.

"The Gospel is the story of Christ humbling himself, being present on earth in the midst of his apostles; Acts is the story of Christ ascended on high and present in his Church, founded by the apostles."¹ Error arises from disregarding this soteriological perspective and attempting to treat the Gospel and Acts as a work of history, which is only partly true, or as a novel ('Roman'), which is not at all true.² The very uniqueness of these earliest Christian writings, however, adds to the great difficulties involved in investigating their literary and historical problems and the peculiar conditions governing their existence, preservation, form and content.

Class Lectures and Seminars in Bonn

I can remember in Bonn in 1932 listening to Professor Schmidt lecturing on the literary shyness of the early Christian community and on the nature of their Urliteratur not as 'literature' in our sense, i.e. not recognisable literary compositions of individual authors, but as Kleinliteratur, i.e. documents with a collective character. In the course of many of these lectures he would often pose some of his deceptively

¹Revue. 1. p.9.

²ibid. p.9.

simple questions which would then lead to the unfolding of the answer.

Jesus, Peter, the disciples, were not writers. Unlike the Old Testament prophets, who either wrote themselves or had their words recorded for them, Jesus never used a calamus, as far as we know. Why was this, Professor Schmidt would ask, and why did things change?¹

Two of the main reasons are traceable to the work of the Spirit and to the influence of eschatology. Through the Spirit, the Risen Lord was present in the congregation. It is always in the perspective of the fact of this Presence that the early Christians viewed Jesus of Nazareth, his life on earth, his crucifixion and death, his resurrection and ascension. The powerful part played by oral tradition in those days doubtless also lessened the need to write, but the fellowship of the Spirit, real, active, alive, and Christ's presence wherever two or three gathered in his name, must have tended to relegate a written record to a secondary place.

Eschatology, in the years when Christians were literally waiting for the end, was another important factor in the situation. It made the formation of a literary tradition unnecessary or even impossible, the more especially since Christianity was never a book religion in the way, for instance,

¹Lectures on the Gospels.

that Islam was. Furthermore, the early Christians already had a holy book - the Old Testament. Like the presence of Christ in his Church, the Scriptures also were a vehicle of God's presence, not something to be regarded as merely an inheritance from the past. Jesus had laid strong emphasis on the Scriptures and in many passages they seem almost to be personified.¹

That missionary work relied more on speaking than on writing, was probably another factor. The results of such work came through the power of the Spirit and were seen in the gifts of the Spirit, though here the emphasis was not so much on individual experience in isolation but in the framework of the Christian community. Paul, probably one of the few who could write, and who described himself as "an amateur (ἰδιώτης) in speaking" (2 Cor.11:6), had to write to clear up the confusions and difficulties that arose in the widely scattered churches. With the passage of time, of course, and the death or martyrdom of more and more of the witnesses to the resurrection, the need to write down the Gospel tradition became more urgent.

All this is not unlike the way in which Streeter describes the situation of the early Christian community.

¹cf. Mt.4:7,10; 5:21,27,33,38,43; 12:5,17,39f.; 13:14; 21:13f.; etc. Mk.7:6f.; 10:19; 12:10,36; 14:27; etc.

"The Primitive Church had no New Testament, no stereotyped traditions. The men who took Christianity to the Gentile world had had no special training, only a great experience."¹ Dodd, like Schmidt, notes the "astonishing confidence" of the early Christians although in those days "the Church was a minority movement with every power in the world against it."² It was a confidence firmly based on fact not fantasy. In his lectures Professor Schmidt on several occasions stressed the further important factor of the inseparable connection between word and deed in the New Testament. The apostles did not merely preach the word. They constantly acted in obedience to the direction of the Spirit and the record of this is rightly called "The Acts of the Apostles". Where they preached the Gospel, signs followed, miracles happened.³ Paul records this too. In the oldest κήρυγμα and tradition regarding Jesus, there is the same intimate link between word and deed. When Jesus spoke, he also acted and the paralytic was healed, Levi rose up and followed him, the leper was cleansed, Jairus' daughter was raised.⁴ Conversely, by the miracles he performed, he preached the word of God.

¹The Primitive Church. B.H. Streeter. 1930. p.45.

²The Coming of Christ. C.H. Dodd. 1951. p.5.

³Acts 2:43; 3:6f.; 6:8; etc.

⁴Mk. 3:12; 3:14; 1:42; 5:41f.

It was in one of his weekly seminar sessions (in July 1932) that I heard Professor Schmidt outline his reasons for regarding Mt.16:18 as a genuine saying of Jesus. The outline naturally followed the detailed analysis of the passage noted above,¹ but he left no doubt among his hearers about his own firm conviction that if a saying of this weight and significance had been a later insertion into the Gospel, it would be more than miraculous to find absolutely no textual indications of this. Yet there is no New Testament manuscript which lacks this verse. The fact that it occurs only in Matthew is no evidence against historicity. Many accepted passages are in similar case.

One point he stressed was the difference between the eschatological character of the Church and that of the Kingdom of God.² The latter is in no way dependent on men. The kingdom comes even without men. Jesus' word calling men to repent was not a call to repent in order that the Kingdom of God should come but a call to repent because the Kingdom of God was at hand. It comes, in other words, by the action of God. The Church, on the other hand, is like the justified sinner, looking to the future when the promise will be fulfilled, but here and now remaining a corpus mixtum. Although

¹See pp. 99 f. above.

²See also p. 106 above.

in Christ, and here Christology joins eschatology, we are "sealed with the promised Holy Spirit" (Eph.1:13), this remains the ἀρραβών (v.14) the advance payment or security, on our inheritance and does not give us complete possession of it. That remains solely in God's hands, not in our power. The Church, therefore, being in essence a corpus mixtum, remains under the promise. It is a σημεῖον, a 'fore-sign', like Joel's 'signs' (Acts 2:16f.), pointing to the Kingdom of God, but the Church is not eternal and will come to an end, just as the Temple is no longer there in the holy city (Rev. 21:22), just as Christ finally hands over all things to God the Father. (1 Cor.15:24f.). The σῶμα Χριστοῦ and the βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ are not identical.

It is interesting to compare Schmidt's interpretation of the ἀρραβών with that of Dodd who held that in Paul's Epistles the vital principle of 'realised eschatology' came into its own.¹ "In its final form, it is true, the consummation of life is still a matter of hope," he writes, "but the earnest (arrhabon) of the inheritance is a present possession; and an arrhabon is a sample of goods guaranteed to be of the same kind and quality as the main consignment. In masterly fashion Paul has claimed the whole territory of the Church's life as the field of the eschatological miracle."² The comparison

¹The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments. C.H. Dodd. 1936. p.154.

²op.cit. pp.154-5.

brings out clearly how important a step forward 'realised eschatology' is in the interpretation of the New Testament texts. It also points to the importance of words and their meanings, which was more Schmidt's emphasis. Is ἀραβών for instance, properly translated as a 'guarantee' or 'sample', or is not Schmidt closer to the Semitic original meaning of an 'advance payment', a 'bond of exchange' as he said, an 'option' as it were? Hunter defines ἀραβών as "a commercial term denoting a down payment which binds the purchaser to pay the total price in full", a definition which would agree with Schmidt's interpretation.¹ It is to be noted, however, that Schmidt insists on keeping whatever optional element the transaction may involve, in God's hands not man's. It is a bond redeemable only in God's time and according to His will.

Always an interesting lecturer, every now and then Professor Schmidt would bring in some illuminating remark or illustration, which, even when he did not elaborate, would throw new light on a whole subject. In one seminar, for instance, he would point up the difference between New Testament days and modern times by remarking that the injunction not to pray on the street corners (Mt.6:5) might well have been made just the reverse today. On another occasion he

¹Hunter. op.cit. p.97.

would point out that some things the Gospels record Jesus as saying, may well go back to the gestures he made, as Rabbis usually did when teaching, which were put into words later.

Critical and careful scholar though he was, he constantly and strongly emphasised the historicity of the Gospel record and frequently in his lectures and writing took issue with Bultmann on this. When Bultmann writes off an incident as an "Ideal" scene because it is "typical of Jewish debates", Professor Schmidt would quietly ask - "But did Jesus not debate with the Jews?"¹ He would point out that to say it was "by the special care of God" might be only one of several explanations when a falling tile just missed you, but that does not take away the event. To say, as Bultmann did, that it does not matter what happened is just Docetism.² There may, for instance, be a certain natural confusion in the records of the Resurrection as to the places and times and numbers of the appearances of the Risen Lord, but the FACT is always there. He did appear to certain known persons in certain known places. The Church, the early Christian community,

¹"The Streitgespräche (i.e. instances of hostile argument) are all 'ideal' scenes." Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition. R. Bultmann. p.40. Bultmann adds that 'ideal' is not meant to imply 'invented' or 'imagined', but that such scenes express a truth in a pictorial way, going beyond the situation and becoming symbolic. (op.cit. p.59).

²Jesus and the Word. 1926. (E.T. 1954). p.14f.; 150f.

was not an inventing machine. The κήρυγμα was historical from the very start. It is Christology, not mythology.

In the course of his ordinary lectures, during the semester I was with him in Bonn, he covered in outline a very wide field of New Testament study, beginning with his own Framework of the History of Jesus in the perspective of Formgeschichte as of that year (1932), and then dealt with the literary character of the Gospels, the Synoptic problem, the Fourth Gospel, Acts, the Epistles, the formation of the Canon, and the history of the text. In those lecture notes it is remarkable how often one finds the seeds of what he was to write later as he turned more and more to the problems and questions connected with the doctrine of the Church.

On the subject of Jesus as the Messiah, for instance, he spoke out in Bonn against Bultmann's view that the oldest conception of the life of Jesus dominating the Synoptic material was non-Messianic, coupling this with the view that the Gospels were a creation of the Hellenistic community.¹ As we have seen, Professor Schmidt held that Jesus undoubtedly did debate with the Jews of his day so that stories of such incidents would in no sense require to be the invention of the Hellenistic community. Again, through his insistence on the inseparable connection between word and deed, the verbum

¹Die Geschichte des synoptischen Tradition. p.153.

efficax, he held that the things Jesus did, regarding the Sabbath for example, he could only do as Messiah.¹ In the Gospels, Dr. Schmidt would say, the real question is not What? or How? but WHO? The Messiah, as applied to Jesus, is not a category, for there can be only one Messiah. If Jesus is the Messiah, however, this fact would inevitably shed new light on words of his which were not at the time understood and so were not included in the tradition until later, when they were understood. On the part of the early Church, therefore, it was not a case of inventing but of understanding.

The Copenhagen Lectures

In the Copenhagen lectures (1938) these same points are also made. Word and deed are inseparable. Form in itself does not disprove the historicity of the event in question.² Here Dr. Schmidt takes the example of Jesus' call to the first disciples, Simon, Andrew, James and John (Mk.1:16-20), and agrees that, form-wise, this may rightly be described in the Bultmann sense as an 'ideal' scene in that it is entirely unpsychologically motivated in Mark.³ But the Gospel interest in any case was never the psychology. It was purely the

¹See H. 105, 150, 186 *above*.

²Revue. 1. p.23.

³*ibid.* p.24.

Master calling and those he called responding. Neither the prophets (cf. Elijah's call to Elisha in 1 K.19:19), nor even more the Messiah, were engaged in theoretical, Socratic dialogue but spoke as ambassadors of God calling the men they addressed to their destiny and changing them in the process.¹

The second of these lectures begins with an investigation of the two Jewish terms "Messiah" and "Son of Man". Schmidt notes that the Church soon showed a preference for terms like "Lord", "Saviour", "Son of God". Certainly the term "Christ" remained prominent but, unlike the word "Messiah", it became almost like a second proper name for Jesus. The "Son of Man" title tends to disappear altogether. Paul never uses it.² This is not simply a matter of Greek terms replacing Jewish ones. It is a matter of considerable theological importance.

Fairly soon in the history of the Church a theologia gloriae began to overshadow the theologia crucis, thus tending to produce a Christology detached from history and more and more open to speculation and to docetism. This, in turn, tended to concentrate on the problem of how knowledge of the historical person of Jesus became faith in the heavenly Son of God, whereas the real question for a true Christology is rather - how "the historical man Jesus is in reality the

¹Revue. 1. p.25.

²ibid. p.26.

Messiah who was rejected by his fellow countrymen and who suffered and died. Then as now the unbeliever was not only the Greek, to whom the cross of Jesus was foolishness, but also the Jew to whom the cross was a scandal."¹ The Church has constantly to guard against overemphasis on the 'life of Jesus' position, which can easily become Ebionitism, and on the myth of Christ position, which can easily become Docetism. The Gospels are concerned with the mission and vocation of the Messiah, Jesus of Nazareth. They deal with history, but history of a very special kind. Hegel's declaration - "Make whatever you want exegetically and historically out of Jesus, the idea is all that matters" - cannot be answered by the methods of those like Ritschl, Wilhelm Herrmann, Harnack, who tried to put together a composite picture of the historical Jesus, stressing now one characteristic now another.² Nor can the answer be found in Rudolf Otto's stress on the 'wholly other'.³ It can only be found by understanding the Messiah.

Among his analyses of the Gospel records Schmidt refers to a detailed examination he made of all the "I" passages (i.e. where $\epsilon\gamma\acute{\omega}$ occurs in relation to Jesus) in the three Synoptic Gospels. This led him to conclude that this was quite an

¹Revue. 1. pp.27-28.

²ibid. p.29.

³ibid.

intentional expression with Jesus, and in a most "precise sense, a messianic sense."¹ The expression "Son of Man" in the third person, is simply another way of emphasising the "I" with reference to Jesus. These are strongly linked to the Old Testament, and the term "Messiah" even more so.² As well as Jesus' words, the miracles he performed point equally clearly to his Messiahship. "Those who deny the Messiahship of Jesus of Nazareth," he writes, "do not take into account the miracles of Jesus which, in the Gospel sources, are placed on the same level as his words."³ Indeed the miracles form one of the main differences between Jesus and John the Baptist. Yet the early Christian community showed an astonishing reserve in the matter, avoiding the superstition, exaggeration, legend and myth commonly found in the Apocryphal Gospels.⁴ In contrast to apocalyptic fantasy and cosmic speculation, Jesus' use of the title Son of Man stresses the concept of the Messiah come from God and entirely obedient to God, Whose Anointed he

¹Revue. 1. p.36.

² ibid. pp.40-41. For his comments on the Suffering Messiah, Schmidt relies to a great extent on the researches of Gustaf Dalman (Der leidende und der sterbende Messias der Synagoge. 1888) and on the Strack/Billerbeck Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch. 1922.

³ ibid. p.44.

⁴ ibid. p.45.

is. If there is any 'secret', it lies in the failure of his adversaries, parents, disciples to understand this.¹ James and John want special seats in the kingdom (Mk.10:35f.; Mt. 20;20f.). Peter rebukes Jesus when 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." (Mk.8:31f. and parallels). They are "prisoners of all kinds of personal preoccupations," and, in this, exact representatives of the people of Israel.²

As the Messiah sent by God, Jesus calls for faith in God (Mk.11:22) and in himself (Mt.18:6) but it is to the pagan centurion he says, marvelling, "Truly, I say to you, not even in Israel have I found such faith." (Mt.8:10). And as Messiah he not only calls for faith but gives faith. (Lk.17:5; 22:32).³

The centrality of the Messiahship of Jesus for the doctrine of the Church was also underlined by Traugott Schmidt, in his case in the perspective of the Church as the Body of

¹Coupled with the need to guard against misconceptions along the lines of a political or apocalyptic Messiahship, and the rejection of any idea of a Suffering Messiah. Revue. 1. pp.49f.

²ibid. p.50.

³ibid. pp.50-52.

Christ.¹ "According to the view of the Urgemeinde," he wrote, "Jesus even on earth was already 'anointed with the Holy Spirit and with power'", a view which "reflects Jewish Messiah ideas."² "God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Spirit and with power", Peter says in Acts. (10:38).³ Like K.L. Schmidt, he held that the Ekklesia was linked intimately with the Old Testament בְּיָד, the people of God, the self-description of the Jewish congregation, a special congregation of the people of Israel.⁴ As already noted, "The young Christian congregation (Christengemeinde) formed such a group within the nation. They considered themselves to be the congregation which, according to eschatological expectation (especially clearly announced in the imagery of the Book of Enoch) the Messiah would gather around himself. Thus, as the Congregation of the Messiah, whom they believed had appeared in Jesus, they made the claim to be the kernel of God's people, the true Israel."⁵

From similar considerations K.L. Schmidt can dismiss

¹ Der Leib Christi. 1919.

² op.cit. p.24.

³ cf. also Acts 4:27; Rom.1:4.

⁴ op.cit. p.118.

⁵ ibid. pp.121-2. See p.143 above.

any notion of a so-called 'Messiasgeheimnis' on the part of Mark and base the claim to Messiah-ship on the historical Jesus himself.¹ "Jesus does not stand in a general spiritual and religious historical context, from which standpoint only unsatisfactory value judgments could be made, but in the special context of the Jewish people with their claim to be the people of God, the 'Church'" he wrote in his "Jesus Christus" article.² "From here it follows, one might almost say as a matter of course, that Jesus of Nazareth, even though we cannot give particulars as to the origin and the separate stages of his Messianic consciousness knew himself to be the Messiah."³

The third of the Copenhagen lectures, "The Trinitarian God, Subject and Object of Faith," has naturally a great deal to say about the Holy Spirit and so is examined in the following chapter on the Spirit.⁴

"Kingdom, Church, State and People"

The last of the four Copenhagen lectures, "Kingdom,

¹Vielhauer. op.cit. p.201. He also notes several of the unsolved problems this solution raises.

²BGG. III. col.148.

³ibid.

⁴See pp. 266 f. below.

Church, State and People: Relationships and Contrasts," provides a rich vein of material for Professor Schmidt's thinking on the Church.

In the first paragraph he quotes the words which might well stand as the key to his constant method of procedure - "ad fontes!"¹ In this going back to the Bible, however, he insists that a biblical theology must rest on God's initiative and sees the need to devote more and more honour and attention to this specific approach. People today often turn to the Bible as to an almanac to find the answer to the questions they put to it, the interpretation of their dreams, as it were. Some look to it for proof texts of their own particular dogmas. More important, however, than our questioning of the Bible is to allow what is given there to question us. If God really has the initiative there is no other course open.²

What then does the New Testament have to say about the Church and its relationships with the Kingdom, State and People?

The words βασιλεία, ἐκκλησία, πόλις (with πολιτεία and πολίτευμα) and ἔθνος (λαὸς, φυλή, γένος), curiously enough, are all Greek secular terms which now, in the New Testament, take on particular and specialised meanings. The most frequent and clear description for Christians is the term

¹Revue. 2. p.146.

²ibid.

ἐκκλησία Θεοῦ , the Church. This is in quite definite distinction from the βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ , for Christians can only be described as belonging to the Kingdom of God in a derivative sense, i.e. in so far as they belong to Christ.¹

This, however, is to anticipate Schmidt's examination of the word βασιλεία in this article, and go straight to his conclusion. In the New Testament βασιλεία is used of earthly kingdoms, including the kingdom of David, where it already is beginning to take on theological colour. There is even a kingdom of the Devil. Contrary to the Biblical idea, however, from Philo to Kant there has been evident a false identification of the Kingdom of God with some Supreme Good, a mixture of pantheism and ethical and anthropological values, usually in the individual sense.² In the collective sense there is a greater danger, namely that the kingdom becomes absolute and is separated from God, a kind of Imperium Romanum with a veneer of Christianity. Against these interpretations, the Kingdom of God in both Old and New Testaments means the "domain where God reigns," or, in the term Matthew prefers, the "Kingdom of Heaven". "It concerns God, and God alone", and requires no other attributes or qualifications.³

¹For a more detailed treatment of the subject, Dr. Schmidt referred his hearers to what he wrote in 1927 (i.e. Die Kirche des Urchristentums) and to his article on ἐκκλησία in TWNT. See H. 124 f., 56 f. above.

²Revue. 2. p.147.

³ibid. p.148.

The kingdom belongs to God. It also belongs to those who are poor in spirit, those who are persecuted for righteousness' sake. (Mt.5:3,10). But man's possession of the kingdom is a possession of a highly special kind. God attributes it to men, just as He attributes justification to the sinner.¹ Jesus did not come preaching a new concept, announcing that a Kingdom of God existed. He said - "the Kingdom of God is at hand." The kingdom does not come by any action of man's, but its nearness and the presence of the Messiah himself challenge men to do all they can to participate in the kingdom. This does not imply any kind of synergism. The Kingdom of God is of a magnitude purely supernatural, never an ideal, a moral good, towards which man can progressively work. The only decision demanded of us is to accept or reject the offered invitation to enter the kingdom. It is a decision of the utmost gravity. Only Jesus Christ himself was able to yield to God the complete obedience involved and make visible in his own person in the present the future greatness of the Kingdom of God.² The great reserve of the New Testament is to be seen again in what unites believing Christians and the Kingdom of God. It is the experience of Christ in

¹Revue. 2.

²ibid. p.151. From this, Schmidt notes, Origen got his term - αυτοβασιλεία, though the idea was earlier expressed by Marcion. See p. 187 above.

the light of the Easter faith, and hence "Christians are only the βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ in a derived sense, in so far as they belong to Christ."¹

It is perhaps necessary to note that Schmidt here, and even more explicitly in his Basileia article,² does not identify the Kingdom of God with the Kingdom of Christ, and Cullmann, in his essay on "The Kingship of Christ and the Church in the New Testament," also makes clear that the Regnum Christi and the Church of Christ are not interchangeable terms.³ Both Schmidt and Cullmann, however, stress the future aspect as well as the present, whereas T.W. Manson, for instance, stresses the presence of the Kingdom.⁴ "We grossly misunderstand the Gospel," he writes, "if we suppose that in all this (i.e. the Messianic Ministry, Jesus' life and death) we are dealing with an interim dispensation, a prelude to the coming of the Kingdom. This is the Kingdom. The Ministry of Jesus is the Kingdom of God spelt out in human terms."⁵ All three seem to agree on the closeness of the links between

¹Revue. 2.

²See p. 246 below.

³The Early Church. p.109.

⁴The Church's Ministry. 1948.

⁵op.cit. p.18.

the Kingdom of God, the Regnum Christi and the Church. Where Manson says "the doctrine of the Church is a branch of Christology",¹ Cullmann writes - "the Church is the heart and centre of the Regnum Christi".² Dodd calls attention to the "rather striking agreement" in Matthew's Gospel and Paul's Epistles, since both assign "a special place in the eschatological scheme to the Kingdom of Christ, as in some sense distinct from the Kingdom of God."³ Then he adds - "It is tempting to say, the Kingdom of Christ is the Church; but the simple equation of the two is perhaps not justified. . . though the relation between the two concepts is very intimate."⁴

Among the Reformers, as Professor Torrance shows, Martin Butzer held that the Church as the Body of Christ, the Bride of Christ, the Flock of the Good Shepherd, was identical with the Regnum Christi because the Rex dwells in her midst.⁵ Butzer's Regnum Christi thus constitutes a third dimension between Luther's sharp distinction between Regnum spirituale

¹ *ibid.* p.20.

² *op.cit.* p.123.

³ New Testament Studies. No.3. 1953. p.54.

⁴ *op.cit.* p.57.

⁵ Kingdom and Church. A Study in the Theology of the Reformation. T.F. Torrance. 1956. p.81.

and Regnum corporale.¹ Calvin, on the other hand, says the Church "participates in the Kingdom of Christ" and because it does so "it can engage in its arduous task of extending that Kingdom on earth."² "When we speak of the Kingdom of Christ," he writes in his Commentary on Acts, "we must respect two things: the doctrine of the Gospel, whereby Christ doth gather unto Himself a Church, and whereby He governs it being gathered together; secondly, the society of the godly (societas piorum), who being joined together by the sincere faith of the Gospel are truly accounted the people of Christ (populus Christi)."³

In Catholic theology, however, there is often what looks like identification of the different concepts. The chapter heading for Father Bonsirven's Theology of the New Testament, Chapter IV, for example, reads simply - "The Kingdom of the Son. The Church."⁴ Writing on the two aspects of the Church, one earthly and empirical, the other mystic and other-worldly, Cerfaux quotes Congar - "We find two things in the New Testament revelation of the mystery of the Church.

¹ibid.

²ibid. p.91.

³ibid. p.115.

⁴Theology of the New Testament. Joseph Bonsirven. S.J. 1963. p.61.

1. The City of God is all present in one entity, and at the same time it is a multiple society. 2. The City of God is already present, and at the same time it belongs to the future, its completion is yet to come."¹ This double element in the mystery of the Church is found in the synoptics as the kingdom and in St. Paul as the new creation and finally Christ's mystical body. "Whereas our Lord spoke of the community of the elect (the messianic community on earth) as the kingdom, Paul calls it the Church."² Though Cerfaux says, "Neither can one identify the kingdom of God with the Church heavenly", he continues, "The equation of Church with kingdom occurs in the captivity epistles . . . the kingdom of the Son is identical with the Church simply because of the sanctifying power of Christ that exists in it."³ And "The kingdom that Christ preached is present in the Church."⁴ Father Küng, on the other hand, makes it clear that the Church and God's Rule (Gottesherrschaft) are not to be identified. "Ekklesia" embraces sinners and righteous people, Basileia is the kingdom of the righteous and the saints."⁵ The real link between

¹Cerfaux. op.cit. p.381. Esquisses du Mystère de l'Église.
M-J Congar. 1941. p.17f.

²Cerfaux. p.384.

³ibid. p.385.

⁴ibid. p.387.

⁵Die Kirche. p.115.

the two is that the Ekklesia proclaims the Basileia and that the Church in her pilgrimage is not forsaken or forgotten by God.¹

It would be appropriate at this point to consider Schmidt's earlier article for the Kittel Dictionary on the word βασιλεία, but to preserve the order of the present lecture it will be taken up later in the chapter.²

Under ἐκκλησία he summarises his main arguments already noted - the special sense acquired by the word through the addition of τοῦ Θεοῦ, the close link between the ἐκκλησία τοῦ Θεοῦ and the קהל הקדש. Surprisingly enough, the body of Christians can also be called a synagogue. It is by error that we customarily consider ἐκκλησία the Christian term and συναγωγή the Jewish term. The original Aramaic term Jesus himself might well have used, kenishta, is probably closer to συναγωγή than to ἐκκλησία. However, "it is of fundamental importance that the reality of the Church in the Old and New Testaments should not be tied to a Greek term."³ When the New Testament speaks of 'Church' the meaning is 'the assembly of God' or, more exactly, 'the assembly of those who have been called by God in Christ'.⁴

¹Die Kirche. p.117.

²See ¶. 142 f. below.

³Revue. 2. p.152.

⁴ibid. p.153.

The Church, therefore, is always visible precisely as an individual is visible. Her only invisible possession rests in having been chosen by God, justified and sanctified by Him.¹ So, in a sense, what she will be lies in the future but in this present age she is and remains the ecclesia militans et pressa, not the ecclesia triumphans, even although, assembled on earth, she is the Ἐκκλησία Χριστοῦ, signifying that the glorified Christ is at the same time present in living communion with the faithful. One day the Church will come to an end, in that day when Jesus Christ her Lord delivers everything over to God and God is all in all (1 Cor.15:28).²

¹ibid.

²In his address to the Eranos group in 1947 on the theme "Homo Imago Dei" Dr. Schmidt dealt with this aspect of the Church in its reflecting one important side of Christology. Warning His disciples that they should not be like the "kings of the Gentiles", Jesus says - "I am among you as one who serves." (Lk.22:27). It is this aspect of Christ as Servant, this aspect of the Church as His body being a militant, not yet visibly triumphant, band, which calls the Christian to be an image of Christ. Those who love God, says Paul, "he also predestined to be conformed to the image of his Son." (Rom.8:29). To the Corinthians he writes - "The first man (Adam) is of the earth, earthy: the second man is from heaven. . . . As we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly," (1 Cor.15:47f.), and "But we all, with open face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord." (2 Cor.3:18). The latter verses show the future of the Christian and the Church, and show also that the risen, coming, glorified Christ cannot be separated from Christ in His lowliness and humility. This is poles apart from Greek philosophy that would glorify man, and from the current existentialist philosophy that sees man as ridden by anxiety and under sentence of death. The Old and New Testaments have a different view. Man may be under sentence of death but he is thrown back, not on anxiety, but on God. Man is the image of God. (Eranos Jahrbuch. 1947. Vol.XV. p.194).

The Kingdom of God, on the other hand, is invisible. Once only has it been present in Jesus Christ, the Messiah. The Kingdom is not an assembly of men but God Himself, triumphant and eternal. The early Church was well aware of this difference between the Kingdom and the Church and in her understanding of herself as the *ἰουδαίαια*, continued to proclaim the *βασιλεία*.¹ Karl Barth referred to the same point in his talks on the Apostles' Creed - "The Church announces the Kingdom of God, she is not the Kingdom of God."²

When these two become confused or assimilated, grave consequences ensue. In the Church, two views, otherwise poles apart, often tend to fall into this danger. From the Roman Catholic side, for instance, the Church is often considered as being in her future state and not as actually present here and now. Evangelical sects, on the other hand, often transfer the Kingdom of God over into the present state of the Church, so that the Kingdom ceases to be purely and absolutely to come. The Church cannot be described as the instrument of God for His Kingdom since she herself is not the *ἔσχατον*. She is an eschatological entity, however, in that she points to the *ἔσχατον* even while, unlike the Kingdom, remaining a

¹Revue. 2. pp.153f.

²The Faith of the Church. 1960. (Originally in French, 1943). p.118.

corpus mixtum.¹ Flew makes the point even more strongly. "It is a profound mistake," he writes, "to infer that the rejection of the medieval view, that the Ecclesia equals the Kingdom of God on earth, implies that the Ecclesia is being dismissed from the teaching of Jesus. The Ecclesia is indeed the necessary correlative to the Basileia, or Kingly Rule."² As Hunter says - "The Kingdom is not the Church; but it implies it."³ "God's redemptive rule" (or "saving Sovereignty") . . . "implies a people living under that Rule. It involves the formation of a community. Thus, the ecclesia or people of God is the inevitable correlative of the rule of God."⁴ To this may be added the far-reaching observation of T.W. Manson that "the Kingdom of God in its essence is the Reign of God, a personal relation between God and the individual: and there is no point in asking whether it is present or future, just as there is no point in asking whether the Fatherhood of God is present or future. It is something independent of temporal and spatial relations. It is a standing claim made by God on the loyalty and obedience of man."⁵ So it is present where

¹Revue. 2. p.154.

²op.cit. p.15.

³The Unity of the New Testament. A.M. Hunter. 1943. p.48.

⁴ibid. p.49.

⁵The Teaching of Jesus. 1935. p.135.

God's sovereignty is accepted, though the final consummation is still in the future.¹ Schmidt's view we have seen, is that the Kingdom of God "has only once been present/^{in Jesus Christ,} but in Jesus Christ entirely clothed in Messianic mystery. The Kingdom of God is not an assembly of men, but is God Himself, always triumphant and eternal."²

These considerations are essential in order to gain a true understanding of what unites and what separates the Kingdom of God and the Church, as they also are for an understanding of the relation of God to His world.³ When the Kingdom of God comes to be present, in that day when God is all in all, then His triumph over the world will be definite and final. The Word made flesh did not bring this final victory. Although the Kingdom was present in Jesus Christ, it was not imposed. The Son of God was crucified and, after his resurrection, returned to God. The Church, which carries on the existence of Christ on earth, has the service and task of fulfilling the role of sentinel or guardian, a role foreshadowed by the Old Testament prophets and perfectly presented in Jesus Christ.

¹ibid. p.136.

²Revue. 2. p.154. See also p.231 above.

³ibid. pp.155f.

State (or City) and People are similarly qualified by the addition, present or implied, of the words "of God." $\pi\acute{o}\lambda\iota\varsigma$ in this sense is an eschatological city, the heavenly country of the Christian, for which the name Jerusalem is reserved in the New Testament. It is different from the Jerusalem of the Jews and from the Babel of the Gentiles. The true $\pi\acute{o}\lambda\iota\varsigma$ is the Kingdom of God. This places the State in its proper perspective to the Kingdom and the Church. The Kingdom of God will exist when the kingdoms of this world have disappeared. From the Church, loyalty to the earthly State is claimed (especially, for instance, in Rom.13:1f.) but, on the other hand, the Christian can never totally 'belong' to the State since the Church points to the true Kingdom, the heavenly Kingdom. So when Paul in Rome tells a meeting of the leading Jews that, because of the objections of the Jews in Jerusalem, "I was compelled to appeal to Caesar", he immediately goes on - "though I had no charge to bring against my nation . . . it is because of the hope of Israel that I am bound with this chain." (Acts 28:19-20). Paul thus remains true to his people as the people of the promise.¹

For the Church, from the earliest years there existed a tension between Caesar and Christ, a loyalty to the State on the one hand, an opposition to the State on the other. It should be remembered that, though Jesus enjoined giving to

¹Revue. 2. p.167.

Caesar what was Caesar's, he spoke of King Herod as "that fox". (Lk.13:32).¹ In apocalyptic writings the opposition becomes even more marked. Rev.13 tells of a 'beast out of the sea . . . uttering haughty and blasphemous words' which "was allowed to make war on the saints and to conquer them." (vv.6-7). This, or the second beast, Number 666, probably represented the god-emperor Nero. Living in a demoniac world of this kind, the Christian had to remember that he was a stranger, an alien, that the Church was an assembly of aliens (immigres), and that his hope in this world rested in his rights as a citizen of the heavenly City.²

The Basileia Article

K.L. Schmidt's first major article for the Kittel dictionary was on the word Basileia, especially on its use and meaning in Hellenistic Judaism, in the New Testament, and in the Early Church.³ Other scholars dealt more briefly (in the article) with Greek usage, Melek and Malkuth in the Old Testament, and the concept in Rabbinic literature.⁴ These

¹Revue. 2. p.169.

²ibid. p.171.

³In addition to the E.T. of TWNT Vol.I there is a convenient Basileia in the Bible Key Words (BKW) series, translated by H.P. Kingdon (1957) and the following page references are to this latter translation.

⁴H. Kleinknecht, K.G. Kuhn, Gerhard von Rad.

last-mentioned sections bring out, interestingly enough, the fact that hope of a Messiah occurs relatively seldom in the Old Testament, and that melek and its derivatives always refer to being king, kingship, never merely to territory.¹ E.F. Scott had already drawn attention to this striking fact of the Messianic idea being secondary in the Old Testament, even although "from the beginning of their life as a nation, the people of Israel had considered themselves to be under the kingship of God."² In the prophets, he noted, interest centred "not on the king, but on the kingdom",³ and the idea of the kingdom became widely understood. In New Testament times, for instance, Jesus' "teaching assumes throughout that all men know what is meant by the Kingdom, and that the idea itself stands in no need of definition."⁴ Basileia, Scott also noted, "refers not so much to a realm wherein God is King, as to the fact of His Kingship, His absolute supremacy."⁵

In Philo, Schmidt notes, "the royal sovereignty is never understood eschatologically. Far more is basileia a chapter

¹BKW. p.16.

²The Kingdom and the Messiah. E.F. Scott. 1911. p.2.

³ibid. p.31.

⁴ibid. p.91.

⁵ibid. p.95.

in moral teaching. The true king is the wise man."¹ This was the common view in ancient philosophy. "Josephus never uses the term basileia tou theou."²

From the original meaning of "being or essence of a king" the meaning "realm" is a natural derivative, as, for example, the English word dukedom. Modern Greek retains the meaning of "monarchy", "royal rule", for basileia and uses another word - basileion - for "royal realm". In a footnote Schmidt quotes definitions by Rawlinson - "God's rule or Sovereignty, the Reign of God" - and Deissmann - "Kingdom or sovereignty, kingly rule of God" - and, setting the pattern for his later articles, proceeds to examine the biblical evidence in detail.³ This examination shows that the expression basileia (tou) theou is the one which "dominates the entire New Testament" and gives rise to "two important insights" - "The essential meaning is not realm, but sway"; and that this kingdom comes not by natural development of earthly relationships or human strivings but "through an intervention of God from heaven."⁴

¹BKW. p.25.

²ibid. p.26.

³Rawlinson. op.cit. The Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul. A. Deissmann. 1923. BKW. p.34.

⁴BKW. pp.37-8.

He is in no doubt as to the centrality of the basileia. "In the Kingdom of God," he writes, "we are concerned with the entire preaching of Jesus Christ and His apostles. If the entire proclamation of the New Testament is εὐαγγέλιον, then this is the εὐαγγέλιον of God's Kingdom."¹ He also stresses the close link between word and deed, how the word of God's Kingdom goes hand in hand with the deeds of God's sovereignty.

When he comes to examine ἤγγικεν in Mk.1:15, and the other synoptic passages concerning the coming of the kingdom, Schmidt mentions but does not discuss Dodd's interpretation,² emphasising rather the "entirely miraculous nature" of the Kingdom of God as contrasted with everything present and earthly, and also that it is a "cosmic catastrophe."³ A decisive point for this latter aspect, however, is not that Jesus shared the conceptions of his contemporaries but that "He stopped short of his contemporaries and did so deliberately."⁴ It would therefore be a serious error to read any sort of popular philosophy into the New Testament, stressing either individualism or universalism, reducing the gospel to a kind

¹BKW. p.41. (cf. TWNT. I. p.583).

²The Parables of the Kingdom. pp.44f.

³BKW. pp.44-5.

⁴ibid. cf. Lk.17:20f.

of "refined humanism" whereas, in reality, it is sheer miracle. "The realisation of God's sovereignty is future," Schmidt writes, "and this future conditions man in the present."¹ Jesus linked the Kingdom of God with a call to repentance. "Where man listens to this call with faith, i.e. in obedience, then he comes into contact with God's Kingdom, which comes without his doing anything to it; there the gospel becomes a message of glad tidings that strikes home."²

It is to the 'poor in spirit' (Mt.5:3), to 'those who are persecuted for righteousness' sake' (v.10), to him "who does the will of my Father" (Mt.7:21), to children (Mk.10:14), that the kingdom belongs, Since, however, only Jesus was able to live this complete obedience, there is a special relationship between him and God's sovereignty, and Schmidt favours Origen's expression - autobasileia - though not agreeing wholly with Origen's interpretation.³ While the basileia and the Lord Jesus Christ remain closely linked, the New Testament does not quite identify the Kingdom of God with the Kingdom of Christ and it does not identify the Kingdom with the believers

¹BKW. p.48.

²ibid. pp.48-9.

³ibid. p.54. T.W. Manson (The Sayings of Jesus. p.344) also holds Origen was right in using this expression regarding Jesus.

in Christ.¹ Furthermore "it is not the case that the emphasis on the Church has supplanted Jesus of Nazareth's preaching of the Kingdom of God. Rather it is the case that in the post-Easter experience of Christ the belief in the Kingdom of God remained firm."²

The early Fathers largely kept to the same view as the New Testament but very soon the metaphysics of Plato and the ethics of the Stoa began to shift the emphasis from eschatology to the quest after the perfection of the individual Christian. This had the effect of separating faith and morality and of stressing ideas like 'eternal life' and 'insight' rather than biblical basileia truth. In the Latin West it was a process which culminated in Augustine's identification of the Kingdom of God with the Church.³

Ministry and Ministries

One of the very few places among Dr. Schmidt's writings in which he takes up the question of Church Orders is in this article - "The Ministry and the Ministries in the Church of

¹In view of this, MacGregor's remark - "K.L. Schmidt's identification of the Kingdom of God and the Kingdom of Christ, in the New Testament, . . . is not to be uncritically accepted as sound exegesis." (Corpus Christi. p.238) - seems hardly justified.

²BKW. (cf. TWNT. I. p.589).

³ibid. p.59.

the New Testament."¹ As he points out, it is not only a vast and complex subject but one concerning which it is difficult to maintain objectivity. In part this is due to the very great difference in the principles underlying the practice of different denominations, in part to the compulsion of a member of any recognisable denomination to understand, base and support the practice of the ministry familiar to him on a doctrine of the ministry and the ministries laying claim to be biblical.

At the outset one would have to admit that this is a subject on which there is no agreement between the Catholic Church, Roman, Old Catholic and Eastern Orthodox, and the Reformed Churches. The "Catholic" Church claims to derive its authority from the possession of a ministry "not only instituted by Jesus Christ but transmitted in the way he himself wished, by apostolic succession."² Irenaeus laid this down explicitly and the Catholic view is that the Reformed Churches have lost possession of this ministry.³ The Reformed Churches, however, largely oppose apostolic succession on principle.

¹Originally titled Amt und Aemter, it was published in French in the Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie religieuses. No.4. 1937.

²ibid. p.315.

³Irenaeus. Adv. Haer. IV. 26,2.

This question of the true organisation of the Church cannot be solved by weighing the respective merits of what we may call democracy, aristocracy and monarchy against one another. When a strict Anglican, for example, maintains that "The Church is not a democracy but a monarchy. Christ is her King."¹ it should be noted that the spiritual and heavenly Kingship of Christ, as God's sole representative, can not be taken over by an earthly organisation. The Kingship of Christ in no way necessitates the Church's being a monarchy, still less an episcopate. This is to confuse two quite different things - the jus divinum of the founding of the Church by God, and the jus humanum of the organisation of this Church by men. God's authority can never be initiated by men. The jus divinum in the founding and also in the preserving of the Church by God in the person of Christ is endangered and finally denied when questions of organisation which can only come under the jus humanum are transferred to the domain of God where they do not belong.²

The history of the monarchy under the Old Covenant provides a useful lesson here. Israel, the People of God, was not a monarchy at the time of their liberation from Egypt and of their conquest of Canaan. "I will not rule over you,"

¹At the World Conference on Faith and Order, Lausanne, 1927.

²Revue. 4. p.316.

Gideon tells them, "neither shall my son rule over you: the Lord shall rule over you." (Judges 8:23). When his son, Abimelech, did take over, a tyranny resulted. Later, when the elders of Israel came to Samuel asking for a king, "the thing displeased Samuel" and he prayed to God. God told him to listen to the people, "for they have not rejected you, but they have rejected me," and "protest solemnly to them and show them the manner of the king that shall reign over them." (1 Sam.8:4f.). The king was a concession to pagan human nature, creating a situation which God controlled through His prophets. There was never, however, a "successio prophetica," a fact which casts some doubt on the legitimacy of "successio apostolica" in a Church built upon the foundation of the apostles and the prophets. (Eph.2:20).¹ Neither the prophets nor the apostles are linked in a succession we can prove. Each received his call and vocation in the way God chose. The primacy of the Pope does not fit in with this picture. Indeed "to accept the papacy would mean admitting a deistic conception of God, a refusal to recognise His free and constant dominion over the Church which He has founded."²

¹Origen comments on the foundation of the Church - "The Apostle also says that the Church is built on the foundation not only of the Apostles but also of the prophets" (among whom he includes Adam), but makes no comment regarding succession. The Early Christian Fathers. Bettenson. 1956. p.338.

²Revue. 4. p.318.

An episcopacy in the framework of the papacy and apostolic succession is simply not in accord with the way in which the Church of the Old and New Covenants was constituted.¹

A "democracy" would, at first sight, seem to be in a more positive position in so far as it helped to give visible representation of God's dominion in the Church (Dr. Schmidt mentions the Reformed Presbyterian constitution as an example), but even where purporting to be representing "spiritual realities", political categories are all in danger of causing a violation of God's honour and need to be eliminated. Dr. Schmidt sees a Lutheran statement formulated at Lausanne, as drawing the right conclusion by being neither episcopal, presbyterian, nor congregationalist, by not regarding any system as divinely instituted, and by adopting certain elements from each.²

The ambiguities and false conclusions, the opposing truths and half-truths which abound concerning our conception of what the Church is, make it all the more necessary to be clear about the biblical material on the subject. The word ἐκκλησία, for example, which is sometimes translated "church" and sometimes "community", cannot be understood sociologically as a quantitative concept, but only theologically as a

¹Revue. 4.

²At the Faith and Order Conference, 1927. (ibid. p.319).

qualitative concept.¹ The plural of ἐκκλησία does not add up to a number of local communities together forming the universal Church. Each congregation however small represents the entire Church. "The Church is present everywhere God assembles His people."² The People of God under the Old Covenant, the קהל , is called ἐκκλησία Θεοῦ , and the first words of the Epistle to the Hebrews shows how closely they are related.

This Church is not a pious or religious organisation available for sociological study. It is the new creation of God, described by Jesus Christ himself as the edifice which God will build. This Church is the body of ~~Church~~^{Christ} glorified but also present in the community of believers. At one extreme it would be possible to say that one single man by himself could be the ἐκκλησία if he is in communion with Christ. This is the real starting point for human fellowship and brotherhood. Colossians and Ephesians make it very clear that ecclesiology is Christology and vice versa.³

This biblical conception of the Church has a considerable bearing upon the question of Church order. Obviously there

¹ Revue. 4. p.320.

² ibid. p.320.

³ "The doctrine of the Church is conditioned by the doctrine of the Incarnation." The Ministry in the Church. H.J. Wotherspoon. 1916. p.77. See p. 82 above.

can be no valid solution which begins by separating the Church from the local community or congregation, for this leads to the separating of the Church from Christ.¹ On the question of ordination, for instance, to set what the Church does as a doctrine in opposition to what Christ does, cannot be justified by the witness of Scripture. In the meaning of the Bible, whoever speaks of Church or community speaks at the same time of Christ.

Clarification of these points of difference which exist between the different Christian denominations about the Church in relation to the ministry should have prepared the way towards a true, biblical doctrine of the ministry and ministries in the Church of the New Testament.

Διακονία or χάρισμα are the words the New Testament uses for ministry in general terms. Again, both are secular words in Greek and acquire their proper biblical sense only with the addition of 'God', either explicit or understood. As the list of different ministries in 1 Cor.12 shows, all are the gifts of grace. In Romans (12:6f.) preaching, serving (Διακονία), teaching, exhorting, are mentioned as gifts of grace (χάρις). Timothy's χάρισμα τοῦ Θεοῦ, through the laying on of Paul's hands, covers a wide ministry. (2 Tim.1:6f.). In 1 Pet.4:10 we find both words used side by side - "As each

¹Revue. 4. p.321.

has received the gift (χάρισμα), minister (διακονοῦντες) the same to one another, as good stewards of the manifold grace of God (χάριτος θεοῦ)."

To serve, or minister, is the response to the grace of God on the part of every Christian in general and of those who have been given some special task by the community in particular.¹ Διακονέω and its derivatives are applied much more widely than to the special ministry of deacons, the description of whose office stemmed from the original meaning of "waiting on table." Acts, Romans, Corinthians, Timothy, all speak of the apostolic ministry as a διακονία,² and the word is used similarly in connection with other types of ministry. What might well be considered a magna charta of a theology and Christology of the ministry is stated in 2 Cor.5:18-21 where Paul calls the ministry of the Word the διακονία of reconciliation, given by God.³ The conception of the ministry in the Church of the New Testament is one of all sorts of ministries grouped round this ministry of reconciliation. To be filled with χάρισμα in order to serve, was the highest gift a Christian could receive.

¹ Revue. 4. p.323.

² Acts 1:17,25; 20:24; 21:19; Rom.11:13; 2 Cor.4:1; 6:3f.; 11:8; 1 Tim.1:12.

³ ibid. p.324.

This is all the more remarkable since to the Greeks *διακονία* was something degrading, to be avoided, fit only for slaves. A real man ruled. He did not serve.¹

Jesus reversed this by coming among men as One who served though he was well aware of the popular conception. "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." (Lk.22:27).² In Mark's version, Jesus links service with his work of reconciliation. "For the Son of Man did not come to be served but to serve and to give his life a ransom for many." (Mk.10:45).

Paul, asserting that "our sufficiency is of God Who has made us ministers (*διακόνους*) of the new covenant," links and contrasts the Old Covenant *διακονία τοῦ θανάτου* and *διακονία τῆς κατεκρίσεως*, which had a certain splendour, with the New Covenant *διακονία τοῦ πνεύματος* and *διακονία τῆς δικαιοσύνης*, showing how, in the sphere of the ministry also, the Old Covenant is surpassed by the New. (2 Cor.3:7-9).

The other Greek word for public service in the widest sense, *λειτουργία*, is hardly ever used in the New Testament except to denote service as of the Temple priests or levites. For the New Covenant, the only High Priest is Jesus Christ.

¹Revue. 4. p.323.

²See also the later Eranos development of this point. *f.237abov.*

The Church of the New Testament knows no priestly ministry apart from this.¹ Verbally the word priest may stem from the word πρεβύτερος but in reality priest corresponds to the word ἱερεύς. The opposite of priest is λαϊκός, a word which appears for the first time in Christian literature in 1 Clem. XL, 5, a writer who also makes much of the word λειτουργία. That the Church of the New Testament does not know this later priestly ministry, is another proof that the doctrine of apostolic succession, which is inseparable from the concept of priest, has no real biblical basis.²

Ministries listed in the New Testament include: ἀπόστολος (missionaries is perhaps the best translation), ἐπίσκοποι (overseers, bishops), πρεβύτεροι (elders), προφῆται (prophets or preachers), εὐαγγελιστάι (evangelists), διδάσκαλοι (teachers).³ Other gifts are listed according to function rather than to the person - miracles, healing, aid, governing, tongues, for example. These ministries clearly vary and overlap a good deal.⁴ Were 'signs' confined to apostles? Aid

¹ Revue. 4. p.326. Father Küng (Die Kirche. p.431) agrees with this view. cf. also "The New Testament recognises no difference between clergy and laity." Truth as Encounter. Brunner. p.189.

² ibid. p.326.

³ Rom.12:6f.; 1 Cor.12:28f.; Eph.4:11f.; Phil.1:1; Pastoral Epistles.

⁴ ibid. pp.327-8.

may have been one function of δίακονοι . Governing, though not explicitly stated, may have been the concern of bishops, or of presbyters. Exhortation may have been the concern of the bishop or the teacher. The μεταδιδούς, (one who offers, gives), also listed, may have been the deacon. From 1 Thess. 5:12 the προϊστάμενοι (presidents) seem to have been bishops or presbyters. Along with apostles, prophets, evangelists and teachers, Eph.4:12 lists a new title - ποιμένες (shepherds). Phoebe, a διάκονος of the Church at Cenchreae, is also referred to as προστάτις (helper, sponsor).¹ (Rom.16:1,2). What is not clear is whether these various ministries and functions represent permanent offices or whether they depend on the particular gifts of grace given to certain Christians.

For brevity the picture that emerges can be summed up under six heads.²

1. In cases where real titles are mentioned, these are always in the plural.³ Anything resembling the monarchical episcopacy does not appear for certain until the time of Ignatius.
2. The ministries listed are not necessarily permanent.

¹This is probably a development of the political sense of προστάτης (patronus), a political sponsor of resident aliens.

²Revue. 4. pp.329f.

³The references to "a bishop" (singular) in 1 Tim.3:1f. and Titus 1:7 are generic.

They may indicate Christian activities present in one community but not in another. Every ministry is certainly not essential to every community.

3. Even where their functions are fairly well established, it is not possible to fix the number of ministries in the constitution of the New Testament communities.
4. It is not easy to fix on the title corresponding to a permanent ministry. Some descriptions are symbolic. A predilection for ποιμένες (pastores), for instance, is not biblical.
5. Ministries and functions overlap and vary so much that it is not possible to give them exact definition.
6. Certain ministries, bishop and presbyter, for example, may at first have been identical. Furthermore, one individual may have carried out more than one ministry.

It might be considered unfortunate that doctrine and practice in the New Testament should be so ambiguous, varied, even confused, particularly in this area. But there is no confusion in fact. The different ministries find their sole norm and common subject in Christ. He is both shepherd and governor, preacher and teacher. To try to separate the ministries too neatly is to go against Christology. We should not be surprised to find the πρεσβύτεροι of the Church at Ephesus (Acts 20:17) called, a few verses later, ἐπίσκοποι who are to "shepherd the Church of God." (v.28).

Presbyter may well describe the origin of the ministry, bishop the practical function.¹

The inter-relation, indeed, serves to underline an essential fact of Christology, namely that in everything which concerns Christ, and also the Church as the Body of Christ, certain relationships fundamental to the history of redemption, are not to be broken. One is the link between word and deed. Another is the link between governing and teaching. Separating these, familiar as it is to us, is foreign to the New Testament.²

So when the Apostles concentrate on prayer and the *διακονία τοῦ λόγου* and seven are appointed for the *διακονία* of tables, we soon find *διακόνου* Stephen and Philip prominent as missionaries and teachers. (Acts 6:2f.). The Christian community, like the community of Israel, was often spoken of as a 'flock' and, in line with Jesus' command to Peter "Feed my sheep", the *διακονία* of those who looked after (i.e. overseers, *ἐπίσκοποι*) the flock lay not in dominating but in feeding and guarding. It is a *διακονία* founded on Christ, "the shepherd and Bishop of your souls." (1 Pet.2:25). Similarly, teaching is concerned not with abstract 'doctrines'

¹ Revue. 4. p.330. cf. "Variety was of the very essence of the gospel tradition." - The Early Christian Church. Archbishop Carrington. (p.464.) Similarly The Primitive Church. Streeter. p.ix.

² ibid. p.331. See also p.216 above.

but with the same wide care for the flock, to lead them into a fully Christian life in every aspect, with an emphasis on soundness and sobriety as against an excess of enthusiasm.¹

The unity which is in Christ, means that while different ministries may be distinguished from one another they must not be separated from one another. "There is in reality only one single ministry, embracing all the particular ministries, none of which has, in fact, primacy over the others."² This does not rule out individuals being commended by name, the household of Stephanas (1 Cor.16:15), for example, or otherwise singled out, like Phoebe, Prisca, Aquila, "my beloved Epaenetus", and many more (Rom.16:1f.).

A particular and fundamental example concerns the place of the Apostles in the New Testament. Nowadays the word brings to mind only the Twelve and Paul. In the New Testament, however, Barnabas is called an apostle as well as Paul (Acts 14:14), Andronicus and Junia are "men of note among the apostles" (Rom.16:7), and Paul mentions "more than five hundred brethren" along with Cephas, the twelve, James, all the apostles, and himself, as having seen the risen Christ (1 Cor.15:5f.). We do not know exactly, in other words, just

¹ibid. Brunner (Dogmatics III) maintained that the Ekklesia was not a 'gathering for divine worship on Sunday' but a 'daily fellowship under the Word of God', penetrating every workaday concern. p.79.

²ibid. p.332.

how many apostles there, only that the Church, "built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Christ Jesus himself being the cornerstone" (Eph.2:20), does not change its nature as apostles and prophets die but continues to be governed by the living Christ.¹

Lightfoot had raised the point of the number of Apostles almost a hundred years earlier, and held that the Apostles' authority was personal and moral, in contrast to the Catholic view of a small, fixed group (the Twelve) appointed by Jesus to rule over the Church.² Hort, too, maintained that "the Apostles were not in any proper sense officers of the Ecclesia", but rather preachers and witnesses.³ Where Schmidt seems to be satisfied to translate 'apostles' as 'missionaries',⁴ however, Lightfoot is probably nearer the mark when he observes that the ἀπόστολος is not just one 'sent forth', a messenger, but a delegate or representative of the sender.⁵ Although the word only occurs once in the LXX, Jewish usage, he says,

¹Revue. 4. p.334.

²St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians. J.B. Lightfoot. 1865. pp.69f.

³F.J.A. Hort. op.cit. p.231. For other similar views cf. Linton. op.cit. pp.71f.

⁴See p. 256 above.

⁵op.cit. p.90f.

would point to "the idea of a highly responsible mission". The meaning of the Jewish word shaliach (agent or messenger) is examined in detail by T.W. Manson¹ who concludes that the commission of the shaliach was not transmittable to another but lapsed when the mission was accomplished.² The New Testament evidence points to more apostles than the Twelve, although, except in the case of Judas, vacant places in the Twelve were not filled by others. Paul claimed apostleship, for instance, but not to be one of the Twelve.³ If there is 'succession' in any sense, "it is the Church that succeeds."⁴ In his earlier well-known work, The Teaching of Jesus, he shows the obvious connection between the choice of the word 'apostle' and the "establishment of a missionary body."⁵ Jesus may have deliberately chosen it "as the exact contrary of Pharisee."⁶ So "the fact that the narrower conception of Apostleship prevailed so soon in the Church, and that 'Apostle' became a title of rank and privilege . . . can only be regarded as a

¹The Church's Ministry. 1948.

²op.cit. pp.35f. (A five-point summary of the argument is given on p.43).

³ibid. pp.50-51.

⁴ibid. p.52.

⁵First edition 1931. p.241.

⁶ibid. p.242.

calamity and the complete reversal of the original intention of Jesus."¹

On the other hand, Cerfaux, who represents the Catholic viewpoint, claims that the apostles were "very well-defined people: they were a group of leaders in the Christian world who had the office of apostles."² He criticises Rengstorf for being "quite systematic in his refusal to speak of offices",³ though he agrees that the formal meaning of ἀπόστολος does exclude the idea of succession. Arguing from the case of St. Paul he says that the corollary of being apostles, entrusted with authority by God, is that "the apostles have the right to direct the faith of the Christians in the churches."⁴

Cullmann, in his detailed study of Peter, holds that the apostles are unique.⁵ They were "chosen by God as witnesses" of the risen Jesus of Nazareth (Acts 10:41) and Paul was an apostle on the same basis (1 Cor.9:1). Apostle-ship was,

¹ *ibid.*

² The Church in the Theology of St. Paul. L. Cerfaux. 1959. p.249.

³ In his "solid article" in TWNT. I. pp.406f. Cerfaux. p.249. Note.

⁴ *op.cit.* p.251.

⁵ *op.cit.* p.220.

therefore, not transmittable. It was an experience that came through revelation from God (Gal.1:12). So apostles did not in turn install other "apostles" but bishops and elders, missionaries and leaders. The unique gift they handed down was not office but word. Without apostles there would have been no New Testament, no knowledge of Jesus as the Risen One. Hence every Christian Church requires both.¹

Quite a different view is put forward by Mascall who sees "our Lord's institution of the Apostolate . . . continued in the universal Episcopate."² "Men enter the Church by baptism", he says, "they do not leave it by death. And what is true of the Church is true of the apostolic Episcopate; a man enters the Episcopate by consecration, but he does not leave it by death. The Church grows with the passage of time, and the Episcopate grows within it. Thus a newly consecrated bishop is not in the strict sense a successor of the apostles; he is simply a new apostle."³

It would be impossible even to indicate here the vast amount of literature on the subject just touched on. The contrast is all the greater when the differing views are set against the "extraordinarily impressive" unanimity of New

¹ *ibid.* p.221f.

² Corpus Christi. p.19.

³ *ibid.* p.22.

Testament teaching on the nature of the Church to which Flew draws attention.¹ Schmidt, too, had noted that Paul and the first Apostles had the same conception of the Church and of the ministry.² It was as the immediate eschatological hope dimmed that ecclesiastical organisation came more and more to the fore, and the pneumatic aspects of the early Church gave ground to the organisational aspects. However, the pneumatic and charismatic, though important, were not the basic elements, since the Church was no mystery religion but the People of God constituted anew in Jesus Christ and founded on the apostles and prophets. It was only as the res juris humani, a natural part of any organisation, took the place of the res juris divini through accenting the successio apostolica and the sacerdotium of bishop and priest, that the step from the Church of the New Testament to that of early Catholicism was taken, a step that separates the doctrine of Church and ministry of Protestantism from that of Catholicism.³ The main structure of Schmidt's argument, as is usual in his articles, rests on biblical exegesis. Once this has been fully considered, however, he tends to pay less attention to the later historical development of the doctrine, and it is not easy to determine what his views were in detail on the inter-relationships of denominations and on the interaction of the Church of the New Testament and the Church of today.

¹op.cit. p.253. Flew also refers (p.168) to Dodd's "brilliant demonstration of the essential unity of the Apostolic preaching."

²Revue. 4. p.335.

³ibid. p.336.

THE PRESENCE OF THE SPIRIT

Christ, Spirit, Church

In one way, the verse most significant for the doctrine of the Church is Acts 2:4 - "And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit." This was on the day of Pentecost, often referred to as the birthday of the Church.¹ With the coming of the Spirit, says Daniel-Rops, "from that moment onwards the followers of Jesus had no longer been just a brotherly community, but a body - a body that was both human and superhuman - of chosen souls, completely renewed in Christ, and ready to face any dangers that might confront them for the sake of their faith: later on this community was to be called the Church."²

Bonhoeffer pointed out that the Holy Spirit is personally at work in the creation of the Church.³ It is the Spirit Who gives community and is the principle of unity. Paul prefaces his chapter on the gifts of the Spirit with the statement

¹ cf. G. Johnston. op.cit. p.66, 51f. O. Linton. op.cit. p.125f., 133. Also Cullmann. The Early Church. p.116. For widely differing views on the beginning of the Church see pp. 76, 145, 227 above.

² The Church of Apostles and Martyrs. p.11.

³ Sanctorum Communio. p.100.

that "no one can say 'Jesus is Lord' except by the Holy Spirit" (1 Cor.12:3), and says in Ephesians - "There is one body and one Spirit" (Eph.4:4). So, while Christ and the ecclesia are not to be simply identified, Bonhoeffer continues - "the Church is the presence of Christ, as Christ is the presence of God."¹ This is very similar to Welch's view that "the Spirit is not to be separated from Christ, nor does the New Testament make such separation."² At the same time, as Canon Streeter observed, "to understand the rise of Christianity we must fix our attention, not only on the personality and teaching of the historic Jesus, but also on the experience spoken of by his followers as the outpouring of the Spirit, which began on the day of Pentecost next following the Crucifixion."³ This experience had direct links with the Spirit of God speaking through the prophets in the Old Testament and with the Spirit of Christ. The real significance of Pentecost lay not so much in its spectacular accompaniments but in the birth of a fellowship "of a quality entirely unprecedented", a quality which "was explained by the early Christians as being due to their interpenetration by the Spirit of Jesus, 'The Lord is the Spirit, and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there

¹Sanctorum Communio. p.101.

²C. Welch. op.cit. p.220.

³The God Who Speaks. B.H. Streeter. 1936. p.120.

is liberty' (2 Cor.3:17)."¹ The Church, as a building of 'living stones', being built by the Spirit, (as Father Kung puts it), has an enduring charismatic structure. The Spirit's gifts can be extraordinary and sensational, but "charismata are by no means only extraordinary. Rather they are given through ordinary daily appearances in the life of the Church."²

The closeness of the links between Christ, the Spirit, and the Church needs to be kept in mind at every turn in the development of doctrine. "It is very probable," wrote Traugott Schmidt, "that both decisive experiences of the disciples, the appearances of Jesus and the receiving of the Spirit, belong together more closely than is generally supposed," and Pentecost in Acts 2 may well be identical with the appearances of Christ in 1 Cor.15:6. Christ and the Spirit mutually supplement one another.³ This naturally involves the Church also. Indeed, "if we want to understand the thought content of $\Sigma\omega\mu\alpha$ $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$, we must first be clear about the relation of the Ecclesia to the divine Pneuma."⁴

Just as Christology and ecclesiology are essentially interwoven, therefore, so the doctrine of the Church is

¹The God Who Speaks. p.154.

²op.cit. p.220.

³op.cit. p.66.

⁴ibid. p.134.

interwoven with the doctrine of the Spirit. Indeed, the Acts of the Apostles has recently been called both "The Young Church in Action" and "The Acts of the Spirit",¹ and Mascall writes - "the unity of the Church is the Church's participation in the unity of God the Holy Trinity. And the bond of the Church's unity is the same as the bond of unity of the God-head, namely the Holy Spirit."² This might seem obvious but it is all too easy to regard the Church as an end in herself, as Professor Woodhouse has indicated, and then - "Dependence on the Spirit gives way to obedience to the Church. . . . Ecclesiasticism or ministerial fundamentalism may evade the responsibility of discerning the mind of the Spirit. Some may assume that the guarantee for the presence of the Spirit is the episcopal type of ministry upon which alone they hold that the Spirit's gifts were bestowed on that first Easter evening. But to those who would infer that the Spirit is monopolised by the episcopal type of ministry, experience, history and the inherent nature of the Gospel answer 'no'. Such a claim is very insecure in its treatment of exegesis, tradition and history and it can be misleading and inaccurate in its use of the phrase 'apostolic succession'."³

¹The Young Church in Action (The Acts in Modern English.) J.B. Phillips. 1955. and The Promise of the Spirit. William Barclay. 1960.

²Christ, the Christian and the Church. p.116.

³"The Authority of the Holy Spirit" by H.F. Woodhouse in SJTh. Vol.20 No.2. June, 1967. p.189.

In K.L. Schmidt's thinking, the significant thing about God, Christ, the Spirit, is that all three are subject as well as object of faith, each is the Giver as well as the Gift.¹ In the Old Testament, therefore, we find that God not only commanded, He made obedience possible. "A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you; and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh. And I will put my spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and you shall keep my judgments, and do them." (Ezek.11:19f.; 36:26f.). The Spirit of God and the Word of God are always closely related.

In the New Testament we see the fulfilment of the prophetic hope and vision. "The Word became flesh and dwelt among us." God, who had been speaking through his servants, through the prophets, has now spoken in Person, through His Son - a revelation that is not confined to the past. God continues to speak, guide, reveal Himself in Jesus Christ and through His Spirit. The Spirit is actually present in Jesus and now, after his resurrection and ascension, is given to his disciples.² If the founding of the kenishta was the

¹"Le Dieu trinitaire, sujet et objet de la foi." Revue. 2. pp.126f.

²In the Synoptic Gospels, for instance, "the Spirit is mentioned at decisive points in his (Jesus') life and ministry - at his conception, his baptism, his temptation, his first preaching, his casting out of demons, and perhaps also at his death on the cross. Taken together, these references make it plain that the intention of the Synoptics is to present the life of Jesus as one wholly possessed and directed by the Spirit." The Holy Spirit in Christian Theology. George S. Hendry. p.19.

seed of the Church, Pentecost is the bursting out, the visible birth and flowering of the Church, quickened into life as the body of Christ.¹ Jesus had sent out the disciples, the twelve and then the seventy, to preach and heal in his name. Now the apostles, witnesses to the resurrection, are to go and teach all nations, baptising them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit (Mt.28:19). Throughout the initiative comes from God. "The use of the aorist in the verbs which describe the first appearance of the Spirit," Cerfaux says, "is aimed to show the initiative taken by God."² The double aspect of the outpouring of the Holy Spirit appears in the confirming of the apostles' work through miracles, charismatic gifts and the efficaciousness of their preaching on the one hand, and the more permanent, deepening spiritual gifts of joy and peace and the like in the faithful. Paul, Cerfaux adds, "does not forget that the gifts of the Spirit opens up eschatological vistas. The giving of the Spirit means the rewards and the joys of the kingdom of God, the realisation of the messianic promises."³ The same point is made by Brunner when he says that the question 'How can the

¹Eranos Jahrbuch. Vol.XIII. pp.189f.

²op.cit. p.172. cf. Rom.5:5; Gal.4:6; Eph.4:4; etc.

³ibid. p.173. cf. Eph.1:13f.; Gal.3:14; 5:5; 2 Cor.5:5.

perfect tense of saving history become the present experience of salvation and fellowship with God?' is answered by Scripture and the Church by reference to the Holy Spirit and His work in the hearts of the faithful and in the Christian community.¹ That this work of the Spirit is inseparable from Christ and the world mission of His Church is underlined strongly by Professor Torrance when he writes - "Though the sending of the Spirit their witness (i.e. the Apostles) is filled out with and echoes and reflects Christ's self-witness in the world. Thus through the Spirit the apostolate is constituted the foundation of the Christian Church, the Body of Christ in history through which Christ makes His own image to appear, His own voice to sound, His own saving work to be effectively operative among men. And so the Church continues to be called into being and to be maintained from age to age by the power of Christ's Word and Spirit."²

The interweaving of Christology, ecclesiology and the doctrine of the Spirit comes out clearly in the further development of Professor Torrance's article. "The Holy Spirit was poured out upon the apostles and the Church at Pentecost in fulness only after the atoning work of Christ had been

¹Dogmatics. Vol.III. p.9.

²"The Mission of the Church." T.F. Torrance. SJTh. Vol.19. No.2. June 1966. p.132.

completed and after He had opened the Kingdom of Heaven to all believers," he writes. "Pentecost means that God's own eternal and supernatural life overflowed upon the Church, and that God Himself, in His own divine being and power, was present in its midst."¹

Many of the same points are echoed in the development of Schmidt's thinking regarding the Church and the Spirit. There is a restoring of broken and scattered humanity into the one People of God, the antithesis of Babel standing for the dividing and confounding that come from man's seeking to glorify himself.² The Church is a communion in Christ through the Holy Spirit, a union between Christ and the Church as a whole, on the one hand, a union between Christ and each believer, on the other hand.³ It is the community of the New Covenant promised by God through the prophets. It is the sphere and instrument of the Kingdom of Christ.

The very close connection between the Regnum Christi and the Church is shown in detail by Cullmann in his essay on "The Kingship of Christ and the Church in the New Testament", and in it he makes more than one reference to K.L. Schmidt's

¹ ibid.

² cf. Eranos. XIII. pp.234-5.

³ cf. Revue. 2. p.153.

Basileia article.¹ In one aspect, he maintains, the Church on earth is the body of the Crucified. "On the other hand, it is also the body of the risen Lord, a spiritual body (σῶμα πνευματικόν - 1 Cor.15:44) since it was constituted by the πνεῦμα at Pentecost; πνεῦμα is its substance, and so everyone that is received into the Church in Baptism enters even now into a spiritual body, the only spiritual body that is already in existence, the Church, the earthly body of the exalted Christ."² Here Professor Cullmann stresses once more the birthday of the Church as at Pentecost, whereas the Regnum Christi "was born at the ascension."³

"At Pentecost" writes Professor Torrance, "the Christian Church was fully called into being, as the life of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, mediated to the world in Jesus Christ, broke forth into the lives of men in an ever-widening movement of universalisation. What took place intensively in Jesus Christ, within the limits of His particular historical life, then began to take place extensively, reaching out to all men in all ages in a movement as expansive as the ascension of Christ to fill all things."⁴

¹The Early Church. Essay No.5. Basileia in TWNT. I.

²op.cit. p.125.

³ibid. p.116.

⁴SJTh. Vol.19. No.2. p.132.

Le Dieu trinitaire

Karl Ludwig Schmidt approaches a doctrine of the Spirit through the Doctrine of the Trinity.

Throughout his theological writings there are to be found, naturally enough, numerous references to the Holy Spirit, but only two of his articles deal directly in detail with the basis for a doctrine of the Spirit. These are his third lecture of the Copenhagen series, the one entitled "The Trinitarian God, Subject and Object of Faith,"¹ and his essay in the Eranos series - "The Holy Spirit as Person and as Charisma."²

In his Romanshorn lecture on the "Upbuilding of the Church with its Members as 'Strangers and Pilgrims on the Earth'" Dr. Schmidt had referred to the indwelling of God through Christ and the Holy Spirit at some length in his consideration of the word $\delta\acute{\iota}\kappa\omicron\varsigma$ and its derivatives.³ As he points out, St. Paul calls the body of Christians both the 'temple of God in which the Spirit of God dwells' (1 Cor.3:16) and 'Your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit' (1 Cor.6:19). Divisions are caused through being led by the human spirit

¹ "Le Dieu trinitaire, sujet et objet de la foi" in the Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie religieuses, March/April 1938. (See

² "Das Pneuma Hagion als Person und als Charisma" in the Eranos Jahrbuch. 1945. Vol.XIII.

³ See tt. 194 f. above.

instead of by the Holy Spirit (1 Cor.3:3). What God has prepared for those who love Him, He has revealed to us through the Spirit. "For the Spirit searches everything, even the depths of God" (1 Cor.2:10).¹

In his lectures in Bonn he frequently emphasised the presence and work of the Spirit in the writing of the Gospels and the rest of the New Testament. These writings came out of a community created by God in Jesus Christ, a definite, living fellowship, a complete contrast to a pious, religious organisation or to a mystery religion. The Church, the fellowship of the Holy Spirit, was the People of God constituted anew in Jesus Christ and founded on the apostles and prophets.² Its unity came from God and was seen in its members. "The unity of the Church is in two directions, horizontal and vertical", as Thornton wrote. "Fellowship with man involves and implies fellowship with God, and both depend upon participation in the gift of the Spirit. The unity of the Body is sustained by the creative activity of the Spirit."³ This Body is not a mere collection of individuals. "We are the Church," Thornton held, "because we are in Christ. He gives unity to his members. The members are the Church because

¹Erbauung. p.30.

²ibid. p.8.

³Thornton. op.cit. p.94.

in him they are one; but not otherwise."¹ The unity of the organism, in other words, resides not in the congregation but in the Messiah.

Now, in "The Trinitarian God, Subject and Object of Faith," several other important points are considered, leading towards a doctrine of the Spirit which is developed in even greater detail in "The Pneuma Hagion as Person and Charisma."

The starting point is the fact that Jesus Christ, as the Ambassador of God, not only demands faith but, equally, gives faith. This is something quite strange to human logic and experience.² In Mark 11:22 Jesus commands his disciples - "Have faith in God." What is, in effect, their reply to this we read in Luke 17:5 - "Lord, increase our faith." To Simon he says - "I have prayed for you that your faith may not fail." (Lk.22:32). In many episodes, those of healing in particular, he praises those who call upon him even though it is his intervention, his power, that calls forth the faith in them. What stands out is that Jesus is at one and the same time both subject and object of faith, just as this is also true of God.³

The same is true of the Holy Spirit.⁴ Whenever research

¹Thornton. op.cit. p.256.

²Revue. 2. p.126.

³ibid. p.127.

⁴ibid.

into the Spirit is attempted, He is found to be the active subject. Paul writes to the Romans - "Likewise the Spirit helps us in our weakness, for we do not know how to pray as we ought. But the Spirit himself intercedes for us with sighs too deep for words." (Rom.8:26). This same sense of One coming to our aid, an intercessor, is found again in the word of the Johannine writings - παράκλητος, advocatus, intercessor, helper, the Paraclete.

The first deduction from this is that here we are dealing with a Spirit quite different from our own spirits, a Spirit beyond our human limits, the creator spiritus, the Holy Spirit.¹ "The Spirit himself bears witness with our spirit, that we are children of God" (Rom.8:16). Here Dr. Schmidt quotes with approval Karl Barth's comment on the Spirit from his famous Commentary on Romans - "It is not we who possess Him, but it is He who possesses us."² Not that this ever degenerates into any kind of mysticism in the New Testament. It is the work of God. "The Spirit intercedes for the saints according to the will of God" (Rom.8:27). God, Christ, the Spirit belong together. "To have the Spirit," Welch points out, "is not to have something other or more than Christ (this is the

¹Revue. 2. p.128.

²ibid. p.129. Römerbrief. p.301. Schmidt considers Barth to be in error in his translation of συναντιλαμβάνεσθαι in v.26.

error of Montanists and Schwärmerei of all ages, and of modern immanentists of a milder, less spirited type;) it is precisely to have Christ, to be in Christ, to be brought into the body which is his body, to be found in his image, to acknowledge Christ's lordship and to bear witness to him."¹

Though the Spirit's interceding for the saints is not used in the sense of mysticism by Paul, some Church Fathers have held that he was not speaking about the Spirit as a third Person in the Trinity.² Yet for the most part the New Testament speaks in the same terms about God, Christ and the Holy Spirit, all three as both Subject and Object, and primarily as Subject. This of itself, though the doctrine is not explicitly found as such in the New Testament, raises the question of the Trinity.

Three-fold Formulae

If, because of problems regarding its authenticity, the one explicitly Trinitarian formula in the New Testament (1 Jn. 5:7) is not pressed, there are three passages which have the three-fold, if not Trinitarian, formula.

2nd. Corinthians closes with the words - "The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ and the love of God and the fellowship

¹op.cit. p.222.

²Revue. 2. p.129.

of the Holy Spirit be with you all." This three-fold formula gives no indication of the relationship existing between the Three but all are clearly named as divine Persons, as distinct from other threes, faith, hope and love, for instance. The striking thing is to find Christ mentioned in first place.¹ This usage, later adopted by the Church, may have arisen from Paul's shorter greeting - "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you" (1 Cor.16:23; Rom.16:20 and 24; Gal.6:18; etc.). The perfect naturalness of this Pauline practice is a clear sign that Paul put all Three on the same level. In his Epistles he employs both formulae - now mentioning only Jesus Christ, now including Father, Son and Spirit - without any sense of differentiation.²

This parallel use of single and tripartite forms should counsel caution in considering the second passage, Mt.28:19 - "Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptising them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit." This baptismal formula has been regarded as a late tradition since, according to Acts, the early Church baptised only in the name of Jesus. But, like Paul, the early Church more than likely had more than one formula. Moreover, whenever

¹Revue. 2. p.131.

²ibid. p.132. Paul even writes - "For by one Spirit we were all baptised into one body," (1 Cor.12:13).

Christ is mentioned, God and the Holy Spirit are also thought of, even when not mentioned. Baptism in the name of Jesus was always baptism in the name of the Son of God, present through the Spirit. Mt.28:19 in naming Father, Son and Holy Spirit is not thereby implying a richer content than baptism in the name of Jesus. It is the same baptism.¹

The third passage, (1 Cor.12:4-6), gives another Pauline Triad - "There are varieties of gifts, but the same Spirit; there are varieties of service, but the same Lord; there are varieties of working, but it is the same God who inspires them all." Here the order is again different - The Spirit, Christ, God. It is a further indication that all Three are assumed to be on the same level, of the same essence. The inter-relation is not gone into, but the existence of a relationship is presupposed.²

Other passages, though not cast so much in formula style, also mention the three Persons. 1 Peter 1, for instance, opens to the elect "chosen and destined by God the Father, and sanctified by the Spirit, for obedience to Jesus Christ," and, later in the same chapter, refers to Christ who "was destined before the foundation of the world," (v.20), an indication of, if not a direct reference to, pre-existence.³ Eph.4:4-6

¹Revue. 2. p.138.

²ibid. p.134.

³ibid. pp.134-5.

speaks of one Spirit, one Lord, one God and Father of all, though the form is even looser. A similar Triad may lie behind the reference to God, the Lord, the Spirit, in 2 Thess. 2:13, where the addition of "faith of the truth" is like the identification of the divine truth with Christ in the Fourth Gospel. In Acts 2:33 we read of Christ being exalted to the right hand of God and "having received from the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit."

What is the origin of the divine Triad formula in the New Testament? It is clearly not a borrowing from Eastern religions where the numerous triads are concerned not with the personal God but with the principle of divinity, divided into male and female in order to give birth to a redeemer, thus producing a father-mother-son plan.¹ The New Testament Triad, "God, Christ, Spirit," has at its root the sequence "Father, Son, Spirit," corresponding to the history of salvation, which remains the basis whichever the order of the Persons. The Christian Triad formula seems to have arisen to safeguard this against all pagan and heretical speculations as to male-female, wisdom, heaven, hell, or other trios whose one common character lay in the number three.²

¹ Revue. 2. p.136.

² ibid. p.136f.

The point of departure for the New Testament Triad is that God, the Father, has sent His Son (Gal.4:4). As against pagan philosophies, "for us there is one God, the Father, from whom are all things and for whom we exist, and one Lord, Jesus Christ, through whom are all things and through whom we exist." (1 Cor.8:6). St. John's Gospel is full of even more striking statements. Christ is "the only Son, who is in the bosom of the Father (Jn.1:18),¹ eternal life is to "know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent" (17:3), and "I and the Father are one" (10:30) are examples. In a secondary way no doubt, esoteric, cult, polemic interests made such bipartite formulae necessary, but the basic factor in the coupling of God and Jesus lies in what God Himself has done.²

When tripartite formulae appear, it is always only the Holy Spirit who is placed beside the Father and the Son. Theoretically the Triad could represent a transition from and development of the bipartite formula. The answer depends on knowing whether the Holy Spirit was understood as a Person, and, if so, in what sense. The New Testament evidence leaves no doubt.³ "Do not grieve the Holy Spirit of God" (Eph.4:30), Paul writes. "Why has Satan filled your heart to lie to the Holy Spirit?" Peter asks Annanias. "You have not lied to men

¹Schmidt does not follow the Nestle text here. p.137.

²ibid. p.138.

but to God" (Acts 5:3-4). "Whoever blasphemes against the Holy Spirit never has forgiveness" (Mk.3:29) Jesus says. The Holy Spirit speaks, is a witness (Heb.3:7; 9:8; 10:15). "The Holy Spirit was right in saying to your fathers through Isaiah the prophet . . ." (Acts 28:25) Paul tells the Jews in Rome. Jesus speaks of David as "inspired by the Holy Spirit" (Mk.12:35). The Spirit helps us, intercedes for us. (Rom.8:26). In 1 Tim.4:1 the Spirit speaks expressly in condemnation of false teachers, and there is a similar passage about the Paraclete reproving the world of sin in Jn.16:8. Indeed, "the Spirit as Paraclete is a particular person" with his own particular functions.¹ "The outpouring of the Spirit is accomplished by the will of God, but without thereby excluding Christ. On the contrary, this outpouring is at once and properly spoken of as the act of the Father and the Son. This explains the dual aspect of the declarations concerning the Paraclete in St. John: God the Father gives the Spirit, Jesus the Son sends him. No Person is a substitute for the other . . . All this constitutes trinitarian thinking without, however, the Trinity being expressed in a formula."²

Where the genitive πνεύματος appears, the question whether it is used objectively or subjectively, Schmidt holds,

¹Revue. 2. p.139.

²ibid.

should be considered in the light of the above conclusion that the Spirit is a Person, a divine Person, in an extremely precise sense.¹ This would imply the subjective genitive, though to interpret it as an objective genitive would not materially alter the meaning of communion with the Spirit. "It is exactly the same as the genitives Θεοῦ and Χριστοῦ."² We may think to approach Him as object only to find in that moment that He is indeed Subject.

In a number of instances in the New Testament, the term 'spirit' does not refer to the Holy Spirit but the question is hardly ever in doubt since references to the spirit of man all make clear the contrast between the human spirit and the Spirit of God. Bultmann raised objections to 'spirit' as the translation of πνεῦμα, since the latter does not mean 'spirit' in the Greek-Platonic and idealistic sense.³ "Pneuma is miraculous divine power that stands in absolute contrast to all that is human."⁴ Schmidt deals with the point in more detail in his Eranos article in which he compares the German 'Geist' with the French 'esprit' and the English 'Ghost'.⁵

¹Revue. 2. p.140.

²ibid.

³'Geist' in German. The Theology of the New Testament. Vol. 1. p.153.

⁴ibid.

⁵Eranos. XIII. pp.194f. See p.291 below.

Mascall, in a long note on New Testament linguistic usages regarding sarx, pneuma, psyche, nous, soma, refers to 1 Cor. 14-15 where Paul contrasts the 'unspiritual' (RSV) man (psychikos, 'psychic', AV 'natural') with the 'spiritual' (pneumatikos) man, showing how 'soul' and 'flesh' can be almost identical over against 'spirit'.¹

It may be objected, Schmidt notes, that, in other instances, the New Testament speaks of other entities besides the Spirit in the same way as reference is made to God and Christ. 1 Jn.5:8, for instance, refers to "three witnesses, the Spirit the water and the blood", where the latter two are obviously impersonal. Jude (v.20) combines four terms - holy faith, Holy Spirit, the love of God, the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ. The fact is that Christian life after the Resurrection was rich in such expressions. What needs to be stressed is that all the expressions are clearly linked to Christ, and that, among them all, only the Holy Spirit appears as equal in rank with the Father and the Son.²

Occasionally we find a tripartite formula with a different third element. Rev.3:12, for example, links the 'names' of God, Christ and the new Jerusalem, though this is not in the style of a proper formula. Nor, on examination, do the seven

¹Corpus Christi. pp.202-3.

²Revue. 2. p.142.

Spirits (Rev.1:4) displace the basic Father-Son-Spirit triad, but are rather part of the special language and symbolism of the Apocalypse.¹ A more important example occurs in Luke's Gospel where Jesus says - "For whoever is ashamed of me and of my words, of him will the Son of man be ashamed when he comes in his glory and the glory of the Father and of the holy angels" (Lk.9:26). Another Lucan passage also mentions the "angels of God" (Lk.9:12), but this time not in tripartite form, and the parallel passage in Matthew reads "my Father who is in Heaven" (Mt.10:33) instead of angels. 1 Tim.5:21 uses a solemn formula - "In the presence of God and of Christ Jesus and of the elect angels I charge you . . .", and Rev.3:5 also links Christ, the Father, and his angels.

How far there was a cult of angels is not clear, but other New Testament statements do make it clear that angels are entirely subordinate to God and are not of the same nature as Christ.² What emerges from nearly all the passages studied is that the sole entity which can be spoken of in the same way as God and Christ, is the Holy Spirit.³

¹ Revue. 2. p.143.

² In this connection, Schmidt mentions, but does not quote from, the Epistle to the Hebrews. After speaking of God's "gifts of the Spirit" the writer goes on - "For it was not to angels that God subjected the world to come" and, though Jesus "for a little while was made lower than the angels", "he took not on him the nature of angels, but he took on him the seed of Abraham" (Heb.2:4,5,16).

³ ibid. p.144.

Conclusions

This leads us to the conclusion, Schmidt claims, that the origin of the New Testament triad - God the Father, God the Son, and the Holy Spirit - arises from the experience of the New Testament community, or, "more exactly, from the special history through which God has led this community which was His."¹ It leads also to a second conclusion, namely, that the way in which the New Testament raises the question brings with it the need for a development in the trinitarian sense. "It is beyond doubt that in the course of the history of dogma," Schmidt writes, "there has been a desire to define precisely many things, doubtless too many. For many, far too many, questions have been posed by us. But the trinitarian problem is posed for us by the New Testament itself and requires discussion, even though no discussion can elucidate the mystery of the divine intra-relationship."²

God, since He is God, remains always Subject, always active, not in any deistic or pantheistic sense, but personally active, revealing Himself in the unique history between Him and His people. It is this action of His, this history, which leads to the Trinitarian affirmation. The Logos became flesh,

¹Revue. 2.

²ibid. p.144.

but remains God, remains Subject. This is the central theme of Christology.¹ He is the Lamb, sacrificed, absolutely passive, and, at the same time, the great High Priest, absolutely active. Returned to the Father, he yet lives here in his community through the Holy Spirit, the Paraclete, whom God gives, but whom he sends. The Spirit of God necessarily lives in the Triad.²

This is what the New Testament teaches us about God, Father, Son and Spirit.

The Pneuma Hagion

In 1945, eight years later, Professor Schmidt was addressing a very different audience from the theologians, professors and students in the University of Copenhagen. The Eranos group which met yearly in Ascona with the well known psychologist C.G. Jung, was composed mainly of writers and intellectuals.³ When Dr. Schmidt spoke to them on the Spirit it was about the Spirit, the Holy Spirit certainly, as a "cosmic, soteriological and eschatological entity."⁴ As was his wont, it was a careful linguistic, biblical, theological

¹Revue. 2.

²ibid.

³See p. 51 above.

⁴Eranos Jahrbuch. Vol.XIII. p.194.

study, developing further the theme of his lecture on "Le Dieu trinitaire."

At the outset he compared himself with Paul at Athens trying to make contact with the "philosophers", styled by the Epicureans and Stoics present as a σπερμολόγος (a seed-picker-bird), a slang term in Attic Greek for a kind of parasite or plagiarist). (Acts 17:18). Not that the term prevented Paul from quoting to them from their own Stoic poet, Aratus, and going straight to the heart of Judgment and grace in the Resurrection. (v.28f.).

Schmidt then drew attention to the choice of adjectives - ἅγιος , (set apart, holy) rather than the other, quite possible, Greek word ἱερός , sacred.¹ From the Septuagint use of ἅγιος to translate the Hebrew qādōsh , used of God in the Old Testament, and the use of ἅγιος with Christ in the New, it is a clear preference for the same adjective to describe the Spirit. Is.63:10f. which speaks of God's holy Spirit, and Ps.51:11 - "Take not thy holy Spirit from me" - show the rendering of 'ruach haqqodash' by πνεῦμα ἅγιον . Here already a foreshadowing of the Triad - God, Christ, Spirit - can be seen. As with God and Christ, the Spirit as a Person immediately signifies that He as Giver is also the gift, the charisma. The Spirit as a Person meets us at every

¹There is also the parallel usage of ἁγία πόλις for Jerusalem. See h.185 above.

turn. One has only to think of the liturgy of the Church and such ancient Christian hymns as "Veni, creator spiritus."¹

The word 'spirit' in most languages presents several problems and difficulties, often being diminished or carried over into the spheres of 'mind' or 'reason' or other human functions² It can also be quite concrete like the English 'ghost', i.e. apparition. This goes back to the word itself which means, literally, 'wind'. Physiologically this comes to mean 'breath', and psychologically, 'life' or 'life-principle.'

Behind πνεῦμα lies the Hebrew ruach. Here Dr. Schmidt turns to Martin Buber's study of the word which stresses ruach's sense of the mighty rushing wind going out from God, wind in its natural form, spirit in its spiritual form.³ πνεῦμα tends to lose the sense of 'rushing wind' and the Latin spiritus is even weaker. "In Scripture ruach always stands for something happening, even where we have to translate it as 'Spirit'," says Buber.⁴ But by the time of Luther

¹Eranos. XIII. p.191.

²Bultmann also pointed this out. See p.295 above.

³Über die Wortwahl in einer Verdeutschung der Schrift" in Die Schrift und ihre Verdeutschung. Martin Buber. (Eranos. p.195).

⁴ibid.

'spirit' had begun to be a thing rather than an event. The 'spiritual' meaning is falsified if the 'natural' meaning is dropped and lost. So Buber would like to translate by the word 'Geistbraus' (gale of Spirit) the ruach in the sense of gripping man, covering him, changing him, inspiring him with the storm of God, and by the word 'Windbraus' (gale of wind) to signify the wind sent by God.

The biblical understanding of the Holy Spirit, the Pneuma, the Ruach of God, while not avoiding anthropomorphism, links wind, breath, life, movement, to God's action.¹ This is neither a pantheistic vagueness nor a deistic atrophy but the underlining and deepening of the sense of a personal, active God, Who is always Subject, and to be included as the prime mover whether explicitly mentioned or not. This applies equally to the Holy Spirit as the living Breath of God.²

The Spirit in Scripture and Church

The Spirit of God created the world, holds and redeems it, and will lead it to the final goal. That is a summary of the action of the Spirit in the Old and New Testament. This

¹In contrast to idealistic philosophy up to Hegel's day and even more so thereafter, having little to do with the real biblical tradition. Eranos. XIII. p.198.

²ibid. p.199.

Spirit stands in complete contrast to the spirit of man, which was created by the Spirit of God. This perception of the difference between God's Spirit and man's spirit is a key point in Israel's history. Another is her perception of the need of testing and proving ecstatic experiences. At the same time, Moses's word to Joshua - "Would God that all the Lord's people were prophets, and that the Lord would put his spirit upon them!" (Num.11:29) - contains the eschatological expectancy that looks forward to the outpouring of God's Spirit upon all flesh (Joel 2:28f.) and to Pentecost.¹ This rules out false prophets who provide selfish wish-fulfilment of human dreams. The true prophet, like Jeremiah, found God's Spirit ran counter to man's spirit. Elijah, the man of action, must listen for the still, small voice. (1 K.19:12). On the Messiah, however, "the Spirit of the Lord shall rest." (Is.11:2). These, and many other, references show all the emphasis on the Spirit as personal, as one who warns, comforts, intercedes.

In the Johannine writings the term Paraclete is used both of Christ and of the Holy Spirit, and the fact that both are Subject as well as Object of faith provides the proper starting point for understanding the New Testament conception of the Spirit.

¹Eranos. XIII. pp.200-201.

This is the same starting point noted in "Le Dieu trinitaire" lecture.¹ Dr. Schmidt sets forth again the evidence from Mk.11:22 and the other passages about Jesus, and from Paul, drawing the same conclusion regarding the difference between the "creator spiritus" and the human spirit. The passages about the Holy Spirit as the Comforter, παράκλητος, in the Fourth Gospel (chapters 14, 15, 16) and the reference to Christ as our advocate, παράκλητος, in 1 Jn.2:1,² so far from being a problem, show rather that both have the same office, the same office which God also has. "I will pray the Father, and he will give you another Comforter (παράκλητον), to be with you for ever," Jesus says in Jn.14:16. These things raise what we call the Trinity, even though the Bible itself has no explicitly stated doctrine of the Trinity.³

As in "Le Dieu trinitaire", he then proceeds with an examination of the three passages, Mt.29:19; 1 Cor.12:4-6, underlining his point that while some style critics held that since Jesus was not systematically named first in the different formulae and that, therefore, no theoretical equality of

¹See p.277 above. In a footnote Dr. Schmidt mentioned that these Copenhagen lectures were out of print. Eranos. XIII. p.203.

²"If anyone does sin, we have an advocate (παράκλητον) with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous."

³Eranos. pp.208f.

Persons was laid down by the divine Persons being named alongside one another, his view was exactly the opposite and that of Paul can quite unconcernedly put Christ first on occasion and God first on other occasions, what this shows is that the equality of the three Persons - in cases where the Spirit is also included - is already taken for granted. "What seems certain to me," he says, "is that a divine Triad in a formula so precisely constructed as Mt.28:19 may not, by its very formality, allow us to penetrate the thinking of the Evangelist on the exact relationship between God, Christ and the Holy Spirit, but it does, all the more, thereby presuppose such a relationship."¹

The argument of the earlier study is then followed very closely in tracing the origin of the New Testament Triad formula from its point of departure in the dual form of God - Christ. The use of the genitive, πνεύματος, in exactly the same way as θεοῦ and Χριστοῦ are used, and the Spirit appearing as the only other entity spoken of in the same breath as God and Christ, all confirm the conclusion that the divine Triad in fact arises from the experience and history of the New Testament community.² Indeed, it is the New Testament itself which raises the question of the Trinity.

¹Eranos. XIII. p.216.

²ibid. pp.220f.

It is only on the basis of this conclusion, namely that the Pnuma Hagion is a Person within the divine Triad, that the Spirit can be spoken of as Charisma.¹ It is a question here of a gift that is, at one and the same time, the Giver. "God's Spirit, Christ's Spirit, the Holy Spirit renews the spirit of man that cannot renew itself. In the story of Pentecost whose theme is the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, we are told not about the spirit and action of the Apostles but about the Spirit and action of God."² There is the same sense of compulsion present when St. Paul says - "For if I preach the Gospel, that gives me no ground for boasting. For necessity is laid upon me. Woe to me if I do not preach the Gospel!" (1 Cor.9:16). Speaking with 'tongues', open as it is to the dangers of enthusiasm or spirit-possession, in this story is a sign that God is speaking, not man. There is the gift - "They were all filled with the Holy Spirit." (Acts 2:4) - that is at the same time the Giver - "The Spirit gave them utterance."³

¹Dr. Schmidt does not take up the question of defining Person, in the sense of persona or hypostasis, where his colleague Karl Barth prefers to use 'modes of being' rather than 'person'. The question is analysed in God was in Christ by D.M. Baillie. 1961. Chap.VI. Eranos. XIII. p.230.

²Eranos. XIII. p.230.

³ibid. p.231.

The contrast between the Spirit of God and man's spirit is paralleled in the contrast between God acting and man waiting. This does not mean either doing nothing or being in a constant state of excitement and enthusiasm. In the same chapter as St. Paul says "Quench not the Spirit," he also says "Let us not sleep, as others do, but let us keep awake and be sober." (1 Thess.5:6,19). This is a vastly different programme than one of piously doing nothing in the affairs of ordinary day to day life, and being piously busy with spiritual things. The Holy Spirit as Charisma means that the inspiration of the Spirit presupposes, as well as produces, vigilance and a down-to-earth common sense.¹

In the context of Scripture this "sobria ebrietas" simply means being alert and ready in the midst of one's regular commitments.² Bible history shows what happened when men chose other courses. Frenzy of enthusiasm led Israelites into Baal worship and some Christians into cults of angels. When John the Baptist came preaching the exciting news of the salvation of God, the wrath to come, the axe laid to the root of the trees, and people asked - "What shall we do then?", the answer was simple, concrete, obvious - "The man who has two coats must share with the man who has none, and the man who has

¹Eranos. XIII. p.232.

²ibid.

food must do the same. . . . (Tax-collectors) must not demand more than you are entitled to. . . . Soldiers, rob no one by violence, don't bring false charges, and be content with your pay." (Lk.3:11f.). Jesus spoke words of warning when Zealots, Pharisees, even his own disciples, wanted, by their impatient action, to force the coming of the Kingdom of God, instead of allowing it to be given, as in the attitude and expectancy of the poor and the children. When the Seventy returned with joy, having subdued devils, Jesus says - "I saw Satan fall like lightning from heaven,"¹ and then He adds - "Nevertheless do not rejoice in this, that the spirits are subject to you; but rejoice that your names are written in heaven." (Lk.10:17f.). "For," Paul counsels the Romans, "by the grace given to me I bid everyone among you not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think, but to think with sober judgment, each according to the measure of faith which God has assigned him." (Rom.12:3).²

¹Dr. Schmidt referred to this verse in another paper to the Eranos group given in the following year (1946) on the theme - "Die Natur- und Geistkräfte im Paulinischen Erkennen und Glauben." On this occasion he dealt with it from the point of view of the final victory of Christ over all false powers, adding the "more than conquerors" verses from Paul to the Romans - "For I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord." (Rom.8:38,39). (Eranos Jahrbuch. 1946. XIV. p.97).

²Eranos. XIII. p.233.

True inspiration, then, is the gift of God and the New Testament community was warned "not to believe every spirit, but test the spirits to see whether they are of God." (1 Jn. 4:1).¹ And God, as Bonhoeffer put it, "is not a God of the emotions but the God of truth."² Christian community, he remarks, "is a spiritual and not a psychic reality. In this it differs absolutely from all other communities. The Scriptures call 'pneumatic', 'spiritual', that which is created only by the Holy Spirit, who puts Jesus Christ into our hearts as Lord and Saviour."³ The Ekklesia, composed of ordinary men, yet not ordered by the will and law of men, but simply and solely by the Spirit, is something strange and wonderful.⁴ Indeed its existence is a miracle, the miracle of the Holy Spirit. "The final authority of the Spirit is partly revealed in and through the Bible, traditions, the Church, the ministry and other agencies," writes Woodhouse. "But the Holy Spirit has not delegated all His powers. Both the Christian community and the individual Christian must leave room for the contemporary voice, the living voice, of the Spirit."⁵

¹cf. "Test everything; hold fast what is good." (1 Thess.5: 21). Eranos. XIII. p.234.

²Life Together. Dietrich Bonhoeffer. 1954. p.15.

³ibid. p.18.

⁴cf. Brunner. Dogmatics. III. p.45.

⁵op.cit. p.197.

Subject as well as Object. In the final paragraph of this Eranos article, Schmidt returns to his main theme. "The Pneuma Hagion as Person and as Charisma meets us not in the story of the Tower of Babel, for in it men without the Spirit of God sought to create themselves the longed-for unity of mankind. The Pneuma Hagion as Person and as Charisma meets us rather in the event of Pentecost, because in it men, through the Spirit of God and of His Christ that came over them, let themselves be given the longed-for unity of mankind and, with that, be given the human existence willed by God."¹

¹Eranos. XIII. pp.234-5.

7.

THE CHURCH, THE CHRISTIAN AND THE WORLD

Four further writings by Karl Ludwig Schmidt remain to be considered. Two are booklets in the Theological Studies series edited by Karl Barth. These are Going through Galatians and The Jewish Question in the Light of Romans 9-11.¹ Then there are his six radio talks from the Basel studio - From the Apocalypse of John, the Last Book of the Bible.² Finally there is the one lecture he delivered in this country - The Proclamation of the Church to the Congregation - given before the theological faculties of Cambridge University and of Manchester University and published in the Scottish Journal of Theology's first volume.

These four are of particular interest as they bring out Professor Schmidt's basic thinking regarding the Church from widely different angles, both from the varied textual material used and from the different audiences he was addressing.

¹Ein Gang durch den Galaterbrief. K.L. Schmidt. Pamphlet 11/12 in Theologische Studien. 2nd ed. 1947.
Die Judenfrage im Lichte der Kapitel 9-11 des Römerbriefes. Pamphlet 13 in Theologische Studien, based on a 1942 lecture.

²Aus der Johannes-Apokalypse dem letzten Buch der Bibel. 1946.

³Scottish Journal of Theology. Vol.1. 1948.

Going through Galatians

This brief commentary of Galatians underlines the practical side of theology in its influence on Christian living. The sub-title of the pamphlet - "Life, Doctrine, Guidance in Holy Scripture" - brings this out.¹ It involves not only leading, guiding, the reader but that the guide himself must be led. Central is the fact that Christ leads, the Spirit guides. "I am the good shepherd . . . my sheep . . . other sheep . . . I must lead (ἀγαγεῖν) and they shall hear my voice." (Jn.10.11f.). "For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God." (Rom.8:14). Christ Himself was "led" into the wilderness to be tempted, and no one is above his Master. What is intended is not a way of life that man can map out and control, but a living relationship, a constant reliance on being led. It is not so much that "you have known God" but "rather are known of God." (Gal.4:9).²

Life, living, events, experience are integral to Christian conduct, therefore, not as part of some existential philosophy but from their real origin which is shown in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. What we experience,

¹The alliterative German is hard to reproduce in English - "Leben, Lehre, Leitung in der Heiligen Schrift." Published 1942. (2nd ed. 1947). See Dr. Schmidt's reference in Eranos Jahrbuch, Vol.XV. 1947. p.151.

²Galatians. p.5.

in other words, goes back to what God has done, the "wonderful works of God" referred to in the account of Pentecost. (Acts 2:11). This is not to cheapen but to deepen Christian ethical conduct, which Galatians calls for, and without which experience and Scripture would be empty husks. We have to remember, on the one hand, that it is not we who build the Kingdom of God. The Kingdom comes without our doing in Jesus Christ who preached - 'Repent because (without your doing) the Kingdom of God comes,' not 'Repent in order that (through your doing) the Kingdom of God come.'¹ This message of God's judgment and grace, on the other hand, calls all the more for good deeds from us as our response to the great deeds of God, and as the fruit of the Spirit. This applies very much to the Church. As Welch says - "The Church may be fully dependent on God's act, but it is not simply God acting. It is a people believing, worshipping, obeying, witnessing."² It is "a community of men responding to the gracious act of God."³ Schmidt also notes the further point that while we are accustomed to separate life and doctrine, practice and theory, in the New Testament they are closely linked together and form a unity in Jesus Christ, for in him Word and Deed are one.⁴

¹Galatians. pp.6-7.

²op.cit. p.48.

³ibid. p.43.

⁴Galatians. p.8.

This is the source of living, teaching, leading for the Church. "God's Deed took place and takes place in Jesus Christ through his Apostles in the Church; God's Word is taught; through God's Deed and Word the Church is led."¹ True enough, the New Testament references concerning the directing of the Church are often ambiguous, many-sided, and even confused. So it is quite pointless to try to find out from the Bible precisely how many different ministries there were, for example, or what were the exact limits of function as between one ministry and another. The problem is not so much lack of clarity in the sources but comes from our efforts to divide pastoral work, preaching, administration, and so on into separate compartments. For the early Church there was no such sharp division. Christ was the determining, unifying factor, the ever-present logical Subject, Who, as Lord, lives, teaches, leads at one and the same time. In Him there is no separation between life and doctrine, or between doctrine and guidance. The preaching-teaching ministry of Christ is the same as His shepherding-guiding ministry. He is the "Chief Shepherd" (1 Pet.5:4), the "Shepherd and Bishop of your souls" (1 Pet.2:25).² "The verb ποιμαίνω does not indicate directing in the sense of ruling so much as of feeding and tending. The same is true of the word "bishop", one who is

¹Galatians. p.10.

²AV. RSV - "Shepherd and Guardian".

an overseer and guardian."¹ Church administration in this sense includes the nurture and education of the faithful in all aspects of the doctrine and conduct of the Christian life. As men, we may see these as separate gifts of grace, since we are not able to grasp these functions in all their fullness, but in Christ they are all one. Interestingly enough, as Best points out, "in the New Testament it is never the Church which is exhorted to action but Christians."²

The first part of Galatians shows Paul, through his life, teaching and leading, constantly linking service of God and service to one's neighbour, and just as steadily combatting man-worship, which is rebellion against God. "There are some who trouble you and want to pervert the gospel of Christ," he writes. "If I were still pleasing men, I should not be a servant of Christ" (Gal.1:7,10). To win human approval so easily becomes the sin of the missionary, the preacher, the speaker, the leader, who would like to have supporters, a party, a following behind him. Equally easily it can be the sin of the hearers, those who are led, who want to be the followers of a man.³ Jesus even had to rebuke Peter - "Get

¹Galatians. p.11.

²op.cit. p.199.

³Galatians. p.17.

behind me, Satan! For you are not on the side of God, but of men" (Mk.8:33).

It would be quite natural to expect to find a record in the early Church of battle against heresy, against wrong teaching and living. It is very unexpected, however, to find a record of two of the leading apostles in conflict, Paul opposing Peter to his face because the latter had stopped eating with the Gentiles, "fearing the circumcision party" (Gal.2:12). It was so unthinkable, indeed, that many of the Church Fathers spent much time trying to explain it away.¹ Overbeck's essay presenting the evidence of this runs to over seventy pages,² and Holl's study of the same conflict brings it up to Luther's day.³ We should remember, however, that what Peter did, everyone knows at least something of from his own experience, and we should guard against any tendency to identify ourselves with Paul here. The very human weaknesses of the 'pillars' of the Church point us to what the Church is - the Body of Christ, the People of God, i.e. God's concern, not primarily a human institution, not of man's making. "Long

¹Galatians. p.19.

²Über die Auffassung des Streits des Paulus mit Petrus in Antiochen (Gal.2:11f.) bei den Kirchenvätern. Franz Overbeck. 1877.

³Der Streit zwischen Petrus und Paulus zu Antiochen in seiner Bedeutung für Luthers innere Entwicklung. Karl Holl. 1920.

before our personal decision, God Himself has decided",¹ and it is God's decision that calls for the response of our obedience. The outcome depends on Him, not on any individual however prominent. Paul, like Peter, had also been against God. It was only as each received grace from God that either could really live, or teach, or lead. "The life I now live in the flesh I live by faith in the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me" (Gal.2:20).

Such a turning-point is part of the experience of the smallest Christian as well as of the greatest apostle, a once-and-for-all experience which is not to be extinguished by subsequent experiences. The Church, and the Christian, must always keep the Cross of Christ at the centre.² Cullmann maintains that the cross is the terminus a quo for the Church.³ "Only the cross makes the existence of the church possible, though a church already existed in the Old Testament in the form of God's chosen people and then as the 'remnant' of Israel, which turns back and which, according to the prophets, God has chosen to save."⁴ As the body of Christ on earth, the

¹Galatians. p.21.

²ibid. p.24.

³The Early Church. p.116.

⁴op.cit. p.116.

Church is the body of the crucified, and "what every Christian individually experiences at Baptism when he enters the Church (Rom.6:3f.), dying with Christ and being raised up with him, characterises the whole life of the Church."¹ Schmidt sees the cross of Christ as making clear the Either-Or of His message, a choice man is always seeking to make into a Both-And, not understanding that this is to make a mockery of the choice, making experience "in vain". But God supplies the Spirit, works miracles (Gal.3:5). "The history of God with His Church, with His people, is a chain of such miracles which have their climax in the history of Christ."² To this both experience and Scripture testify.

In the Epistle, Paul goes on to present the evidence of the faith of Abraham and of God's purpose "that in Christ Jesus the blessing of Abraham might come upon the Gentiles, that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith" (Gal.3:14). The Law is a schoolmaster to bring us to Christ. There is the story of the two covenants, the story of Hagar the bond-woman and Sarah the free-woman. All this points to the freedom that Christ has won for us, though it remains always in Him. The Church, the people of God, is not like a human society or association founded by some long-dead

¹ *ibid.* p.125. For its other aspect as a spiritual body - see p.274 above.

² Galatians. p.28.

president, but is the continuing incarnation of Jesus Christ, the Head of the Church, whose Body at the same time the Church also is.¹ So it is in Him alone that Christians are one.

When men try to bring about unity through their own efforts, history shows this results in a Tower of Babel. It was at Pentecost that language and national barriers disappeared.²

"It is as we allow Him and His Spirit to work in us that things look different in our despondent and feeble hearts, and also in the wider, fear-ridden world."³

This linking of Christ's work in the individual and in His Church was also stressed by Brunner when he spoke of faith, in the sense of the individual becoming a believer, being "the loneliest of all experiences", and then adds that when this happens, "you are no longer an isolated individual; not only because God is now your ever-present Thou, but because you are in this same moment given your place in the Body of Christ, in the fellowship, in the ekklesia."⁴ This is the key to unity, where differences no longer divide. It was this the Law could not do, Schmidt points out, emphasising, at the same

¹Galatians. p.45.

²ibid. p.46. See footnote 2, p.310 below.

³ibid. p.47.

⁴The Word of God and Modern Man. Emil Brunner. (E.T. 1965) p.84.

time, the Law's positive part in Paul's view. In a long "lexicographical and biblical-theological" note on the word παιδαγωγός (Gal.3:24f.), he quotes with approval Luther's words - "Lex enim ad gratiam praeparat, dum peccatum revelat et auget, humilians superbos ad auxilium Christi desiderandum" - though he favours his own translation, 'tutor' (Hofmeister), as against Luther's 'taskmaster' (Zuchtmeister).¹ A detailed examination of the views of Wilhelm Vischer, Walter Baumgartner, Jakob Wirtz, Franz Delitsch, leans towards a specifically Greek meaning for the word with the emphasis on the 'tutor, teacher' (Erzieher) side.²

One of the shortest yet completest summaries of the Kerygma of the early Church is given in this Epistle. "But when the time had fully come, God sent forth His Son, born of a woman, born under the law, to redeem those who were under the law, so that we might receive adoption as sons" (Gal.4:4-5). This, Schmidt says, is as full of content as the more richly phrased Kerygma in Philippians 2:6-11, putting the whole story of Christ on earth in His humility in the compass of two verses.³ It is linked, in the next verse, with the gift of

¹Galatians. p.48.

²ibid. p.49. (Nok² p.304.)
|cf. Gustaf Wingren who also refers to Pentecost as "the means of restoring a fragmented and disintegrated humanity." (Gospel and Church. 1964. p.106).

³Galatians. p.54.

the Spirit. "And because you are sons, God has sent the Spirit of His Son into our hearts, crying, 'Abba! Father!'" (Gal.4:6). This is the same Spirit Paul speaks of in Romans - "When we cry 'Abba! Father!' it is the Spirit himself bearing witness with our spirit that we are children of God" (Rom.8: 15-16). It shows the Holy Spirit, the 'creator spiritus', as on an equal plane with God the Father and God the Son, the determinative factor, Subject and Person, as well as Charisma, and who, as Paraclete, intercedes for us in our weakness when we have no words of our own.¹ Again Schmidt brings in the link between word and deed. "That we are called children of God means that we are His children. For our naming through God, Whose word is effective (verbum efficax!), is our being through and from God."²

In Galatians, chapters 5 and 6, the Spirit is mentioned almost twice as often as in the first four chapters. This is an indication that the ethical injunctions in these last two chapters are set in a theological, soteriological framework of the warfare between the 'works of the flesh' and the 'fruits of the Spirit', for, just as the Church as the People of God is the battle-ground between the Kingdom of God and the kingdoms of this world, each individual who is awake is

¹Galatians. p.55.

²ibid. p.61.

also this battle-ground.¹ "Walk by the Spirit," Paul says, "and do not gratify the desires of the flesh, For the desires of the flesh are against the Spirit, and the desires of the Spirit are against the flesh; for these are opposed to each other, to prevent you from doing what you would" (Gal.5:16-17). So then, "if we live by the Spirit, let us also walk by the Spirit" (5:25), and "peace and mercy be upon all who walk by this rule, upon the Israel of God" (6:16). Such is the outcome of living in the Spirit, a vastly different philosophy from the Kantian aim of seeking to do good for its own sake. The New Testament stresses the objective $\delta\delta\acute{o}\varsigma$, not the subjective $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\theta\omicron\delta\omicron\varsigma$, and here again Christ Himself as the determinative Subject is 'the way'.² For the New Testament always views the human situation very realistically. Man is prone to self-love, not love of God and, thence, love of neighbour. It is only the Word become flesh, only Jesus Christ, who has perfectly fulfilled the command to love that is laid down in the Old Covenant as well as in the New. Without him men "bite and devour one another" (5:15) and cannot inherit the Kingdom of God which, like the heavenly Polis, is not to be identified with the Church, though promised to the Church.³

¹Galatians. p.62.

²ibid. p.73.

³ibid. p.70.

Into this realistic but dark picture Paul brings the Holy Spirit and the fruits of the Spirit as the answer.¹ The 'works of the flesh' and the 'fruits of the Spirit' listed in Galatians are not moralistic imperatives but an ethical statement about two different worlds which are at war with one another. Victory lies not in our spirits but in the Holy Spirit, i.e. in the Spirit of God and in His once and for all time Ambassador, Jesus Christ. The word 'fruit' itself is a sign of this. It totally precludes human self-will and self-effort. Fruit is not made, it grows and is, whatever our efforts may have been, a gift.²

The Jewish Question. (Romans 9-11)

Although this second pamphlet by Dr. Schmidt in the Theologische Studien series has for its central theme a subject not directly bearing on the doctrine of the Church, it does yield several informative and relevant points for this present study.

It is in this booklet, as we have seen, that he speaks of his birth and upbringing in Frankfurt, his war service in Poland and Russia in the first world war, and his travels to Egypt and Palestine.³ In it he also underlines yet again

¹Galatians. pp.82f.

²ibid. p.89.

³See H. 13 f. above.

the close links between the Old Testament and the New, the Israel of God being the Church of God in Jesus Christ, and the present-day solidarity of the Church with Jewry against any form of anti-semitism.

In his Going through Galatians he had described the Epistle to the Romans as "this magna charta to the whole Church for all time",¹ and had underlined the point that the Apostle to the Gentiles, free as he was from legalism, was anything but an antinomian. As a witness to Christ, indeed, he was still answerable to the law, properly understood. "Do we then overthrow the law by this faith?" Paul asks. "By no means! On the contrary we uphold the law." (Rom.3:31). In Galatians he had spoken of the law of Christ. In Romans he speaks of the law of faith.

What Paul is attacking in Romans 9-11 is the concept of righteousness-by-race and the failure of his fellow-Israelites to realise and accept the great gifts, including the gift of the Law, that God had given them. This, he said, was like "a great sorrow and unceasing anguish in my heart. For I could wish that I myself were accursed and cut off from Christ for the sake of my brethren, my kinsmen by race." (9:3).

In his practical way, Dr. Schmidt begins his study by asking topical questions and in considering them one has to

¹Galatians. p.29.

remember that this booklet of his is based on an address given in 1942, during the war, in the Hitler era, to a gathering held by the Swiss Evangelical Aid Society (Hilfswerke) in aid of the Confessing Church of Germany. "What are we modern men, and especially we Christians, to think about our Jewish contemporaries? How should we behave towards them?"¹

Not content with condemning the "newer antisemitism" out of hand, he then made the point that the "Jewish Question" includes not only Jews (Jesus was a Jew) but Jewish Christians (Paul was a Jewish Christian) and also Gentile Christians who, equally with their Jewish Christian brothers, belong to the same Church, the same People of God, the same Body of Christ. This point comes out particularly clearly in Romans 9-11, though these chapters of course must not be thought of in isolation from the rest of the Epistle or indeed from the rest of the Bible, the Old Testament included.² Chapters 9-11 contain more Old Testament quotations than almost any other section of the New Testament.³ "All Israel will be saved," Paul writes. "As it is written, 'The Deliverer will come from Zion, he will banish ungodliness from Jacob'." (Rom.11:26).

¹Judenfrage. p.3.

²ibid. p.5.

³From Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Deuteronomy, 1 Samuel, 2 Kings, Nehemiah, Job, Proverbs, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Hosea, Joel, Malachi.

And he warns the Roman Christians - "Do not boast over the branches. If you do boast, remember it is not you that support the root, but the root that supports you." (11:18). The same point - "The first Christians were Jews" - is also stressed by Dr. Davies, who points out at the same time the reaching out of Christianity to include all mankind, not only by word but by a way of life seeking to establish God's righteousness, not man's.¹ From the time of the Acts of the Apostles on, life and word powerfully spread the Christian faith. Justin Martyr speaks of many pagans who "have changed their violent and tyrannical disposition, being overcome either by the constancy which they have witnessed in the lives of their Christian neighbours, or by the extraordinary forbearance they have observed in their Christian fellow travellers when defrauded, and by the honesty of those believers with whom they have transacted business."² With only the most fragmentary, or even non-existent, historical records, churches appear in Gaul, Spain, Britain, Africa, India, and other parts of the world. All belong to the one Church, the one Body, supported by the same root.

Dr. Schmidt proceeds as usual by carefully examining and defining the terms 'Jew', 'Israel' (and Israelite), and

¹The Making of the Church. J.G. Davies. 1960. p.19.
cf. Rom.10:3.

²Quoted by Davies, op.cit. p.23.

'Hebrew' as used in the Old and New Testaments. What emerges is that where, for example, Paul addresses the Galatians as "the Israel of God" (Gal.6:16), he is referring not to "Israel according to the flesh" nor to Jewish Christians, i.e. those who were formerly Jews, but to the Church of God in Jesus Christ, an assembly of Jews and Gentiles, which, on occasion, might be an assembly consisting only of Gentiles.¹ This is not something that depends on race or on acquired spiritual characteristics. The real connection between 'Israel', People of God, the Church of God in Jesus Christ, lies in the action of God and in His choice of His people.² "As regards the gospel, they (the Jews) are enemies of God, for your sake (the Gentile Christians); but as regards election (ἐκλογήν), they are beloved for the sake of their forefathers." (Rom.11:28).

Jesus' words as Messiah in the Fourth Gospel come as a warning to His Church, composed as it is of Jews and Gentiles. "Salvation is of the Jews." (Jn.4:22). Romans 9-11 bears this out. It keeps stressing the solidarity of the Church with Jewry on the basis of God's choice, a choice that may even seem to run counter to human values.³ As Paul, in Galatians,

¹Judenfrage. p.10f.

²ibid. pp.11,13.

³In the text and in extensive notes Schmidt examines the arguments of Wilhelm Vischer (Die Hoffnung der Kirche und die Juden), Karl Barth (Römerbrief and Kirchliche Dogmatik II), Bultmann (Kommentar zum vierten Evangelium), Ethelbert Stauffer (Die Theologie des Neuen Testaments) and others regarding πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ (Rom.11:26), a burning question for the Church facing the spread of Nazi anti-semitism, and concludes with Vischer that this includes 'Israel after the flesh' as well as the spiritual Israel, though with a caution against reading more into the New Testament than the New Testament itself says. cf. Judenfrage. pp.38f.; (notes) pp.65f.

used the analogy of Sarah and Hagar, the free-woman and the bond-woman, here (Rom.9) he uses the analogy of Jacob and Esau. The choice of Jacob (or Israel) is inexplicable by human standards, but the fact of his being chosen by God makes him the root of the Church and bars any and every kind of anti-semitism. This unity of the Church as the true Israel is made possible through Jesus Christ, and in Him alone.¹ "The scripture says - 'No one who believes in him will be put to shame.' For there is no distinction between Jew and Greek; the same Lord is Lord of all and bestows his riches upon all who call upon him." (Rom.10:11,12).

It was in 1933 that Dr. Schmidt debated points like these with Martin Buber in the course of a discussion in Stuttgart on "Church, State, People, Jewry."² He agreed with Buber's view that Israel is something quite unique and cannot be fitted into the usual categories of ethnic and sociological studies. However, in so far as the history of Israel is the history of God's action and efforts on behalf of His people, this action must be seen in the perspective of what is said in the opening of the Epistle to the Hebrews - "In many and various ways God spoke of old to our fathers by the prophets;

¹Judenfrage. p.44.

²In Th.Bl. Sept. 1933. Judenfrage. Note 46, p.69f.
cf. also Jüdisch-christliches Religionsgespräch in 19 Jahrhunderten. H.J. Schoeps. 1937.

but in these last days he has spoken to us by a Son, whom he appointed the heir of all things." (Heb.1:1,2). "Nevertheless," Dr. Schmidt went on, "we Christians, like the Jews, look to the 'last days'. But we dare to do so only on the basis of the fact that God in Jesus Christ is the One Who brings this end. Concerning the coming of Jesus Christ, 'in these last days' we can speak only in the light of His second coming, His return."¹ In this sense, community of Christian and Jew is provisional, and if the Church were more Christian the difference would be sharper than it can be at present. (Dr. Schmidt was at pains to make it clear that this was in no sense a personal disagreement with Martin Buber but something bound up with the Church's obligation of mission to the Jews.)²

To this, Buber replied that if Jewry were once more Israel, if the divine features shone out more clearly from behind the mask, then, though separation might remain, the differences would not be so sharp between Jews and the Church - something quite new would emerge which could not, at that moment, be put into words.³

Bultmann had also called attention to the special character of Israel. "A unique picture is presented by the

¹Judenfrage. p.70.

²ibid. p.69.

³ibid. p.70.

Jewish nation as it existed at the beginning of our era, with its centre in Jerusalem, the holy city," he wrote. "A people endowed with great vitality, strong natural instincts, the highest moral energy, and the keenest intellectual capacity, yet whose life consisted not in all the things which fill the life of the other peoples of the earth. Law and promise determine the life of this people, obedience and hope define its meaning. . . . This law and the unconditional obedience of the religious man to it make the Jewish nation a chosen people."¹

In addition to Bultmann's picture, Schmidt quotes Schlatter's view - "With the death of Israel, the early Church (Urkirche) also died, and its death did damage to the whole Church; for into the gap came sect-split Christianity, there Mohammed, here bishop, monk and pope."² Schmidt further quotes Erik Peterson's word concerning the Jewish-Christian relationship (though it should not be pressed too far) - "Against the heathen one carries on a controversy (polemisiert man) . . . with the Jews, on the other hand, one carries on a discussion (disputiert man) . . ."³

¹Jesus. E.T. pp.21-22.

²Die Kirche Jerusalems vom Jahre 70-130. Adolf Schlatter. 1898. p.90.

³Patristic Studies on the Church of Jew and Gentile. Schweiz.Rundschau. 1936. (Judenfrage. p.71.)

Over against Buber's view, and even more against the views of Leonhard Ragaz who saw a conflict between the 'Jesus line' and the 'Paul line', or the 'Kingdom line' and the 'Church line',¹ Schmidt stresses the need to understand that "in the perspective of the Kingdom of God and His Messiah, Jesus, the Church, the congregation, the assembly of the People of God in Jesus Christ (ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ) alone is the true Israel of the New Covenant, i.e. the 'Kingdom line' and the 'Church line' are to be regarded as one line, on which the Kingdom of God is promised to the Church of God in Jesus Christ."²

Some years earlier Schmidt had commented on the "enigma of the existence of the Jewish people" in his address to students gathered in Aarau, maintaining that the key to the enigma was to be found in Romans 9-11.³ There he went on to deal with the question of death, in an interesting personal passage. "No heroism, no cynicism, no popular myth, can cover up this the most certain fact of human life," he said. "Either natural death is the end of everything human, or it is a pointer to the end to which God, as creator and replacer, is

¹Judentum und Christentum (1922) and Israel, Judentum, Christentum (1942).

²Judenfrage. p.72.

³"Wie spricht Gott zum heutigen Menschen?" Th.Bl. No.6. June, 1936. p.134. See p.46 above.

leading us. Either human despair, or divine comfort! Either nothing, or everything! To try to avoid this hard alternative is mere escapism, a strange head-in-the-sand policy. As a soldier during the war I saw many of my comrades die, and as a pastor in peace time, many members of the Church. Sometimes there was fear. Sometimes there was much heroism."¹ Humble fear before God, however, led more readily to an understanding of God's promise that death was not the end. The Bible speaks of death because it bears witness to life as eternal life. "But in fact Christ has been raised from the dead, the first fruits of those who have fallen asleep" (1 Cor.15:20). Jesus Christ, the Word become flesh, restores the fallen creation from its subjection to sin and death.²

The Last Book of the Bible

In 1944, at the height of the war, Schmidt made a series of six broadcast talks on the Book of Revelation over Radio Basel and these were subsequently published in brochure form under the title Aus der Johannes-Apokalypse dem letzten Buch der Bibel. The talks were dedicated to his mother, and reference has already been made to them in the biographical

¹ ibid. p.141.

² ibid.

opening section where a brief summary of their contents is also noted.¹ As a booklet it went through more than one edition and press comment at the time showed how ably Dr. Schmidt brought the "permanent and eternal truths" out of the text of the Apocalypse and made them plain for his day, combining "careful theology with non-pious 'upbuilding'" in a "really masterly performance".² To some extent, therefore, it foreshadowed his later and fuller treatment of 'upbuilding', rescuing it even more fully from all pious or synergistic interpretation, which he gave in his Die Erbauung der Kirche mit ihren Gliedern als den 'Fremdlingen und Beisassen auf Erden' (Heb.11:13).³

The broadcast talks began on a Good Friday and the first dealt with the Apocalyptic Christ: Lion and Lamb. From the start, Schmidt stressed the Semitic coloration and style of the Apocalypse - the scroll, the seven seals, the Lion of the tribe of Judah, the root of David, the Lamb "as though slain" with seven horns and seven eyes, the seven spirits of God sent out into all the earth.⁴ Only this Christ, who "wast slain

¹See p.49 above.

²National-Zeitung. Basel. April 1944.

³See pp. 164 f., 202 f. above.

⁴Apoc. p.7.

and by thy blood didst ransom men for God from every tribe and tongue and people and nation, and hast made them a kingdom and priests to our God, and they shall reign on earth" (Rev.5:9-10), could open the seals of man's perplexity and God's mystery.¹ The four Horsemen of the Apocalypse, representing what plagues mankind; the apocalyptic number 666, representing the Antichrist and his satellites; and the apocalyptic Babel, described with the words 'Pride and Fall'; these vividly portray the battle between the kingdoms of this world and the kingdom of Christ, a world in which is set the "small, weak Congregation of God in Jesus Christ".² The apocalyptic Church, the subject of the fifth talk, Schmidt describes with the words 'Need and Promise' (Not und Verheissung),³ a complete contrast to the 'Pride and Fall' of Babel (or Babylon), and to underline the close relationship between Church and Kingdom, the sixth and final talk of the series is entitled "The Apocalyptic Kingdom: thousand-year Kingdom and Heavenly Jerusalem."⁴

As it fell out, beginning on Good Friday, this talk on the apocalyptic Church came to be delivered at Whitsun and

¹Apoc. p.8.

²ibid. p.43.

³ibid.

⁴ibid. p.52.

Schmidt began from the widely held idea that the events of Pentecost marked the foundation or birthday of the Church. "But now," he went on, "even before Pentecost, Church, Christian congregation, people of God, was the small flock for whom was valid the promise of Jesus Christ: 'Where two or three are gathered in my name, there am I in the midst of them' (Mt. 18:20)."¹ Church depends entirely on this God-given quality, not on humanly measured quantity. Furthermore, Church is not made up of the sum of churches. Even the most modest, smallest congregation can be the Church in the full sense of the term. This characteristic mark of the Church can also be observed from the linguistic side. "In the whole of the Greek Bible, both Old and New Testaments, what we call the People of God, the Congregation of God, congregation or church, is described by one single word ekklesia, Latin ecclesia, French église, Italian chiesa, German (through different linguistic development of the same concept) Kirche."²

The outpouring of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost inspired the small group of apostles to make their appearance before the great world in order to tell it what Church really is. "True Church, proper People of God, real community among men, is to be found, always and only, where, in contrast to the

¹ Apoc. p.43.

² ibid. p.44.

strivings towards unity in a Tower of Babel which have failed in the past and will inevitably fail in the future, the Pentecost unity is understood and lived in the sense of the apostolic-pauline jubilation - 'There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is neither male nor female; for you are all one in Christ Jesus.' (Gal.3:28; cf. Col.3:11)"¹

At first sight this would seem to be another linking of ecclesiology and Christology, which Schmidt often stressed.² In a recent book on the Church, Professor Edmund Schlink of Heidelberg University objects to this as being too limiting. "In his inquiries into the New Testament conception of the Church," he writes, "Karl Ludwig Schmidt propounded the thesis: Ecclesiology is Christology - a thesis which is certainly not new, but which is by no means self-evident in the context of Protestant theology."³ In addition to the New Testament statements of the Church as $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha\ \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$, there are many other connexions between Christ and the Church, he says and goes on to suggest that "ecclesiology taken as a whole must be expounded and developed in a trinitarian way", since from

¹Apoc.

²TWNT. III. p.512. See H. 85/ ^{above} 366 below.

³The Coming Christ and the Coming Church. Edmund Schlink. E.T. 1967. p.96.

Pentecost "the Church considers herself to be the opus proprium of the Holy Ghost."¹ In spite of this view, however, he frames his 12 theses for ecumenical discussion of Christ and the Church "not with ecclesiology in the whole of its trinitarian context, but simply with the special aspect of its Christological reference."² In much of his writing this is precisely what Schmidt does too, although in this talk and even more explicitly in his two articles on the Spirit, he brought out that the New Testament itself raises the trinitarian question.³ Whether or not Schlink was taking these into consideration is not clear. At any rate, since Schmidt made little attempt towards a synthesis of his many writings directly or indirectly concerning the Church, Schlink's statement is readily understandable and in fact draws attention to one of Schmidt's notable contributions on the doctrinal and on the ecumenical side.

His talk on the apocalyptic Church underlined the point that disunited mankind's confused efforts to solve the problems of human existence by constructing philosophies (Weltanschauungen) built up of human feelings, desires and thoughts, fail to take seriously enough and realistically enough the true

¹op.cit. pp.96-97.

²ibid. p.97.

³See p. 288 above.

nature of human need.¹ The evil spirits, the seven seals, the seven trumpets, the Antichrist, the seven bowls of wrath, Babylon in pride and fall - these are all spirits of death. For the ultimate need is death. But in Christ the ultimate answer is already promised. Paul's words - "The last enemy to be destroyed is death" (1 Cor.15:26) - find their counterpart in the apocalyptic vision - "The Death and Hades were thrown into the lake of fire" (Rev.20:14) - and in the apocalyptic promise - "and death shall be no more" (Rev.21:4). Death had no place in God's original plan of creation. Death has no place in God's new world. This final need, death, like all other needs, is overcome for the Church that recognises the risen Christ who conquered death.²

As well as the earthly community there is also the heavenly host eternally praising God, and in need and promise, also has its constant part. Even in the midst of strife and suffering its is promised God's peace.³ Its battle, its sojourning, does not take place in the dark. The goal of the Church is definite and clear - the coming Kingdom of God, envisioned in the Apocalypse as the heavenly Jerusalem, the City of God.⁴

¹ Apoc. p.45.

² ibid. p.46.

³ ibid. p.51.

⁴ ibid. p.52.

So with the powers of the world and of darkness arrayed against it, the Church of God, trusting in and obeying Christ, confidently expected the final victory. For, though the imagery on occasion might border on the fantastic, it was based on solid fact. Christ had come and He it was who would in the end deliver the kingdom to God the Father.¹

There is an astonishing similarity of emphasis between this talk of Schmidt's and C.H. Dodd's broadcast talks over the BBC. for Advent, 1950.² "The Church was a minority movement with every power in the world against it," Dodd said, yet one of the outstanding characteristics of the early Christians was an astounding confidence.³ They "did not simply expect a great 'divine event'; they expected the coming of Jesus Christ, whom they knew. It was not just a Last Judgment they expected. It was the judgment of Christ; and they knew what standards He judged by, and how His judgment passed into a forgiveness that set a man up again."⁴ They already shared God's victory that Christ had won, a victory through defeat and death.⁵

¹Apoc. p.59.

²The Coming of Christ. C.H. Dodd. 1951.

³op.cit. p.5.

⁴ibid. p.4.

⁵ibid. pp.8, 41.

The apocalyptic Church, described by the words 'Need and Promise', looks to the future with similar certainty. Even amid the trials pictured in the Apocalypse, those who are awake (Rev.16:15), those who are invited (19:9), those who wash their robes (22:14), those who share in the first resurrection (20:6), are called 'Blessed'.¹ The Church militant and suffering yet receives the peace of God, enjoys the "sabbath rest for the people of God" (Heb.4:9). The apocalyptic Kingdom calls for no "Fahrt ins Blaue" but is a definite goal for the Church, presented as the provisional thousand-year kingdom and the final Kingdom of God in the form of the heavenly Jerusalem.² In this connection the number 1000 itself has little significance and indeed late Jewish apocalyptic uses different numbers in portraying the messianic consummation.³ Man cannot tie God, for Whom "a thousand years is as one day" (2 Pet.3:8), to a number. The real point of the promised Kingdom is bound up with the Lordship of Christ and the whole people of God as the true Israel.⁴ According to Martin Buber "the realisation of God's all-embracing reign is the Alpha and Omega of Israel,"⁵ and it is in these basic

¹ Apoc. p.51.

² ibid. p.52.

³ ibid. p.58f.

⁴ ibid. p.59.

⁵ Quoted by Schnackenburg. God's Rule and Kingdom. p.11.

Old Testament links that Schmidt sees the roots of the Church. Both Kingdom and Church are God's doing. Looking for the Kingdom, the Church is supported by the Kingdom. The ekklesia is the "threshold of the βασιλεία", to use a phrase of Jeremias'.¹

The relation between Church and Kingdom is therefore a very intricate and many-sided one. The two are not identical, but neither can they be separated. The early Christian congregation regarded itself as the ekklesia and continued to preach the basileia,² indeed, "it is for the ekklesia, the remnant and kernel of the People of God that the βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ or τῶν οὐρανῶν is intended."³ In the second place, the central link between the two is Christ. As the People of God and now also His Body, the Church shares in His presence and saving grace, represents His promise of unity, in anti-thesis of Babel, and looks for His coming in power when He will hand over the kingdom to God the Father.⁴ So, thirdly, in spite of its present situation in the world as a corpus mixtum, an ecclesia militans et pressa, the gates of hell will not prevail against it and the Church will endure until the

¹cf. Schnackenburg. op.cit. p.231.

²TWNT. III. pp.507, 522.

³Festgabe. p.293.

⁴Apoc. pp.44, 46-47.

coming of the Kingdom of God. Always it is both ekklesia, called into being by God, and paróikia, a stranger, resident here on earth, but whose real home is in heaven.¹

In view of the long history of the somewhat varied interpretations of the Apocalypse, Schmidt even in this 'popular' series of broadcasts is careful to guard against any sort of chiliasmus either crassus or subtilis.² He cites Heinrich Corrodi's four volume Kritische Geschichte des Chiliasmus,³ and Johann Caspar Lavater's Aussichten in die Ewigkeit⁴ as examples of earlier works on the problem, bringing out the basic point that this Church composed of Jews and Gentiles, militant and suffering in this present age and present world will at the end of this age and world be victorious over all the opposing forces. One day the triumph of Christ and His Church will certainly take place.⁵ In the end He will deliver the kingdom to God the Father . . . that God may be all in all. (1 Cor.15:24f.). Hence in the heavenly Jerusalem coming from God there was no temple to be

¹Apoc. pp.51-52.

²ibid. pp.53-54.

³Published 1781-83. Apoc. p.54.

⁴Published circa 1770.

⁵Apoc. p.56.

seen "for its temple is the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb" (Rev.21:22).¹ A transfigured Church widens out ultimately to include transfigured humanity. The very name 'Jerusalem' points to the fact that all things in the mind of God, and therefore real, although they may be misunderstood, defaced and almost brought to the point of destruction at the hands of men, cannot be destroyed since they are God's thoughts and deeds, but are restored by Him, are made visible once more by Him.²

The Proclamation of the Church to the Congregation

As the title of this talk, the only one Professor K.L. Schmidt delivered in English, implies, the starting-point is the Church's proclamation, the kerygma.³ Here the New Testament puts the emphasis very strongly on the message, using 'proclaimer' 3 times and 'proclaiming' more than 60 times. There is a need, he suggested, to note and restore the original meaning of the word praedicare which means to 'publish, make public, extol, laud, glorify.' The word kerygma strikes a solemn note. The "Christian proclamation is nothing other than public proclamation of the living God Whose Will is

¹ Apoc. p.59.

² ibid. p.60.

³ SJTh. Vol.1. 1948. p.151. See p.92 above.

directed upon the whole world."¹

The kerygma, therefore, has a direct and vital bearing upon the nature and mission of the Church. "The fact that Christian preaching is consciously public proclamation makes it possible, and at the same time necessary for us to understand the Christian Congregation as the Church. That Church and Congregation are ultimately the same is evident in both the language and the facts of the Bible of the Old and New Testaments. Whereas we are accustomed to speak sometimes of the Church, sometimes of the Congregation, the whole New Testament has always the same expression for both - an expression which means neither more nor less than 'assembly, flock, people, company of God' - the customary expression of the Greek world for 'national assembly' qualified by the Old Testament addition 'of God'. Where this addition is lacking, it is nevertheless always to be understood. And to think of God, to speak of God, has only meaning if the God of the Old and of the New Covenant moves into our field of vision. That is the explanation of the fact that the Church, the Congregation of the New Covenant, is addressed as the true Israel with titles from the Book of the Old Covenant."²

¹SJTh. Vol.1.

²ibid. p.152.

In this short talk Schmidt was doubtless assuming as background some of the related points regarding proclamation and Church, Church and Congregation (Gemeinde) he had frequently underlined in his earlier writings. To a certain extent, more and more modified as time went on, he had followed the Bultmann-Dibelius Formgeschichte conclusion that the origin of the Gospels lay in the life and worship of the early Church.¹ Already in his Die Stellung der Evangelien in der allgemeinen Literaturgeschichte he held that the uniqueness of the literary origins of the Gospels, the very fact that they came out of the Gemeinde and were not the literary creations of individuals, was a strong guarantee of their authenticity and historicity. "It ought to be recognised", he wrote, "that this uniqueness, quite apart from their later use, which also shows no signs of misuse, is immanent in tradition of this kind. The very fact that they were handed down and formed not by individuals by a large group (Menge, Volk, Gemeinschaft, Gemeinde) is important."² The individual writer can master the material. The Gemeinde, on the other hand, "is built up by the traditions and records current in its midst, gathers itself around these, and precisely

¹cf. Rahmen. p.303. See 4.23 above. Even in this earliest work of his, Schmidt already viewed the Passion narrative as firmly based in history and in the tradition.

²Stellung. p.117f.

thereby is consolidated as Gemeinde."¹ Gemeinde and Gospel, then, are in constant interaction and each powerfully affects and supports the other, in Schmidt's view. To this, in his later studies of ekklesia and other New Testament concepts bearing on the nature of the Church, he added all the evidence from the closeness of the Old Testament links and the central role of the Messiahship of Jesus, thereby parting company with Bultmann and Dibelius. For the two last named, Formgeschichte, they claimed, had eliminated the Messianic categories from the sayings of Jesus on the ground that these reflect the faith of the post-Easter Church.² Indeed Bultmann carried his view that the life of Jesus was 'not messianic' so far that the end result amounted to a kerygmatic-theological docetism and led to Althaus' comment: "According to the New Testament the Word became flesh . . . in kerygma theology the Word became -kerygma."³

Bultman had also maintained that "we may not go behind the kerygma using it as a 'source' . . . to reconstruct an 'historical Jesus'" and indeed concentrated the whole event of revelation on the kerygma, not on Jesus himself.⁴

¹Stellung.

²cf. The New Testament in Current Study. R.H. Fuller. p.44.

³Das sogenannte Kerygma und der historische Jesus. Paul Althaus. 1958. p.27.

⁴Kerygma and Myth. Rudolf Bultmann. E.T. 1953. p.41.

Subsequent critics, including Käsemann, Bornkamm, Ebeling, Fuchs, Dinkler and Conzelmann, however, as Zahrnt's review of the situation brings out, regard Bultmann's attitude here as defeatist, and are investigating the kerygma for its authentic traditions and logia of Jesus,¹ thus following, more or less, Schmidt's conclusions that there is both continuity and difference between Jesus and the kerygma, seen, for example, in the claim of the early Christian Gemeinde to be the ἐκκλησία Θεοῦ in its quality of πῶμα Χριστοῦ.² It is true that many of these modern critics no longer think of beginning on the basis of the Messiahship of Jesus and using that as a central point as Schmidt did. Nonetheless Käsemann writes: "The only category which does justice to (Jesus) claim is completely independent of the question whether he himself did or did not, use and claim it. It is that which was given to him by his disciples, namely the title 'Messiah'."³

For Schmidt the relationship between Proclamation and Church is a many-sided one. Both are from God and arise from His Word and Deed. Both have the world in view, i.e. they do not exist for themselves but for God's purpose for all mankind.

¹Zahrnt. op.cit. pp.93f.

²Revue 1. p.19. See p.48.above.

³Das Problem des historischen Jesus. Ernst Käsemann. 1960. p.206.

Their perspective, therefore, includes the whole of history, from the creation until the final consummation of God's plan and will.¹ What he says in this article about the Christian proclamation making it possible, and necessary, for us to understand the Christian Congregation as Church, he had already indicated in his Jesus Christus article when he underlined the special character of the Gemeinde, the cradle of the Gospel tradition, as "that Gemeinde which presents itself as the Old Testament-New Testament People of God ('Church')." ² Both the early Christian kerygma, the oldest tradition concerning Jesus, and Jesus himself must all be placed in the framework of Old Testament-Jewish tradition, he maintained. The analogy for New Testament writers, of God calling together His people in Christ out of the world was a most natural one.³ "The Church is present everywhere where God assembles His people."⁴ Ekklesia means not our modern term 'Christian Church' but always 'the assembly of God in Christ'. "The One Who is at work in and with the ἐκκλησία is always God."⁵ Hence, Christianity

¹ See p. 333 above.

² RGG. III. p.114.

³ TWNT. III. p.514.

⁴ Revue. 4. p.320.

⁵ TWNT. III. p.507.

was never a cult.¹ Though the different parts of the New Testament came from the hand of different writers, always there was only one Gospel, one kerygma.² For the Urgemeinde, for Paul, for the Evangelists the Proclamation was one and the same, and that Proclamation goes back to the Person and teaching of Jesus. There is more than a hint in what Schmidt writes that the kerygma must have played a major part in creating the Gemeinde rather than the other way round.³ Had it not been so, "we can assign no adequate reason for the emergence of the Church", as C.H. Dodd observes.⁴ The Kerygma and the Ekklesia mutually support one another. "The Gospel is the story of Christ humbling himself, of his being present on earth in the midst of his apostles", Schmidt writes. "Acts is the story of Christ ascended on high and present in his Church, founded by the apostles."⁵ Thus for both kerygma and ekklesia the perspective is always soteriological, arising from the work of the Holy Spirit and from the coming of Jesus as the Messiah, together with the eschatological character of

¹TWNT. III. p.516.

²Revue. 1. p.19.

³Stellung. p.119.

⁴History and the Gospel. pp.77-78.

⁵Revue. 1. p.9.

Jesus' preaching and of the Church's preaching.¹ "God's Deed took place and takes place in Jesus Christ through his Apostles in the Church; God's Word is taught; through God's Deed and Word the Church is led."² Thus, in complete contrast to Bultmann and Dibelius, Schmidt's picture of Jesus Christ is drawn from the kerygma together with the Gospel tradition (including the Johannine tradition), and that picture, he was convinced, therefore corresponds very largely to the historical reality.

Further evidence of the close link Between the Old Testament and the New in all that is said about the ekklesia, is to be found in the First Epistle of Peter. Here the Church is referred to, not by the word ekklesia itself, but in Old Testament terms. "You are a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, God's own people, that you may declare the wonderful deeds of him who called you out of the darkness into his marvellous light. Once you were no people but now you are God's people" (1 Pet.2:9,10). It is this fundamental note of being a divine assembly of men which gives the Church what Dr. Schmidt describes as "unshakable majesty".³ "In the world," he goes on, "there have been and are races, priesthods,

¹Bonn lectures. See p.214 above.

²Galatians. p.10.

³SJTh. p.153.

nations, peoples, of various kinds and many degrees of worth and worthlessness. But there has been and is only one elect race, only one royal priesthood, only one holy nation, only one peculiar people. This is, may be, and must be the Church, as God founded it in Jesus Christ. The real Church is God's own peculiar possession."¹ In Paul's words, it is "the church of God which he has purchased with his own blood" (Acts 20:28).² In this sense the Church is not merely God's instrument through which the Gospel is proclaimed, but is part of the proclamation, indeed is at the heart of the proclamation. This is clear from the nature of the relationship between the kerygma and the ekklesia just discussed, and is even more clearly seen in the relationship between Christ and his Church described in Colossians and Ephesians as $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha\ \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$.³ Schmidt's statement in this connection - "Christology and ecclesiology are reciprocally related" - shows how central a place the Church has in the Gospel.⁴ Similarly, when discussing the way in which the New Testament speaks about the true, new Temple of God, he writes: "God is the Temple, as Christ

¹SJTh.

²RSV reads 'the church of the Lord' here, against the AV and the Nestle text.

³TWNT. III. p.509. See p.82 above.

⁴ibid.

also is, and then also Christians are as the Church, the Body of Christ."¹ It remains true, nevertheless, that the Church, remaining on earth a corpus mixtum, does not possess of itself the quality of divinity or holiness but only has this attributed to it.² This is one main reason why Schmidt frequently, in his writings, referred to the doctrine of justification, even though he did not enter into any detailed discussion of the doctrine.

In this article, however, it is the divine aspect of the Church that he stresses together with the implications of that aspect for its life in the world. "The positive fact that the Church was conceived and created by God - that we men have been accepted by Him as His own and adopted as His children - has its negative side in the fact that the Church has not come into being like any other natural or historical structure. All this together points to the fact that the Church struggles and endures in opposition to this world. This cannot be otherwise, because in our midst the beginning-time and end-time of the God of all eternity stand opposed to this time-series, because the other Kingdom, the Kingdom of God, breaks up this world and its kingdoms without being able here and now completely to supersede them."³ So, the People of God, are

¹ Erbauung. p.18.

² ibid.

³ SJTh. p.154.

'strangers and pilgrims' on the earth, the Church of God is a pilgrim Church, and Abraham, an obedient man of faith, is the pattern and example for the Christian. The fact that Jesus Christ was of Jewish lineage is one further sign of how closely the Church's origins are related to Israel as God's chosen people.¹ This is part of the undeniable, historical facts of God's gift. "Israel's service to Christian and non-Christian mankind as God's gift to them cannot be removed or obscured."²

A further characteristic of the Church as the ekklesia of God is its independence of numbers and organisation. "The Church in the full sense of the term exists wherever the smallest company of true believers in Christ is assembled." Jesus said - "Where two or three are gathered in my name, there am I in the midst of them" (Mt.18:20). "Thus the humblest house congregation can be the Church, whereas a formal Church, be it ever so great, is not necessarily so."³ This in no way suggests, however, that 'Church' equals 'Congregationalism'. The New Testament ἐκκλησία had an inner unity of faith, of proclamation and confession, of instruction and upbuilding. This inner bond manifested itself in outward links - honour and respect (and contributions) to the Mother Church in

¹SJTh. p.155.

²ibid.

³ibid. p.157.

Jerusalem, for example, and the place and hospitality accorded to those travelling between the different congregations.¹ Any notion of congregations being wholly independent of one another "completely misunderstands the New Testament congregation."²

Like the prophets of the Old Testament, the Church, often against human inclination and desire, felt impelled and constrained to reach out to the world with its proclamation. In doing so, it gave the same uncompromising proclamation to all sorts and conditions of men. "The question is raised whether the proclamation to Church people in the congregation has to be different from the proclamation by the congregation to those who stand without. What we have previously affirmed has really answered this question in the negative."³ Paul's Epistle to the Romans, like his speech to the citizens of Athens in Acts 17, includes, among other things, a resounding call to repentance, a reminder of the coming judgment of God, the good news of the resurrection of Jesus Christ. However embarrassing or uncomfortable such proclamation might be to philosophers, it was an unchanging message of the riches of God in Christ being offered to mankind and to be passed on by the

¹SJTh. p.158.

²ibid. p.158.

³ibid. p.161.

Church.¹ Proclamation should rightfully include not only the announcing of the good news but the unveiling, the revealing, the teaching of it so as to persuade, convince, comfort, so that the hearers come to obey the commands of Christ. The message at the heart of the New Testament as embodied in the event of Christ is 'Repent for the Kingdom of Heaven is near.'² It is a call to repent not in order that the Kingdom may come near, but to repent because it is near. "We cannot make it clear enough to ourselves that God's Kingdom, God's Dominion, breaks through even without us. The process to which the Bible witnesses is as plain and simple as that. The one and only question put to us men is whether we take part or not."³ It is a question which should leave us no peace. Its answer is in the prayer which Jesus teaches each of his disciples - "Thy Kingdom come."⁴

¹SJTh.

²ibid. p.163.

³ibid. p.164.

⁴ibid.

"NEW VISTAS" AND LIMITATIONS

By gathering together and presenting the main themes of Karl Ludwig Schmidt's writings concerning the Church, the impression might be given that, setting out as one of the chief initiators and founders of Formgeschichte research,¹ he had then turned away from this to devote his attention more and more exclusively to doctrinal aspects of the New Testament together with consideration of later historical developments, especially on the subject of the Church. As he said himself, study of the Church, particularly the New Testament Church, did become one of his main concerns from 1926 on,² but he would never have claimed to have become a dogmatic theologian and, indeed, very often he failed to draw out the theological implications of his own research. Many scholars still regard his Rahmen as his major work, and to the end of his days he continued his New Testament lectures, seminars, research and writing that fell under his wide scope as a professor of New Testament language and literature.

His notable contributions in the field of New Testament studies fall naturally into two main fields: 1. Investigation

¹See pp. 16 f. above.

²Erbauung. p. 25. See pp. 40, 166 above.

of the literary problems of the New Testament; 2. Philological and Biblical-theological studies in New Testament words and meanings. This, of course, leaves out what ought to be regarded as a third field of operation, namely his work as editor, first of Theologische Blätter and then of the Theologische Zeitschrift, though here his contribution was also outstanding as both Cullmann and Vielhauer point out.¹

Investigation of the Literary Problems

The importance of Schmidt's findings in this field stand out clearly when one examines the situation in New Testament research up to 1919, the year his Rahmen appeared. Until then, discussion had centred mainly around the Gospel sources and how far they bore witness to the historical Jesus, his life, his teaching and his self-consciousness.² The consensus of critical opinion preferred the Synoptic sources as against the 4th. Gospel, and the two-source hypothesis for the Synoptics was fairly generally accepted. Efforts were still being made on some hands to find an Ur-Markus which would provide a really trustworthy historical outline. Much controversy over Wrede's

¹"He was the born, scholarly editor" - Cullmann. *op.cit.* p.6. See pp. 40, 50 f. above. Vielhauer (*op.cit.* pp.208-214) gives a much more detailed account of Schmidt's editorial work.

²cf. Vielhauer. *op.cit.* p.192.

view that Mark's Gospel was dominated by his dogmatic theory of the Messianic secret, and Wellhausen's view that "Mark only collects and sets in order loose sections, stories and sayings", was still going on.¹

Formgeschichte came as a new method of analysing the single sections of the Synoptic tradition according to their 'form', seeking thereby to reach behind our present written sources in order to discover how the handing down process had taken place and thus get closer to the original 'form'.² Schmidt's investigation of the topographical and chronological framework of the Synoptics was an independent yet parallel literary approach to the problem, so that the two methods supplemented one another and formed an advance on the methods of comparative religion and the reaction against rationalisation as found, for example, in the writings of Bousset and Rudolf Otto.³ Of Formgeschichte as a method, Zahrnt says - "in Germany no New Testament study is conceivable without it",⁴ though in this country Hunter, for example, feels that while its aims are laudable, it "has not fulfilled the high hopes

¹See p.20 above.

²See pp.16f. above.

³cf. The Work and Words of Jesus. A.M. Hunter. 1950. p.12.

⁴See p.32 above.

with which it was launched".¹ This may be due in part to the fact that form in itself is not a sufficient criterion of historicity, as William Manson observed.² Schmidt himself was quite well aware of the limitations of the method and warned that, applied to the Christian community in its claim to be the *ἐκκλησία Θεοῦ* in its quality of *σῶμα Χριστοῦ*, "to try to grasp it in a purely sociological manner is not enough and ends up causing errors".³

Much more than his fellow Form critics, Dibelius and Bultmann, Schmidt took up these questions in an effort to limit speculation by more methodical, objective research. In asking such deceptively simple questions as, for instance, 'Is there any genuine topography and chronology of Jesus' public ministry in Mark's Gospel?', he was pointing to the important principle that "the historical problem is complicated for the very reason that in the first instance it is a literary problem. Only after the literary-critical work has been done, can the historian evaluate the outline of the history of Jesus given in the Gospels."⁴ So, in distinction from previous

¹Hunter. *ibid.* p.13. Some "second thoughts" on the subject are given by V. Taylor in *Exp.T.* Sept. 1964. pp.356f.

²Jesus the Messiah. p.25.

³Revue. 1. p.19. See *ff.* 48 above.

⁴Rahmen. p.v. See *ff.* 23, 31 above.

research, he concentrated on the topographical and chronological data as the primary problem, and stressed the importance of keeping the literary and the historical questions strictly separate.¹ "In research in general, historical and literary considerations are far too much mixed up with one another", he wrote.² "The exponents of the Markan hypothesis hold the right literary view that Mark is the oldest Gospel but then proceed to draw the wrong historical conclusion that this Gospel as a whole possesses greater historical value than the other Gospels." Others "hold the right historical view that Mark does not possess this historical value but then proceed to draw the wrong literary conclusion that he was not the writer of the oldest Gospel."³ Careful literary-critical investigation, he maintained, opened the way to a better understanding of the composition and special character of the Gospels.

Some of his conclusions - that Mark's presentation is "not a necklace of loosely strung pearls" but rather a "heap of unstrung pearls" of originally separate pericopae (except for the Passion narrative),⁴ and that the Sitz im Leben of the oldest tradition is to be sought in the early Christian

¹cf. Vielhauer. op.cit. p.193.

²ibid. p.17.

³ibid.

⁴Rahmen. p.281. See †.23 above.

cult and worship and the practical needs of preaching - have been questioned by many subsequent scholars of the New Testament, notably C.H. Dodd, T.W. Manson, J. Jeremias, W.G. Kümmel,¹ though there is general agreement regarding the basic pericope nature of the Gospel tradition from Wrede's day on, e.g. Schweitzer, Streeter, Burkitt, E.F. Scott, V. Taylor, Rawlinson, Dodd himself, and, of course, Dibelius, Bultmann and the Form critics.² As regards the first point, Schmidt remarked rather wryly in his Copenhagen lecture on Formgeschichte that he had come to be regarded as "the great destroyer of the chronology and topography of the Gospels (some congratulating me, others blaming me)", and suggested that Matthew and Luke also distinguished between tradition and composition in their editing of Mark.³ "The sparseness of the Gospels from the biographical point of view comes quite simply from the fact that their authors were not biographers",⁴ and the fact that the history of Jesus is not more homogeneous indeed reflects the evangelists' faithfulness to the tradition. It is harder to understand his apparent limitation of the Sitz im Leben to the Kult, especially in view of his more positive

¹See p. 24 above.

²ibid.

³Revue. 1. p.16.

⁴ibid. p.17.

and conservative attitude than that of the Form critics proper.¹ Certainly his views altered by the time he wrote his Ekklesia article. In it he strongly underlined that the Christian faith never was a 'cult', and he traced the founding of the ekklesia back to Jesus himself.² At any rate, his method and his insistence on separating literary from historical considerations remain factors of permanent value to all New Testament studies and, as Vielhauer notes, the content of his initial work is being "taken up anew in systematic form today".³

The development of Schmidt's thinking on the Church appears very clearly in his Jesus Christus article.⁴ Building on his previous literary researches, he now adds theological definition to the Gemeinde as representing the Old Testament People of God, i.e. the Church, and this "in the framework of eschatology which is peculiar to all statements regarding the People of God from the prophets onward."⁵ Furthermore he stresses

¹See ¶.31 above. Die Stellung der Evangelien in der allgemeinen Literaturgeschichte. p.124.

²TWNT. III. p.516; p.521.

³op.cit. p.192. cf. also Fuller's excellent review of developments of the past 30 years, in The New Testament in Current Study. p.85.

⁴RGG. III.

⁵ibid. col.148. See ¶.117 above.

the connection between the oldest tradition concerning Jesus and the Old Testament-Jewish tradition, and places Jesus himself exclusively within that tradition.¹ Here, Vielhauer suggests, "lies the essential difference between this article (i.e. Schmidt's Jesus Christus) and the 'Jesus' books of Bultmann and Dibelius; the latter attempts to reconstruct a picture of the historical Jesus and his message on the basis of their analysis of the Synoptic tradition, Schmidt constructs a picture of the kerygmatic Jesus Christ on the basis of a consensus of Kerygma and Gospel tradition (including the Johannine tradition) - a picture that, in his opinion, coincides to a large extent with the historical reality."² In spite of the many problems involved which still remain to be solved, the complete picture of Jesus' preaching, deeds and person which Schmidt constructs, is one of "impressive coherence", Vielhauer continues.³ "Schmidt interprets the whole ministry of Jesus eschatologically in close connection (agreement and difference) with Jewish salvation expectation. Convincing on the whole is the characterisation of Jesus' preaching of the rule of God and the demonstration of the inner unity of eschatology, ethical challenge and faith in God in

¹ibid.

²Vielhauer. op.cit. p.200. See p.336 above.

³ibid.

that preaching. Convincing on the whole also, is the demonstration of the interconnection between Jesus' words and deeds (miracles as signs of God's rule)."¹

Of the greatest importance is the historical continuity between the Old Testament and the New. It is upon the close Old Testament links, and not upon psychological or religious categories, that Schmidt claims it to be almost a matter of course that "Jesus of Nazareth, even though we cannot give particulars as to the origin and the separate stages of his Messianic consciousness, knew himself to be the Messiah."² His Ekklesia article develops this important insight a good deal more, and his work, along with that of Traugott Schmidt,³ has opened up completely new vistas of understanding the Biblical doctrine of the Church especially in connection with the Messiahship of Jesus.⁴ If Jesus viewed himself as Son of Man in the Daniel 7 sense, K.L. Schmidt said, "new vistas are opened up as regards the nature and significance of his founding of the Church."⁵ That Jesus' view of himself as

¹Vielhauer. op.cit. p.200.

²RGG. III. col.148.

³cf. Leib Christi. pp.24,118,121. See pp.226 f. above.

⁴See pp. 118, 221, 225 f. above.

⁵TWNT. III. p.521. See p.103 above.

Messiah in the Daniel sense and in the sense of the Isaiah 'Servant of Jehovah' implied the gathering of a community, is also made very strongly by Professor Hunter.¹ A further similar argument is the frequent picture of God, or His Messiah, as Shepherd which implies His flock or People.² But the main argument for the founding of the ecclesia lies in what Jesus did. He "called twelve disciples . . . taught them . . . sent them forth on a mission . . . instituted a covenant with them - all these facts show Jesus deliberately executing his Messianic task of creating a new Israel, the true people of God."³ Jeremias' study of the $\pi\alpha\iota\varsigma$ ($\Theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$) in Is.53 likewise supports the view that the Servant was part of Jesus' interpretation of his Messiahship.⁴

Philological and Biblical-theological Studies

The Jesus Christus article marks a transition from investigation of the literary problems of the New Testament to Biblical-theological considerations. In conjunction with related philological aspects, this brings us to the second main

¹The Unity of the New Testament. pp.47f.

²ibid. p.53.

³ibid. p.55.

⁴Abba. Joachim Jeremias. 1966. pp.197f.

field of Schmidt's work. Again it should be emphasised that these distinctions are in no sense rigid and that naturally there is a good deal of overlapping. Nonetheless it is true that in addition to his ordinary work as a university Professor of New Testament plus all his editorial activities, he did turn a great deal of his attention from 1926 on, to the doctrine of the Church, particularly as contained in the New Testament together with its roots in the Old Testament.

His philological and Biblical-theological studies turned on careful, detailed investigation of key New Testament concepts that have a bearing on the doctrine of the Church and which are all closely interlinked. He regarded this work as a steady process of correcting his theories by closer examination of the New Testament evidence and by consciously attempting to set aside any pre-judgments or assumptions, not reading into, or out of, the text anything not actually there.¹ His approach is in marked contrast to the work of Dibelius and Bultmann. While they concentrated on religious-historical research, Schmidt began from the basic philological-lexicographical data.² His outstanding work in this field began appearing in TWNT³ in major articles on Basileia,⁴

¹See p. 163 above.

²On the new interest in lexicography cf. O. Linton. *op.cit.* p. 145.

³Projected by Kittel in 1928 and still in process of completion.

⁴See pp. 242 f. above.

Ethnos, and Ekklesia,¹ together with numerous smaller articles. Later, when his writing was no longer permitted in Nazi Germany, there came from his pen Oikos, Paroikia,² Polis,³ Pneuma Hagion,⁴ the highly topical 'Opposition of Church and State', the four Copenhagen lectures,⁵ the 'Upbuilding of the Church',⁶ and a number of smaller related works such as 'Ministry and Ministries', booklets on Galatians, Romans 9-11, the Apocalypse, and numerous articles in Judaica and the Theologische Zeitschrift. From this considerable body of material, the following chapter will attempt to draw out the main Biblical-theological results. Here, in his philological-lexicographical studies, Schmidt presents the raw materials, the words themselves, in most illuminating fashion.

His typical treatment of the related words - Basileia, Ethnos, Ekklesia, Polis, Pneuma Hagion, is by no means something apart from the rest of his writing on the Church.⁷ This can

1 See p. 56 above.

2 See p. 42 above.

3 See p. 182 above.

4 See pp. 275f., 299f. above.

5 See p. 212 above.

6 See p. 164 above.

7 See above *passim*.

be seen in the sub-titles of, for example, Die Kirche des Urchristentums¹ - Eine lexikographische und biblisch-theologische Studie, and Die Verstockung des Menschen durch Gott - Eine lexikologische und biblisch-theologische Studie. In the section of the Erbauung article in which he refers to the development of his studies on the Church he again concluded on a lexicological note - this time on the word παροιμία. His Polis article he sub-titled Eine lexikographische und exegetische Studie. Even in his Going through Galatians, written for less theologically trained readers, he emphasised the importance of words. Just as any educated person knows at least something of the meaning of terms from other languages such as Nirvana, Karma, Tao, Taboo, they should also build up a vocabulary of Greek words, he advised.² Many words (kosmos, dynamis, pistis in Galatians, for instance) cannot be properly conveyed by one single German (or English) word.³

This characteristic lexicographical-lexicological approach for him included philology in its widest sense, using etymology and lexicology to arrive at the derivation and original meaning, the sources and history, the proper signification and use, in short, the 'life' of the word in question. His

¹See pp. 124 f. above.

²Galatians. pp. 102f.

³ibid. p. 104.

fondness of the phrase 'Ad fontes!' expresses this concern to mine out, through study of the words, the given facts of the New Testament texts. According to his Basel colleague, Professor Cullmann, "his two concerns - philological and historical examination of the text, and determination of its theological content only after stripping away all pre-judgments imported into the text from outside - that make him one of the most eminent of the founders of the so-called formgeschichtliche method of research into the Gospels."¹

What is not always recognised is that words and their use are governed by discernible laws. Professor Theofil Spoerri has defined these as - 1. the law of the hermeneutic circle, i.e. that in the exegesis of a text the single word can only be understood from the context, and that the whole sentence, in order to achieve its meaning, is dependent on the single word; 2. language is an event, a movement, and when spoken or written is the highly personal expression of the individual self; 3. this movement always has direction, intentionality; word and recipient are closely linked.² "To speak is, at the same time, to hear", Heidegger said. "Indeed, not just at the same time. Listening comes first. . . . We do not only speak the language, we speak out of the language."³ "It may

¹Karl Ludwig Schmidt. p.3. See p.17 above.

²"Sprache, Denken und menschliches Wesen" in Die Spur. June, 1967.

³ibid. cf. Unterwegs zur Sprache. Martin Heidegger. 1959. p.254.

come as a surprise to realise," Spoerri says, that the desire of every individual to be a human being "only happens through the roundabout way of language."¹

These vital elements of context, history and intention that go to make up the aliveness of words can all be detected in Schmidt's philological-lexicographical studies, though he may never have heard of the three laws. Kittel's successor in the editorship of TWNT, Professor Gerhard Friedrich of Erlangen, likewise drew attention to similar aspects of the vitality of words. The etymology of a word carries far-reaching theological consequences, he noted. Words are not like lifeless, unchanging stones but are alive and developing, with a history that needs to be taken into account in establishing meanings.² With Schmidt's keen mind, his background of wide reading and careful scholarship, the lexical method, as well as the words examined, came to life and that life has carried over into his Biblical-theological conclusions.

Word and Deed

A further factor of great importance for lexicological investigation of the New Testament is one that goes beyond

¹Spoerri. op.cit. He also notes the importance for modern linguistics of the work of Ferdinand Ebner, Martin Buber, Gabriel Marcel, and of the dialectic of such theologians as Barth and Brunner. ²In his foreword to TWNT. VII~~4~~ (though he also edited Vols. V and VI). See p. 56 above.

philology into theology, namely, the closeness of the link, in the New Testament, between word and deed. Schmidt was well aware of this connection. The kerygma was a historical proclamation, I often heard him say; it was Christology, not mythology. Pointing to the limitations of Formgeschichte, he would insist that the important aspect of a particular saying or incident in the Gospels was not so much the form but rather Who spoke thus, Who acted thus.¹ When Jesus, the Christ (i.e. the Messiah), spoke, miracles followed. His words were effective. Thus the paralytic was healed, Levi rose up and followed him, the leper was cleansed, Jairus' daughter was raised.² Conversely, by the miracles he performed he preached the word of God. In like manner the apostles did not merely preach the word. They acted constantly in obedience to the direction of the Spirit and the record of this is rightly called "The Acts of the Apostles".³ Where they preached the Gospel, signs followed, miracles happened. Word and deed are inseparably linked. The verbum efficax is linked to the Messiah.⁴ "In the New Testament word and deed are united by

¹See p. 38 above.

²See p. 216 above.

³See p. 222 above.

⁴Polis. p. 37.

a tight, unbreakable bond; for God as for His Envoy the two things constitute one single happening", Schmidt wrote.¹ "With man there has been a divorce between word and deed; with God and with Christ Their word is deed, and Their deed, word. Men of old have well expressed this by speaking of the verbum efficax of God".² He returned to this same theme in the second Copenhagen lecture, pointing out that in the Gospel records the miracles of Jesus "are placed on the same level as his words".³ Indeed, Jesus' word of power followed by its corresponding deed or event, constrained him to accept publicly the claim to be the Messiah with all that that would involve.⁴ Similarly in the third lecture, he notes that Jesus Christ as the Ambassador of God not only demands faith but gives faith.⁵ God, Christ, the Holy Spirit, are at one and the same time both Subject and Object of faith.⁶ Equally,

¹In the first Copenhagen lecture. Revue. 1. p.24. See p. 222 above.

²ibid.

³ibid. pp.44-45.

⁴ibid. p.52.

⁵Revue. 2. p.126.

⁶ibid. p.127. Although, as Brunner observed, "the concepts of objectivity and subjectivity are themselves inadequate . . . for they belong to the 'It' world, and not to the world of personal encounter." The Theology of Emil Brunner by Professor David Cairns in Exp.T. Nov. 1964. p.55. See also p. 414 below.

as Lord, Christ lives, teaches, leads at one and the same time. In him there is no separation between life and doctrine, or between doctrine and guidance. "Through God's Deed and Word the Church is led".¹ Word and deed are linked in the Basileia article too. The word of God's kingdom goes hand in hand with the deeds of God's sovereignty.²

Ekklesia

It was Hort who pointed out the importance of the word ekklesia. It is, he wrote, "the only perfectly colourless word within our reach, carrying us back to the beginnings of Christian history, and enabling us in some degree to get behind words and names to the simple facts which they originally denoted."³ Schmidt's article on the word is a striking example of the value of the philological approach. From the etymology of the word the New Testament is seen to be avoiding a cultic word and to be using an ordinary, secular Greek word.⁴ Ekklesia, however, is primarily and fundamentally linked to the same word in the LXX and to the history of Israel as the

¹Galatians. p.10. See p.304 above.

²BKW. p.41; TWNT. I. p.583.

³op.cit. p.2. See pp.4,60 above.

⁴See p.67 above. TWNT. III. p.516.

People of God and assembly of God.¹ The important point is always who assembles and why. Hence the only attribute attached to ekklesia is ἄσπεθελῶ which is always to be understood even when not written.² Size is of no account. What stands out is that "each community, however small, represents the total community, the Church."³ Cerfaux, who finds that Schmidt presents in the main as "acceptable theory", questions making Church and Church of God one and the same.⁴ He would like to make a distinction between the church universal and the local congregation. "The notion of the 'people of God' is one thing, and the history of the word ekklesia is another. We cannot conclude that this history is a simple one. We have no indication that the word ever connoted the universal Church, directly and explicitly. We have no proof that 'church' and 'Church of God' are synonymous."⁵ He also sought to show from Pauline usage, that 'Church of God' was "the special name for the church of Jerusalem."⁶ Here,

¹Festgabe. p.268.

²TWNT. III. p.505.

³ibid. p.506. See p.72 above.

⁴op.cit. p.107.

⁵ibid. p.107.

⁶ibid. p.115.

however, Schmidt's arguments are supported far more convincingly by the evidence.¹ The Old Testament link seems definitely established.

Study of the Pauline ekklesia references brings out the important point that, contrary to the widely held view that Paul had developed a new view of the Church which was in conflict with the view of the primitive Jerusalem congregation, Paul and the Jerusalem apostles held essentially the same view of the Church. All the disciples recognised that "the assembly of God stands or falls with its sole foundation and continuance in the Messiah Jesus, with its recognition of Christ alone as Lord."² Paul, indeed, traces its roots back to God guiding Moses.

These important points are not yet strictly a 'doctrine' of the Church. A specific doctrine (in the New Testament) is to be found for the first time in the Epistles to the Colossians and Ephesians, in Schmidt's opinion.³ Here he touches, of course, on the ekklesia as the Body of Christ but strangely enough he never develops this theologically in any depth. What he does emphasise strongly is the close relationship, the essential connection, between ecclesiology and

¹Best also takes issue with Cerfaux's views. One Body in Christ. p.104.

²TWNT. III. p.509. See p. 81 above.

³ibid. p.509.

Christology. The core of Paul's doctrine of the Church lay in fellowship with Christ.¹ The Church is the Body of Christ on the one hand; it is $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\kappa\tau\omicron\varsigma$ on the other hand. Paul's language, taking into account the circumstances the early Church was facing, was not necessarily always logical and consistent, but it was certainly not Gnostic speculation. A true doctrine of the Church cannot be reached by means of a historical, sociological or mystical approach, Schmidt held. "In Paul, in his disciples, and then in the Fourth Evangelist, ecclesiology is simply Christology and vice versa."² This ecclesiology and this Christology, however, are of a quite distinct and definite character. They are part of the New Covenant, a New Covenant that goes back to the Old Covenant, for God established both, the same God Who speaks in Christ. So "the New Testament assembly of God in Christ is none other than the fulfilled Old Testament assembly of God."³

Another important step for the construction of a doctrine of the Church is taken with his very full investigation of the ekklesia references in Mt.16:18 and 18:17 whose authenticity is questioned by many critics.⁴ Schmidt raises some very

¹ TWNT. III. p.512. See p.85 above.

² *ibid.*

³ *ibid.*

⁴ See p.99 f. above.

strong points in their favour. No significant MS omits them. Even Bultmann agrees they have undoubted Semitic colour.¹ T.W. Manson allowed that Mt.16:18 was "of Palestinian origin", the strongest argument against it being "the fact that it is not mentioned by the Fathers of the 2nd. Century." But then he goes on to answer his own argument very convincingly.² It is true the verses do not appear in Mark or Luke, the main argument against authenticity, Schmidt says.³ But those who use this argument do not satisfactorily explain the presence of the verses in Matthew. Moreover there are many other verses in Matthew which are accepted without question though they too do not occur in Mark or Luke. That these verses contain the only three instances of the word ekklesia itself in the Gospels, is not too surprising since the concept of the Church is often present. The Cross never occurs in the Epistle to the Romans, Cullmann pointed out, although it is mainly dealing with the atoning death of Christ.⁴ MacGregor argues that the differences in usage between Mt.16:18 and 18:17 casts further suspicion on their authenticity, but Dodd clearly shows that Matthew uses ekklesia in the same two senses

¹cf. Fuller. op.cit. p.52.

²The Sayings of Jesus. p.203. See p.102 above.

³TWNT. III. p.519. See p.101 above.

⁴Peter. p.187.

that Paul does.¹ To the cardinal theological question - Could Jesus, the preacher of the Kingdom of God, have founded an ekklesia? - Schmidt replies that this is "really the question of (Jesus') Messiahship" and of his instituting the Lord's Supper.² In this light the Church is also an eschatological entity and is not only compatible with the idea of the Kingdom but in a sense is required by the Kingdom.³

On the problem of Jesus' words to Peter, Flew strongly supports Schmidt's reasoned arguments, whereas Kümmel remains unconvinced.⁴ Johnston held it to be a "safe inference" that Mark knew nothing of any such promise to Peter but, after noting all the difficulties, adds - "it is possible to argue that a genuine saying does lie behind Mt.16:18."⁵ O. Linton, Johnston, Fuller, all discuss the cleavage of opinion regarding the verses and indicate that a majority of critics do not think they are authentic.⁶ One of the most up-to-date

¹op.cit. p.123; New Testament Studies. p.57.

²TWNT. III. p.521.

³cf. O. Linton. op.cit. p.172; Introducing New Testament Theology. A.M. Hunter. p.34.

⁴See p.112 above.

⁵op.cit. p.50. G.K. Barrett, on the other hand, states flatly: "The verse falls out of consideration." (Jesus and the Gospel Tradition. 1967. p.73.)

⁶See pp.102 f. above.

reviews of the whole situation regarding the ekklesia, the relation of Jesus and the Church, the Church and the Holy Spirit, the Body of Christ, the Church and eschatology, has been compiled by J.R. Nelson who makes numerous references to K.L. Schmidt's views and brings out both the centrality of questions regarding the nature of the Church and the wide variety of opinion on almost every aspect of the problem.¹ Bornkamm highlights the scope of the divergence of opinion by noting that Cullmann felt that the authenticity of Mt.16:17f. cannot seriously be questioned, while von Campenhausen felt equally strongly that the founding of the Church on Peter is unthinkable.² At any rate, as Bishop Nygren points out, "Christ and Church belong inseparably together."³ The fact that many scholars question the authenticity of the passage, the Bishop feels, "raises the suspicion that the difficulty lies less in the text than in the presuppositions with which the exegete approaches it."⁴ What emerges is that the problems here are not questions "to which we are likely to find an

¹The Realm of Redemption. Studies in the Doctrine of the Nature of the Church in contemporary Protestant Theology. 1951.

²op.cit. p.254. See p.108 above.

³Christ and His Church. p.13. cf. Gustaf Aulén: "The Church and Christ belong together. They constitute an inseparable unity." (The Faith of the Christian Church. E.T. 1960. p.294).

⁴ibid. p.16.

answer with which everybody will be convinced", as Streeter commented.¹ Schmidt held very firmly that from a literary and textual point of view Mt.16:17-19 must be considered just as genuine as the surrounding verses, 16:13-16 and 20.² But he was just as clear that "Jesus' so-called founding of the Church does not stand or fall by Mt.16:18. It is not an isolated act which is spoken of there but one to be understood out of Jesus' overall attitude towards his people, among whom, for whom and in opposition to whom, he gathered a council of Twelve as a special כְּנִיּוּטָא , and commissioned them to represent the קהל יהוה."³

Die Kirche des Urchristentums is of particular interest in being on certain points a halfway house between the Jesus Christus and the Ekklesia articles. It is possible, for example, to trace the growing emphasis on the New Testament - Old Testament link, and the growing emphasis on the central point of the Church being Jesus the Messiah - good examples of how "semantics lead to Biblical theology", as Schmidt puts it.⁴ "The question whether Jesus made his disciples into the ἐκκλησία

¹The Four Gospels. p.258.

²Festgabe. p.282.

³ibid. p.292. See p.134 above.

⁴ibid. p.264.

must be answered in the affirmative."¹ To understand how this happened requires not only that we avoid treating Mt.16:18 in isolation but also that we take into account the tradition complexes dealing with "the so-called Messiah consciousness and the so-called institution of the Last Supper."² A properly developed Christology of Jesus as Son of Man, Messiah, Christ, "leads directly to the Pauline and deutero-Pauline understanding of the ἐκκλησία which is ἄνωθεν on the one hand and yet also σῶμα Χριστοῦ on the other, just as Christ is both exalted on the one hand and yet also present in the community on the other."³ Such statements contain the elements for his doctrine of the Church even though he does not go on to any specific statement of a doctrine. Instead, he preferred to stress the basic unity of the Jewish Christian and the Gentile Christian communities on these matters and to show that whatever speculative or sacramental aspects are to be found in Paul's thought, these all bear the prefix or key signature that "the σῶμα Χριστοῦ is one and the same as the Old Testament ἐκκλησία τοῦ Θεοῦ."⁴ These observations, too, have a bearing on the doctrine of the Church but likewise are not in themselves the statement of a doctrine.

¹Festgabe. p.293.

²ibid.

³TWNT. III. p.521. See p.150 above.

⁴Festgabe. p.314. See p.157 above.

In his investigation of the institution of the Lord's Supper he relies heavily on Kattenbusch's conclusion that for Jesus as Son of Man "the Last Supper was the act of founding his ἐκκλησία, his congregation (Gemeinde) as such."¹ He diverges from Kattenbusch, however, in arguing for a modified Lucan account of the institution as being basically older than Paul's in 1 Cor. 11, a view clearly outdated by Jeremias' authoritative and comprehensive The Eucharistic Words of Jesus.² The writings of Schürmann, E.F. Scott, Burkitt, Kattenbusch, Hort, Flew, Johnston, Kümmel and others, all show how complex the problem is, and Jeremias himself observes - "I no longer consider this (the Markan) account as the oldest form of the tradition; rather I should prefer to think that in the earliest times we have to reckon with quite a number of parallel versions behind which the Urform lies hidden."³ Schmidt's treatment of the complex in his Jesus Christus, Die Kirche des Urchristentums and Ekklesia is of additional interest, however, as here especially the change and development of his thinking from a more or less sceptical historical approach to one centred on Jesus as Messiah, supported by careful analysis of the whole Old and New Testament record.⁴ Obviously there would

¹Der Quellort der Kirchenidee. p.295.

²See pp. 138 f. above.

³op.cit. p.7.

⁴See p. 137 above.

have been no Church without the Cross and Resurrection, but that in no way invalidates Schmidt's view of the centrality of the Last Supper for the founding of the Church, a view very much in accord with Hort's words - "the Twelve sat that evening as representatives of the Ecclesia at large."¹

Eschatology

From the comparatively small number of references to the Kingdom of God in Schmidt's writings on the Church it is something of a surprise to recall that his first major article for TWNT was on the word Basileia.² In it his lexicographical approach is not so exhaustive as in his Ekklesia article, but his method is already in evidence. Examination of the Biblical texts shows that the expression βασιλεία (τοῦ) Θεοῦ "dominates the entire New Testament."³ From such investigation two important insights come to light. For basileia "the essential meaning is not realm but sway" and it comes, not by human effort, but "through an intervention of God from heaven."⁴

Schmidt was quite well aware of the importance of eschatological considerations, especially in the investigation

¹The Christian Ecclesia. p.30.

²See H. 242 f. above.

³BKW. p.134.

⁴ibid. pp.37-8.

of such concepts as Basileia, Ekklesia, Polis. In the Erbauung talk he began by taking up Brunner's observation that eschatology is usually left too much in the background, and then went on to draw attention to the need to consider the eschatological aspect of the Church.¹ He saw a close parallel between the New Testament usage of βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ and ἐκκλησία τοῦ Θεοῦ, though the two are not synonymous.² The primitive community regarded itself as the ekklesia and continued to preach the basileia.³ Indeed, it is for the ekklesia, the remnant and kernel of the People of God that the βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ or τῶν οὐρανῶν is intended, and the constituting of the disciples as the ἡγεῖα ἡπρ receives its meaning "first through the reference to the coming and mysteriously already dawning kingly rule of God in His ἡγεῖα."⁴ Traugott Schmidt had pointed to this consciousness of the young Christian community of being the true Israel, the community the Messiah would gather round himself according to eschatological expectation.⁵ For Karl Ludwig Schmidt,

¹Erbauung. p.5. See pp. 168 f. above.

²TWNT. III. p.507.

³ibid. p.522.

⁴Festgabe. p.293.

⁵op.cit. p.121.

too, the Messiah was at the centre of the eschatology.

Writing of the Church's goal, marked out for eternity by God

Himself, he writes - "The beginning and end rest in the

Messiah Jesus, who, as the One sent by God, is Alpha and

Omega."¹ The question as to how far the Polis or the Basileia,

which are future, coming from above, can be regarded as here

now "can only be answered thus: the inbreaking Kingdom of

God has come into time and into the world in the messianic

Person, Jesus of Nazareth. What for Christians is and remains

future, something they long for, is in Jesus Christ, and only

in him, a 'Today' (cf. Lk.4:21 - σήμερον)."² He also points

out that "the beginning-time and end-time of the God of all

eternity stand opposed to this (world's) time-series" and that

"the Kingdom of God breaks up this world and its kingdom

without being able here and now completely to supersede them."³

O. Linton showed that, since the time of Weiss and his view that for Jesus the rule of God was a supernatural, escha-

tological entity, much discussion has centred on a supposed

opposition between the Church, as being an earthly entity, and

eschatology.⁴ On this view, many critics argued that since

¹Polis. p.39.

²ibid. Later in the article he says - Polis, Kingdom, Church, are all eschatological-Christological matters. p.109.

³SJTh. p.154.

⁴op.cit. p.121.

Jesus preached the Kingdom he could not have willed an earthly institution. Others simply transferred to the Church categories properly belonging to the Kingdom of God.¹ Schmidt answers both errors. "Ecclesiology is simply Christology and vice versa", he says more than once.² "In the perspective of the Kingdom of God and His Messiah Jesus, the Church, the congregation, the assembly of God in Jesus Christ, alone is the true Israel of the New Covenant, i.e. the 'Kingdom line' and the 'Church line' are to be regarded as one line, on which the Kingdom of God is promised to the Church of God in Jesus Christ."³ The Church, however, remains a corpus mixtum and "will come to an end in the future aeon when God is all in all and when the Kingdom of God alone is present. It cannot be emphasised enough that Church and Kingdom of God are two different things."⁴ Though the two are closely linked, there is also a difference between the Church and the Kingdom of Christ, since the latter is more far-reaching than the Church.⁵ Only God, only Jesus Christ, can build the Church, which is

¹ ibid. See p. 172 above.

² TWNT. III. p. 512.

³ Die Judenfrage. p. 72.

⁴ Erbauung. p. 18.

⁵ ibid.

an outreach of his Messiahship. The Church, like the justified sinner, remains under the promise, looking to the future when the promise will be fulfilled but here and now remaining a corpus mixtum, a κηρσίον, a 'fore-sign' pointing to the Kingdom of God.¹ The Kingdom belongs to God and He attributes it to men just as He attributes justification to the sinner. It does not come by any action of man's but its nearness demands acceptance or rejection. "Who could give God this entire obedience? Here is the answer: there has been one and one only, Jesus Christ himself.² . . . Christians are only the βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ in a derived sense, in so far as they belong to Christ."³

Schweitzer, in his attempt to "interpret the whole teaching of Jesus in exclusively futuristic terms", viewed the Church as "completely synonymous with the Kingdom."⁴ As we have seen, Schmidt opposed this. "The Church in this aeon is and remains a corpus mixtum which does not possess of itself the quality of divinity or holiness but only has this attributed to it (this, and not otherwise, is how justification

¹See p. 218 above.

²Revue. 2. p.151. From this, Schmidt notes, Origen got his term κῆρσίον. See pp. 187, 246, above.

³ibid.

⁴cf. Lundström. op.cit. p.74.

operates)." ¹ Equally strongly he opposed any division of the Church into visible and invisible parts. "The Church is always visible precisely as an individual is visible. Her only invisible possession rests in having been chosen by God, justified and sanctified by Him. The Kingdom of God on the other hand is invisible. Once only has it been present in Jesus Christ the Messiah, but in Jesus Christ completely clothed in the messianic mystery." ² The early Church was well aware of the difference between Kingdom and Church. When the two become confused or assimilated grave errors ensue. The early Fathers largely held to the New Testament view but soon the metaphysics of Plato and the ethics of the Stoa caused a shift in emphasis from eschatology to individual improvement, culminating in Augustine's identification of the Kingdom of God with the Church. ³ It was the emphasis on eschatology that made Biblical theism so different from Stoicism, Platonism and pantheism, Schmidt maintained, for citizenship in the heavenly Polis embraces both the Kingdom of God and the Church. "In so far as Christians on earth live as citizens of heaven, the heavenly Polis is represented by the Church, for which the Kingdom of God that she proclaims is destined." ⁴ Over against

¹Erbauung. p.18.

²Revue. 2. p.153.

³BKW. p.59.

⁴Polis. p.109.

the world, the Church has a permanent dual role. Called together by God in Christ, her real citizenship in heaven, she lives in this world as an alien, a stranger, a sojourner. "The Church of the New Testament is ἐκκλησία and παροιμία, or, rather - as ἐκκλησία it is therefore also παροιμία ".¹ The Church "finds herself in opposition to States because she herself points to the true State, the heavenly Polis."² Church members are only 'at home' (in God, in Christ) in that they are 'not at home' (in the world).³

What is missing in Schmidt's treatment of eschatology can be seen clearly in the light of 'realised eschatology'. Not only does he limit the 'realised' element to the Messiah (which, up to a point, is correct) but the Kingdom comes "mysteriously", present only once in Jesus Christ "completely clothed in the messianic mystery",⁴ and he does not really apply eschatology fundamentally and consistently in interpreting the results derived from his lexicographical-lexicological investigations or in the drawing out of a doctrine of the Church from these results. His eschatology is basically futuristic and of the era previous to the developments of

¹TWNT. V. p.850.

²Polis. p.110.

³Erbauung. p.10.

⁴See H. 240, 245 above.

Realised Eschatology. Neither in the Basileia article nor in his later writings does he take Realised Eschatology into account. Where he discusses the Mk.1:15 ἡγγικεν (in his Basileia), he mentions but does not take up Dodd's interpretation, emphasising instead the "entirely miraculous nature" of the Kingdom, on the one hand, and that it is a "cosmic catastrophe", on the other.¹ "The realisation of God's sovereignty is future and this future conditions man in the present," he wrote. This is not very far removed from Harnack's view,² though it would be fair to add that much of what Schmidt wrote later modifies this statement considerably. Lundström, who mentions these features of the miraculous and the catastrophic in his evaluation of Schmidt's views, is not wholly correct in maintaining that Schmidt held the Kingdom of God was opposed to the here and now and that any question of realisation was entirely future.⁴ One has only to think of Schmidt's view of the Messiah, for instance.⁵ However, Lundström's evaluation seems to be based on a few of Schmidt's earlier writings,

¹ BKW. pp.44-45.

² ibid. p.48.

³ cf. Lundström's review of the topic. op.cit. p.35.

⁴ The Kingdom of God in the Teaching of Jesus. p.144.

⁵ Revue. 2. p.153. See also †.2.21 above.

notably Basileia, Jesus Christus, and Le problème du christianisme primitif, whereas major developments in Schmidt's Biblical-theological thinking regarding the Kingdom, the Messiah Jesus and the Church come to light in Ekklesia, Polis, Erbauung, Pneuma Hagion, and other later writings not mentioned by Lundström.¹ Dodd also later modified his 'realised eschatology' to 'inaugurated eschatology', (sich realisierende Eschatologie, in Jeremias' phrase), as being less open to misinterpretation and to counter the criticism, Kümmel's for example, that his theory more or less struck eschatology of the future out of Jesus' preaching.² Dahl drew attention to the importance of eschatology as a factor for a better understanding of the New Testament Church, which is an 'eschatological community'.³ "This does not only mean that the Church has an eschatological hope for the future," he points out, "but also that the very existence of the Church is

¹op.cit. p.143.

²Das Neue Testament. p.555. Kümmel also notes that Catholic theology (Karl Adam, for example) tends to oppose any view of immediate eschatological expectation in relation to Jesus. Heilsgeschehen und Geschichte. p.48. Re Dodd's views - Verheissung und Erfüllung. pp.11, 17, 20, 51f. V. Taylor observes that the work of A.T. Cadoux, C.H. Dodd, and J. Jeremias in connecting the parables with the life situation of Jesus during His ministry, may have "been carried too far, to the virtual elimination of the eschatological aspects of the parables in the teaching of Jesus." (Exp.T. Sept. 1964. p.357).

³The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology. Part II. No.22.

due to what Professor Dodd has called 'Realised Eschatology'.¹ In so far as this eschatology is centred solely on the Messiah it is also an important element in Schmidt's thought, but it is never widely applied and at times hardly seems to affect the other issues he deals with. The problem of the vital relationship between the future and the present in connection with the Kingdom and the Church is not one he goes into in any detail. It is a complex subject in itself. Kingdom, one of the English translators of Schmidt's Basileia article, prefers Jeremias' view of New Testament eschatology, i.e. as being in process of realisation, but adds the cautionary note - "We may do well to remember that it is often a telos, rather than an eschaton - or any '-ology' - that is referred to as being realised in the New Testament."² Lundström rather sweepingly criticises Dodd's theory as being "English Incarnation-theology" with a "strong thread of Platonic influence, as a result of which the Biblical conception of time has no place. Futuristic eschatology disappears, and all that is left is 'the eschaton' as the Eternal."³ Cullmann, who points out that the philosophical idea of eternity as timelessness is alien to the New Testament, suggests that the

¹ ibid. p.422.

² BKW. p.vi.

³ op.cit. p.121.

answer lies in the fact that the New Testament brings in a new division of time with its centre in Jesus, so that time is not regarded as 'Here - Beyond' but is divided into Before - Now - Afterwards, i.e. a linear concept linked to the history of salvation.¹ Possibly the closest to the New Testament idea of eschatology is William Manson when he pointed to the essential bi-polarity in Christianity. For we must say - 'The End has come! The End has not come!', both at the same time.² The Kingdom's urgency was a moral urgency. Jesus saw what the nation lacked. "Alone in Israel's history He recognised that God's Kingdom needed not to be waited for, but to be received by faith."³

Conclusions

The two scholars best acquainted with Karl Ludwig Schmidt's writings and contribution in the field of New Testament studies, Oscar Cullmann and Philipp Vielhauer, agree in pointing to his outstanding achievements in literary criticism, as represented by his Rahmen, and in Biblical theology, as represented by his major articles in TWNT, which show,

¹cf. Lundström. op.cit. p.225.

²"Eschatology in the New Testament". SJTh. p.7. cf. V. Taylor: "Discussions as to whether the Kingdom is present or future are barren; it is obviously both." (Jesus and His Sacrifice. p.9). See also p.177 above.

³Jesus and the Christian. p.168.

Cullmann says, "both his analytical thoroughness and his somewhat more limited capacity for synthesis."¹ This lack of synthesis is one of the main factors which make it difficult to appreciate fully (a) the scope and freshness of the results of his investigations; and (b) the value for all research of his aims and method. It is true that he makes no use of Realised Eschatology, says comparatively little about the Body of Christ in any developed theological sense, deals only in passing with the problem of the Church visible and invisible² and with the doctrine of justification, though the latter is mentioned several times,³ and his views on the institution of the Last Supper are largely outdated in the light of later research. Except for a few broad comments on the Church Fathers and a few references to Luther there is very little development of the doctrine of the Church outside the New Testament.⁴ All this would not have been so important if he had drawn out the theological implications of his most valuable philological, literary and historical studies. But this he did not do and possibly for this reason his work to some extent remains inconclusive.

¹Karl Ludwig Schmidt. p.5.

² See pp. 122, 159, 237 above.

³ See pp. 106, 122, 157, 199, 217, 231 above.

⁴ See pp. 119 f., 223, 247 above.

On the positive side, however, the wide variety, scholarship and originality of his writings, many of them gathered together here for the first time in English, form a veritable gold mine for the New Testament student and for a Biblical understanding of the Ekklesia that has both critical value for research and practical implications for present-day ecumenical considerations. Vielhauer underlines the permanent value of his lexicographical-lexicological studies and his insistence on keeping literary and historical questions strictly separate.¹ One can point to the importance of his detailed studies of historical problems such as those raised by Mt.16:18 or the relationship between Paul and the Urgemeinde, to his stress on the historical continuity between the Old Testament and the New and on the inseparable Biblical link between Word and Deed. One can turn again and again to all he has to say about the Messiah and the unbreakable bonds between Jesus and the Church. One can note the "impressive coherence" of the consensus of Kerygma and Gospel tradition in presenting a unified picture of such complexes as Jesus, Messiah, Son of Man, Disciples, the Lord's Supper, leading directly to the Pauline understanding of the ἐκκλησία which is both ἀνωθεν and ὄνωμα Χριστοῦ, as Schmidt pieces it all together.² It is

¹op.cit. p.193.

²See Mt. 150 f. above.

possible, as Vielhauer suggests, that he sometimes "undervalued the Hellenistic element and overvalued the Old Testament-Jewish element" in developing his views but, as Vielhauer immediately adds, he was never a 'Rabbinist' or opposed in that sense to 'Hellenists' among New Testament scholars.¹ Schmidt was "too sovereign, too independent, too widely read and learned a scholar to be tagged with any of these false labels. Rather, it was his theological conviction not only that early Christianity stems historically out of Judaism but that there exists an inseparable salvation-history connexion between 'Church' and 'Israel'."² A great deal of his work, as Cullmann indicates, grew out of living contact with life, the life of the Church, of the university, and of the world.³ He wrote for the scholar - and for the ordinary Church member. He spoke to Jung and his intellectual circle, to students, to radio audiences. In his own experience he knew what it was to be called by God and to be a stranger and a sojourner, as is the Church. His philological approach and his constant aim to hold to a steady process of correcting theories by closer examination of the Biblical texts without prejudice, will long continue to shed light on the pathway to Biblical understanding

¹ op.cit. p.204.

² ibid.

³ op.cit. p.5f.

so necessary for the Church in its "unceasing battle for
God's righteousness on earth."¹

¹Erbauung. p.29.

SCHMIDT'S DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH

Looking for a doctrine of the Church in the writings of Karl Ludwig Schmidt is like looking for a doctrine of the Church in the New Testament. In both cases it is there, but in neither is it systematised or presented as a doctrine. Furthermore the problems of ecclesiology are so many-sided that some scholars, Father Rahner for instance, hold that "a proper history of ecclesiology has not yet been written", since "such a history would not only need to have as adequate a grasp as possible, and make as complete a collection as possible, of what has been said about the Church in each period, and by the different Fathers - but would also have to give its particular attention to what was uppermost in the Church's consciousness during the different periods."¹ What is clear is that in the New Testament the Church is so central that it is referred to directly some 115 times and it is very often implied even when not specifically mentioned. It is true that the word itself, ekklesia, occurs only three times in the Gospels, all in St. Matthew.² Yet, as Professor Mackintosh wrote, "Just as you cannot say 'citizen' without

¹Theological Investigations. Vol.II. Karl Rahner. 1963. p.5.

²See p.99 above.

implying the State, you cannot say 'Christian' without in turn implying the Church."¹ Schmidt's writings make it clear that, likewise, it is impossible to speak of Jesus the Messiah without implying the Church, one Church, gathered by him to be his Body, the fellowship of the Holy Spirit. From the story of the Primitive Church in the early part of Acts "we ought not, perhaps, to speak of them as having 'a doctrine of the Church'", Professor Hunter comments, but "they certainly held certain basic convictions about themselves", claiming to be the true people of God, holding a common allegiance to Maran-Jesus, being endowed with God's Spirit, and having a mission to fulfil.²

Schmidt's writings cover a vast variety of different points concerning the Church so that it becomes a hazardous task to single out some fundamental aspects towards formulating his 'doctrine', without seeming to neglect others, also important. There are, however, certain basic convictions about the nature of the Church in all he writes, certain recurring themes which show that the Church (a) is built by God, (b) is rooted in the Messiah Jesus, (c) is the People of God, the Body of Christ, the fellowship of the Holy Spirit, and (d) is on earth a pilgrim People.

¹The Divine Initiative. H.R. Mackintosh. 1921. p.89.

²The Unity of the New Testament. p.60.

The Church is what God builds

For the doctrine of the Church a primary consideration is that the Church is $\kappa\lambda\iota\kappa\alpha$. It is the building of God, i.e. what God has built, and is building, and will build. It is from above, by God's initiative, not a human invention or association.¹ It is, in Paul's words, "the ekklesia of God which he has purchased with his own blood" (Acts 20:28).² It is God assembling His own. "It depends first on the One who calls and gathers it, and only then on those who answer the call and gather together. 'For where two or three are gathered in my name, there am I in the midst of them' (Mt.18:20)."³ Some modern Catholic writers stress this same point. "Of course, without the decision, without the faith, of the individual, there would be no Church. But, before that, there is the call of God," writes Father Küng. "This is what constitutes the Church and alone makes possible the response of faith... Only as con-vocatio Dei is there con-gregatio fidelium, only as institutio Dei is there communio sanctorum."⁴ Schmidt's emphasis on God as the Builder of the Church, based

¹TWNT. III. p.505.

²AV.

³TWNT. III. p.505. See p.70 above.

⁴Die Kirche. p.107.

as it is on his thorough New Testament investigations, has been a powerful contributory factor in what Linton described as "the shift in emphasis to view it (the Church) more and more as a creation from above, not merely explicable from man's side. It is the ecclesia of God, the body of Christ, the field of operation of the Holy Spirit."¹ The word ekklesia itself bears out this emphasis. It is an assembly called together by God, and only thereafter an assembly of men responding to that call. In the New Testament this is underlined by the one attribute attached to ekklesia, i.e. $\tau\omega\theta\epsilon\omega$ $\Theta\epsilon\omega$.² Even when $\tau\omega\theta\epsilon\omega$ $\Theta\epsilon\omega$ is not added it is implied. "It is almost like a name, parallel in some ways to God's 'name'", and it is precisely not a cult word.³ The special nature of the ekklesia is never left in doubt. "The congregation, or Church, of God always stands in contrast and even in opposition to other forms of society."⁴ It is the creation of God, not something within the control of man. "The One who is at work in and with the ekklesia is always God."⁵

¹O. Linton. op.cit. p.133.

²See f.69 above.

³Festgabe. p.266. See f.128 above.

⁴TWNT. III. p.505.

⁵ibid. p.507.

Hence the key word, as the starting point for any attempt to say what the Church is, is ekklesia and the key to the doctrine of the ekklesia is to be found in the emphasis on and understanding of the words $\tau\omicron\upsilon \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$.¹

This cuts straight across some of the so-called 'modern' pronouncements like those of Harvey Cox, for example, claiming that "the starting point for any theology of the Church today must be a theology of social change", and where the main emphasis is on the 'responding community' and human action, a process culminating in such inherent contradictions as 'Christian atheism' and 'God is dead' and the like.² Such statements entirely miss the essential nature of the Church as the assembly of God. Bonhoeffer pointed this out very forcefully. "The nature of the Church can be understood only from within, cum ira et studio, and never from a disinterested standpoint. Only by taking the claim of the Church seriously, without relativising it alongside other claims or alongside one's own reason, but understanding it on the basis of the gospel, can we hope to see it in its essential nature."³

¹TWNT. III. p.505.

²The Secular City. Harvey Cox. 1965. p.105. An excellent critical analysis of the views of Altizer, Cox, Wm. Hamilton, J.A.T. Robinson, etc. is to be found in What's New in Religion. Kenneth Hamilton. 1968.

³Sanctorum Communio. p.20.

To try to grasp the ἐκκλησία θεοῦ in a purely sociological manner, Schmidt says, is insufficient and ends up by causing errors.¹ The Church can be confused with the religious community, for example, as Bonhoeffer pointed out, or it can be confused with the Kingdom of God. Both errors cause men to lose grasp of the reality of the Church "which is at once a historical community and established by God."² 'Established by God', however, must not be taken to mean that man can then take over the establishment. "The Church is not divine revelation institutionalised," Barth observed, as if God had resigned His will and truth and grace to an organisation.³ The truth of God is not an object but the eternal subject which makes itself known to us in a mystery only, and only to faith. On the other hand, the Church is not a voluntary association for the cultivation of impressions, experiences, impulses from divine revelation. It is not the result of human decision. "It arises from the election, decision and disposition of God toward man. . . . The Church is not a religious society."⁴ While Schmidt does not draw out the theological implications as Barth does, he says much the same.

¹Revue. 1. p.19. See p.210 above.

²op.cit. pp.87-88.

³God in Action. 1936. p.20.

⁴op.cit. p.21.

"Religion, whether as an idea or a reality, has no place in the Bible, either Old Testament or New. It speaks always of faith, faith in the sense of obedience to God."¹ "A true conception of the Church, the community (or congregation), the assembly of God in Christ, stands or falls with a true conception of justification." Even Paul's figurative language concerning the Church as the Body of Christ never suggests that this body is a natural growth, in human terms, but a divine creation emerging first from God's initiative and call and only thereafter becoming visible in human form through those who hear and obey that call.² To be God's instrument, to be a part, a member, an organ, of that Body necessarily depends upon listening to God and obeying Him.³ Neither a purely historical, sociological or mystical approach can be the basis for reaching a true understanding of the nature of the Church.⁴

¹"Wie spricht Gott zum heutigen Menschen?" Th.Bl. No.6. p.132.

²TWNT. III. p.515.

³cf. John Baillie: "To listen and obey - that, according to the Bible, is what is required of us. Yes, but what else? The answer is, nothing else. Nothing at all but to listen carefully for the voice of God, and then act in accordance with what we hear." (The Idea of Revelation in Recent Thought. 1956. p.134.) Also my Monesty and God on "The centrality of God speaking, and of the guidance of the Holy Spirit, in the Bible." (1966. pp.142f.).

⁴TWNT. III. p.512.

In Schmidt's view of the Church as being $\zeta\upsilon\omega\theta\epsilon\iota\upsilon$ and the $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$, one essential element which can never be sufficiently emphasised is the fact that the roots of the description of Christian people as the ekklesia go back to the history of Israel as the People of God, the assembly of God, the $\eta\omicron\eta\ \beta\eta\rho$, the $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$.¹ The assembly of the New Covenant stems from and is the true representative of the Covenant of the Old Testament.² " $\beta\eta\rho$ is the people of God in the framework of eschatology which is peculiar to all statements regarding the people of God from the prophets onward . . . The community represented by Jesus and his disciples is Israel, precisely Israel, the remnant of Israel, the Israel of the final consummation."³ There is, it is true, a difference between the New Covenant and the Old, but there is also continuity.⁴ This may not be explicable on a human basis but it remains a fundamental fact for the doctrine of the Church. "Salvation is of the Jews", St. John says (Jn.4: 22), and Romans 9-11 bears this out. The real connection between Israel, People of God, the Church of God in Jesus Christ, lies in the action of God and in His choice of His

¹TWNT. III. p.504. See p.69 above.

²Judenfrage. p.72.

³RGG. III. col.148. In the LXX ekklesia occurs about 100 times, usually for $\beta\eta\rho$.

⁴Festgabe. p.281.

people. Schmidt quotes St. Paul's warning - "remember it is not you that support the root, but the root that supports you" (Rom.11:18).¹ Israel is chosen by God, singled out, is obdurate, fails, but remains chosen since a remnant repents and is converted, just as Peter is chosen, singled out, is obdurate, fails, but nonetheless remains chosen and the foundation of the Church.² "Israel was the chosen people of God, elected not for its own sake but for God's sake, in the fulfillment of his revealing and redemptive purpose," writes Professor Torrance. "It was Church, therefore, not in the merely sociological or political sense of ecclesia; it was society formed not by human but by divine convocation. It was Church as act of God, as the community called into being by the Word of God, and constituted through union and communion with him."³

God is the Builder of the ekklesia. The initiative rests always with Him, and upbuilding from the human side can only take place as a secondary or derived initiative.⁴ The New Testament, Schmidt brings out, has a characteristic word for another aspect of the ekklesia - παροικία. "That the

¹Judenfrage. p.5.

²RGG. III. col.149.

³Theology in Reconstruction. p.195.

⁴Erbauung. p.19.

Church as the already-built, and the to-be-built, house of God in this aeon, as the οἶκος or οἰκοδομή of God, is at the same time a sojourning and a pilgrimage in this world, is a παροικία of sojourners and pilgrims, this in no way involves a μετάβασις εἰς ἄλλο γένος but is the actual content of what the nature of the Church as the οἶκος τοῦ θεοῦ really means."¹ Like a coin, the Church has two sides. One side tells us that what God builds is the sole foundation and in His purpose the decision as to the goal that lies before us has already been made. The other side tells us that as strangers and sojourners we strive towards the goal set by God. The final decision still has to be made.² Schmidt refers more than once to the example of Abraham, a man of faith, looking for a city "whose builder and maker is God" (Heb.11:8).³ In the final consummation, when God is all in all, there is no Church, no Temple.⁴ "All that the New Testament says about the true, new Temple of God is theologically, Christologically, soteriologically, ecclesiologically eschatologically stamped. God is the Temple, as Christ also

¹Erbauung. p.25.

²ibid. p.28.

³TWNT. V. p.849; Judaica. p.285; Erbauung. p.8; Galatians. p.61f. etc.

⁴Revue. 2. p.155.

is, and then also Christians are as the Church, the Body of Christ, that Temple which is prophesied and fulfilled in the transition from the Old to the New Covenant, that Temple which, in Christ, was present and which, in him, is still present, even while Christians wait and long for this Temple as the heavenly Temple, until the day they are brought to glory in it as the Temple of God."¹

The Church is the Community of the Messiah Jesus

God is the Builder, then, is one side of the coin. The other side is the building, the living stones, the Church, which is just as visible and real as an individual is.²

"The Church may be fully dependent on God's act," Welch wrote, "but it is not simply God acting. It is a people believing, worshipping, obeying, witnessing."³ Schmidt also stresses this side of the coin but for him, as for the New Testament, the central point of a doctrine of the Church is the Messiah, Jesus Christ, and the community (Gemeinde) he, as Messiah, founded the actual, historical, visible link between the קהל יהודה and the Ἐκκλησία Χριστοῦ. The Church is the Messiah-Jesus-Gemeinde. For Schmidt, however, the investigation into the

¹Erbauung. p.18. See p.199 above.

²Revue. 2. p.153. See p.137 above. cf. also Erbauung. p.19.

³The Reality of the Church. p.48.

founding of this all-important Gemeinde, takes precedence over any formulation of doctrine to place it in proper theological perspective. He is not even very consistent in his statements for at an early point in the Ekklesia article he speaks of the "divine assembly of the new covenant" being "first constituted by the resurrection of Jesus Christ",¹ but later in the same article, speaks of the institution of the Lord's Supper, in the light of the evidence showing that Jesus viewed himself as Messiah in the sense of Daniel 7, as "an act in establishment of the Church."² This view of Schmidt's of the earlier founding of the ekklesia by Jesus himself, is further confirmed by the Festgabe article.³ The founding of the Church, he says, has "to be understood out of Jesus' overall attitude towards his people, among whom, for whom and in opposition to whom, he gathered a council of Twelve as a special כְּנִישָׁא and commissioned them to represent the קהל יהוה."⁴ So it is "with the disciples that the קהל יהוה is constituted", and it is for the ἐκκλησία, the remnant and kernel of the people of God, that the βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ οὐ τῶν οὐρανῶν

¹TWNT. III. p.508. See p.54 above.

²ibid. p.521.

³Festgabe. p.292. G. Johnston (The Doctrine of the Church in the New Testament) also notes that Schmidt links the origin of the Church with the instituting of the Lord's Supper. p.66. See p.141 above.

⁴ibid.

is intended.¹ "The question whether Jesus made his disciples into the ἐκκλησία must be answered in the affirmative."²

Schmidt's picture of the kenishta provides a vivid example of how his lexicographical-lexicological approach uncovers historical development leading to theological conclusions.³ Behind the word ἐκκλησία lies the word כהן (and its Aramaic equivalent ܟܗܢܐ). But in Rabbinic literature the usual word for synagogue was not כהן (or עדה) but כניסין. So, as Jesus and his disciples knew the word כהן (from Hebrew Scripture) but spoke Aramaic, kenishta may well have been the very Aramaic word he used as Messiah to describe the special ekklesia he gathered around himself. Kenishta is thus a very significant term for "the community of God is embodied in the synagogue of Jesus the Messiah. In the apparent paradox of this pars pro toto arrangement lies the very essence of the genuine synagogue and of the genuine community of Jesus Christ."⁴

"Ecclesiology is simply Christology and vice versa", Schmidt was fond of saying and for him the key to both is to

¹Festgabe. p.293.

²ibid. See p.134 above.

³TWNT. III. p.526.

⁴ibid.

be found in the conclusions that Jesus did know himself to be the Messiah and, as such, did found the ekklesia and that both Messiah and his ekklesia are inseparably linked to God's continuing plan of salvation revealed of old by the prophets but now through the Son.¹ The Church had constantly to guard against tendencies towards Ebionitism on the one hand, and Docetism on the other. Here it is interesting to note that the Jewish term 'Son of Man' tends to disappear and 'Messiah', unlike 'Christ', never became as the term 'Christ' did, almost like a second proper name for Jesus. The Church preferred terms like 'Lord', 'Saviour', 'Son of God'.² In so far as there is any Messiasgeheimnis, however, it lies in the failure of Jesus' adversaries, parents, disciples to understand what He meant by Son of Man and Messiah, the Messiah come from God and entirely obedient to God, Whose Anointed he is.³ Both the ecclesiology and the Christology, therefore, have a distinct and definite character. The new covenant goes back to the old covenant, for God established both, the same God Who speaks in Christ. So "the New Testament assembly of God in Christ is none other than the fulfilled Old Testament assembly

¹TWNT. III. pp.509, 512, etc.

²See p. 213 above. Revue. 1. p.26.

³Vielhauer. op.cit. p.201.

of God."¹ The הַקְּהִלָּה , the לֵהָר , the ἐκκλησία , the community represented by Jesus and his disciples, then, is Israel in the eschatological sense.² But with the coming of Jesus the Messiah an entirely new element has entered the situation. "In what Jesus said and did eschatology - i.e. the view that the approaching Kingdom of God is intended for the remnant and core of the people of God - has become acute. With Jesus himself the claim of the Kingdom of God has been given. . . . So he points to the constitution of the Messiah-Jesus-Gemeinde, i.e. the Church."³

The next important stage in the development of Schmidt's doctrine of the Church grows directly out of the Messiah-Jesus-Gemeinde. The complex - Jesus, Messiah, Son of Man, Disciples, Community (Gemeinde), Lord's Supper - he says "leads directly to the Pauline and deutero-Pauline understanding of the ekklesia, which is ἐκκλησία on the one hand and yet also ἐκκλησία Χριστοῦ on the other, just as Christ is both exalted on the one hand and yet also present in the community on the other."⁴ A specific doctrine of the Church is to be found

¹TWNT. III. p.512.

²See p. 86 above.

³RGG. III. col.148.

⁴TWNT. III. p.521.

for the first time in the New Testament in the Epistles to the Colossians and to the Ephesians, he says. "Here are to be found explicit, far-reaching statements about the ἐκκλησία," including the expression σοφία Χριστοῦ.¹ Strangely enough he does not go on to develop these in any doctrinal way. Instead he is at pains to make it clear that Paul's language in trying to describe divine mysteries revealed by God may have parallels to Gnostic writings in some respects but has fundamentally nothing to do with Gnosticism. When Paul speaks of σοφία, for instance, he is not speaking of "freely ranging speculations or esoteric insights."² Rather, it is practical wisdom that comes from obedience to God, i.e. in faith. In Paul's thinking about the Church, Schmidt holds, the "decisive point" lies in fellowship with Christ, and here he stresses the connexion between ecclesiology and Christology and adds the doctrine of justification for good measure, though this last he does not enlarge on either.³ What stands out in his survey of Paul's thinking regarding the Church is the complete difference there is between the Christian faith and mystery religions and cults. The Church has a firm,

¹ TWNT. III. p.509. σοφία Χριστοῦ is not confined to these two Epistles, however. cf. 1 Cor.12. etc.

² ibid. p.511.

³ ibid. p.512.

unyielding basis in history. "The Christusmysterium is the σταυρός, the execution of a man who actually lived, not the myth of the dying and rising again of a god symbolising some general truth."¹ The hallmark or key signature affixed to all Paul's thoughts is that "the σῶμα Χριστοῦ is one and the same as the Old Testament ἐκκλησία τοῦ Θεοῦ."²

This can be looked on as part of the powerful case Schmidt builds up out of the New Testament evidence in support of Kattenbusch's view concerning the basic unity of early Christian thought regarding the Church, a unity going back to Jesus and his conception of himself as Son of Man, representative of the People of Man, Messiah.³ Holl had claimed that Paul was creating a new idea of the Church and argued that there was a conflict in principle between the charismatic idea of Paul and the legal, theocratic idea of the primitive Jerusalem community.⁴ Schmidt convincingly shows that this was not the case and that Peter and Paul (the Jerusalem ekklesia and the Hellenistic ekklesiai) held essentially the

¹Festgabe. p.314.

²ibid.

³Der Quellort der Kirchenidee. See p.125 above.

⁴Der Kirchenbegriff des Paulus in seinem Verhältnis zu dem der Urgemeinde.

same view of the ekklesia.¹ All the disciples recognised that "the assembly of God stands or falls with its sole foundation and continuance in the Messiah Jesus, with its recognition of Christ alone as Lord~~g~~."² As Professor Hunter, who cites Schmidt, puts it - "Though Paul writes for the most part to Gentiles and though he does not always see eye to eye with the leaders of the Mother Church, he speaks of the ecclesia essentially as they did."³

Christologically speaking the heart and unity of the Messiah-Jesus-Gemeinde depend on Christ, the Messiah, come from God and entirely obedient to God, Whose Anointed he is - all a complete contrast to apocalyptic fantasy and cosmic speculation.⁴ Eschatologically speaking the hope of the Messiah-Jesus-Gemeinde is similarly centred in Christ. "The beginning and end rest in the Messiah Jesus" in whom the Kingdom of God has come into time and into the world and who will finally deliver the Kingdom to God the Father.⁵ Seen from

¹O. Linton (op.cit. p.86) also answers Holl's arguments.

²TWNT. III. pp.508-9. See p.81 above.

³The Unity of the New Testament. p.64.

⁴Revue. 1. pp.40-41. cf. "The real background of the mind of Jesus, to judge from the tradition, was not Jewish apocalyptic or ethnic gnosis but the prophetic religion of the Old Testament." Jesus and the Christian. William Manson. p.11. Also H.J. Cadbury who noted that for Jesus religion "is much more what God does than what man does." (The Peril of Modernising Jesus. 1937. p.183).

⁵Polis. p.39. See p.126 above.

the outside, the Messiah-Jesus-Gemeinde, the kenishta, would at first have looked like a synagogue, a part of Judaism. What brought about the fundamental transformation was that in Jesus of Nazareth the promised Messiah had come. His synagogue was not just a synagogue, a part of Judaism. It was, potentially, the whole of Judaism. For it was the true Israel, the remnant in which alone the קהל יהוה was now visible. "In the Messiah-Jesus-synagogue alone was the Congregation of God."¹ The Messiah-Jesus-Gemeinde was the ἐκκλησία .

The Church is the People of God, the Body of Christ

As we have seen, and as Schmidt emphasises over and over again, the description of Christians as the ekklesia roots back to the history of Israel as the people of God.² The ἐκκλησία τοῦ Θεοῦ is the קהל יהוה .³ God chose Israel and Israel remains chosen in spite of its obduracy and failure. Thus there is a continuity between קהל and ἐκκλησία , just as there is continuity between the Old Covenant and the New.⁴ The link between the two is Christ, and his community, the

¹Festgabe. p.280.

²See p. 395 above.

³TWNT. III. p.504.

⁴RGG. III. col.149.

Messiah-Jesus-Gemeinde, brings in a new factor, transforming the preparatory form of the Church as the People of God into its permanent form as the Body of Christ. But the Church remains the People of God, and, in Schmidt's view, λαός is completed by the addition of τοῦ Θεοῦ just as ἐκκλησία is. Indeed he sets down the following equations: "λαός Θεοῦ = יהוה אלהים - יהוה אלהים = ἐκκλησία (τοῦ Θεοῦ), Church."¹ It is this Church which knows itself to a special entity in the world of peoples, a third race, the true, new people, over against Jews and pagans. However important the bonds of race and blood may be for a people in the worldly sense, above and beyond these the eternal promises remain valid for the People of God.² Verses like - "You are a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, God's own people, . . . Once you were no people but now you are God's people" (1 Pet.2:9-10); and where Paul quotes Hosea - "Those who were not my people I will call 'my people'" (Rom.9:25), show how closely People of God and Church are linked.³ It is difficult for people today to realise that only gradually did a word like χριστιανός become usual for a follower of Jesus Christ, and then it was given by outsiders.⁴

¹ Revue. 2. p.172. -

² ibid.

³ TWNT. III. p.513.

⁴ ibid. p.516. Dahl maintains that in the days of the Early Church the characteristic name for its members was not μαθηταί nor χριστιανοί but the older People of God, λαός (Θεοῦ). Das Volk Gottes. p.203.

In his discussion of the different emphases associated with Peter and with Paul concerning the Church, Schmidt held it was important to preserve the Pauline awareness of the Church as "the people of God and not as the hierarchy of men",¹ and in his Polis article he pointed out that the meaning of πολιτεία (Eph.2:12), qualified by τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ, "derives from the origin, existence and future of Israel as the People of God, which as the true Israel is to be identified with the Church and thereby points to the Kingdom of God."² The early Church, he said, is "that Gemeinde which presents itself as the Old Testament-New Testament People of God ('Church')."³

The New Testament phrase ἐκκλησία τοῦ Θεοῦ is not all that is said about the nature of the Church. Centred, historically speaking, in the Messiah-Jesus-Gemeinde, its roots go back to the Old Testament, but burst into flower after the resurrection. The ἐκκλησία τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ is how the New Testament describes it. Ekklesia, in short, means not just 'Christian Church' but the 'assembly of God in Christ'.⁴ "The new thing about the ἐκκλησία τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, i.e. the fulfilment of the Old Testament prophesy of the new covenant, is given with the fact that a

¹Festgabe. p.319.

²Polis. p.20.

³RGG. III. p.114.

⁴TWNT. III. p.507.

specific number of selected disciples of Jesus experienced the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead and received special authorisation thereby", Schmidt writes.¹ "The divine assembly of the new covenant which was first constituted by the resurrection of Jesus Christ did not derive its claim or commission from the enthusiasm of pneumatics and charismatics. It derived it solely from a specific number of specific appearances of the risen Lord."²

In a way this highlights how little Schmidt was concerned to work out a consistent doctrine of the Church. As we have seen,³ later in this same article he sees the founding of the Church as linked to the instituting by Jesus of the Lord's Supper.⁴ Like the New Testament he seems quite happy to portray the Messiah and his kenishta side by side with the risen Christ and the $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha\ \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$. Possibly he regarded the two aspects as different sides of the same reality, though he does not say so.⁵ From the apostolic foundation on the witnesses

¹ TWNT. III. p.508.

² ibid.

³ See p.399 above.

⁴ TWNT. III. p.521.

⁵ cf. Calvin's two aspects of the Kingdom of Christ - "the doctrine of the Gospel, whereby Christ doth gather unto Himself a Church, and whereby He governs it being gathered together; (and) the society of the godly (societas piorum), who being joined together by the sincere faith of the Gospel are truly accounted the people of Christ (populus Christi)."
in Kingdom and Church. T.F. Torrance. p.115.

to the resurrection, he goes on to make the point that the basis of Paul's apostle-ship was exactly the same - "He appeared also to me" (1 Cor.15:8). "From this standpoint Paul had the same view of the Church as the primitive community at Jerusalem."¹ Its roots go back to Moses and its Rock is Christ.²

At the same time Schmidt holds that Jesus' words to Peter in Mt.16:18 are a genuine saying. According to the New Testament Paul clearly regarded Peter as having a special position.³ Human failings however, taking sides, desire for privilege and position, clash of personalities - these and the like were always in danger of corrupting the true nature of the Church so there was a constant struggle within the Christian community itself to keep the ekklesia to what it is and should be. Hence the strong emphasis on the ekklesia being $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\theta\epsilon\iota\upsilon$, though this has at once to be guarded against gnostic speculation.⁴ It is out of this kind of situation that Paul's doctrine of the Body of Christ grew.⁵ For Schmidt it is linked to the doctrine of justification. The only

¹TWNT. III. p.508.

²ibid. p.509. 1 Cor.10:1-4.

³cf. Flew. op.cit. p.136.

⁴TWNT. III. p.523.

⁵ibid. p.511.

invisible possession of the Church rests in having been chosen by God, justified and sanctified by Him.¹ In this present age she is and remains the ecclesia militans et pressa, not the ecclesia triumphans, even although, assembled on earth, she is the ἐκκλησία Χριστοῦ, signifying that the glorified Christ is at the same time present in living communion with the faithful.²

The New Testament view of apostles throws further light on the nature of the Church. The word denotes a man sent with full authority, in this case based on being an eye-witness to the resurrection.³ Nowadays the word brings to mind the Twelve and Paul. But in the New Testament there are many more apostles, more than five hundred. Barnabas, Andronicus, Junia, Cephas, James, the Twelve, Paul, are all called apostles.⁴ We do not know exactly how many apostles there were, only that the Church, "built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the cornerstone" (Eph.2:20), does not change its nature as apostles and prophets die but continues to be governed by

¹Revue. 2. p.153.

²ibid.

³cf. Rengstorf, TWNT. I. pp.407-445.

⁴Revue. 4. p.334.

the living Christ.¹ There was never a "successio prophetica" and an episcopacy in the framework of the papacy and apostolic succession is simply not in accord with the way in which the Church of the Old and New Covenants was constituted.² The "successio apostolica" was one aspect of how res juris humani, a natural part of any organisation, took the place of res juris divini which asserts the founding and also the preserving of the Church by God in the person of Christ.³ This transferring of matters of organisation (jus humanum) to the domain of God (jus divinum), where they do not belong, marks the step from the Church of the New Testament to that of early Catholicism.⁴ The transition "is nowhere so palpably clear as in the conception of the Church."⁵ The ekklesia as the assembly of God in Christ is not invisible on the one side and

¹ Revue. 3. Cullmann points out that being an eye-witness is not transmittable. The apostles did not install other "apostles" but bishops and elders, missionaries and leaders. The unique gift they handed down was not office but word. Without apostles there would have been no New Testament, no knowledge of Jesus as the Risen One. Hence every Christian Church requires both. (Peter. p.221f.) See p.263 above.

² Revue. 4. p.318.

³ ibid. p.316.

⁴ ibid. p.336.

⁵ TWNT. III. p.536.

visible on the other. Triumphant, it would be the βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ, and no longer the ἐκκλησία. On earth it is always militant, a corpus mixtum, that ought not to have been divided.¹

The Fellowship of the Spirit

The building of God, centred in Christ, rooted in the Old Covenant - the other great key to the doctrine of the Church is the gift of the Spirit. We Christians as the Church, Schmidt says, are, and are to be, the πῶμα Χριστοῦ, the gift of the Spirit being God's guarantee.² The "decisive point" for Paul's doctrine of the Church, the real core of his thinking about it, lay in fellowship with Christ, the fellowship made actual by the Holy Spirit.³ As C.H. Dodd put it - "For Paul, the church is the Body of Christ, in which he

¹TWNT. III.

²Erbauung. p.17.

³TWNT. III. p.512. cf. Brunner - "The New Testament knows nothing of a church as institution." It is always and only personal, a living fellowship. Truth as Encounter. p.168. "The problem of fellowship is not one human problem among many others. It is the problem." The Word of God and Modern Man. p.67. He finds modern evidence of the answer to this problem in Catholic philosopher Gabriel Marcel's Un Changement d'Espérance à la rencontre du Réarmement Moral. (E.T. 1960). Dogmatics. Vol.III. pp.111f. cf. also Professor Karl Adam S.J. - Moralische Aufrüstung und Christentum im Westen.

dwells by his Spirit."¹ In spite of all difficulties the common experience of Christ held the early Christians together in fundamental unity, the Spirit providing an answer both to the personal and the local limitations. While it is true that "without the first Apostles and without Jerusalem there is no ἐκκλησία", and that Paul also recognised this, yet he strongly opposed any over-emphasis on the personal and the local aspect.² The ekklesia as the Body of Christ was more than a mere collection of individuals. It was pervaded by Christ, who is its Spirit and Lord. The true centre of the ekklesia lies not in a place but in the Lord Christ. The Body of Christ does away with all local limitation, even the Temple itself.³

It is with the "indwelling of God through the mediation of Christ as the head of the ἐκκλησία that we as Christians have to do", Schmidt writes.⁴ God supplies the Spirit, works miracles. "The history of God with His Church, with His people, is a chain of such miracles which have their climax in the history of Christ."⁵ The Church is not like a

¹"Matthew and Paul." Exp.T. 1947.

²Festgabe. p.304.

³ibid. p.305.

⁴Erbauung. p.15.

⁵Galatians. p.28.

human society or association founded by some long-dead president, but is the continuing incarnation of Jesus Christ, the Head of the Church, whose Body at the same time the Church also is. So it is in Him alone that Christians are one.¹ The Body of Christ, the Church, is the real starting-point for human fellowship and brotherhood.² It was at Pentecost that language and national barriers disappeared.³

The Holy Spirit, the creator spiritus, in the New Testament is placed on an equal plane with God the Father and God the Son. He is Subject and Person, as well as Charisma, and as Paraclete intercedes for us in our weakness.⁴ In the New Testament, where God, Christ, the Spirit, are all subject as well as object of faith, we see the fulfilment of the Old Testament prophetic hope and vision. God spoke through the prophets. He continues to speak, guide, reveal Himself in Jesus Christ and through His Spirit.⁵ "In the story of Pentecost, the theme of which is the outpouring of the Spirit, tells not about the spirit and acts of the apostles, but is all

¹Galatians. p.46.

²Revue. 4. p.320.

³Galatians. p.46.

⁴ibid. p.55.

⁵Revue. 2. p.126f.

about the Spirit and acts of God", Schmidt observes.¹ The Spirit, present in Jesus, is now after his resurrection and ascension given to his disciples. If the founding of the kenishta was the seed of the Church, Pentecost is the bursting out, the visible flowering of the Church, quickened into life as the Body of Christ. Pentecost and the gift of the Spirit reveal God's way of restoring broke and scattered humanity into the unity of the People of God.² It is from this perspective only, Father Küng notes, the perspective of the People of God, that the Church can "be rightly understood as the Body of Christ. Christ, the Head, is present in the life of the Church, His Body. But He is also her Lord. The does not possess Him; He possesses her and demands her obedience."³

A very large part of both Schmidt's articles dealing specifically with the Spirit is devoted to a careful investigation of the doctrine of the Trinity in the New Testament.

¹Eranos. XIII. p.230. cf. Wm. Manson - 'Forms' in the New Testament are to be interpreted not out of the "creative spirituality of the Early Christians" but from the "creative impress of the divine Spirit." Jesus and the Christian. p.13.

²Eranos. XIII. p.234. cf. Thornton - "The unity of the Church is in two directions, horizontal and vertical. Fellowship with man involves and implies fellowship with God, and both depend upon participation in the gift of the Spirit. The unity of the Body is sustained by the creative activity of the Spirit." The Common Life in the Body of Christ. p.94.

³Die Kirche. p.288. So also Barth - see p.278 above.

This is a question the New Testament itself raises.¹ It speaks of the Father, the Son and the Spirit always on the same level, always primarily Subject, always related to one another, always personal. Behind the word pneuma stands the Hebrew ruach which, in Scripture "always stands for something happening, even where we have to translate it as 'Spirit'", according to Buber.² The Biblical evidence leads to the conclusion that the origin of the New Testament Triad arises "from the special history through which God has led this community which was His."³ God, always Subject, always active, reveals Himself in this unique history between Him and His people. The Logos became flesh, but remains God, remains Subject, absolutely passive as the Lamb, absolutely active as the great High Priest. Returned to the Father, he yet lives here in his community through the Holy Spirit, the Paraclete, whom God gives, but whom he sends. Hence, "the Pneuma Hagion as Person and as Charisma meets us in the event of Pentecost."⁴

As one would expect, the references to the Holy Spirit are numerous in Schmidt's writings concerning the Church but

¹Revue. 2. pp.134, 144. See p.218 above.

²Eranos. XIII. p.191.

³Revue. 2. p.144.

⁴Eranos. XIII. p.235.

nowhere does he attempt to systematise the relationship between Church and Spirit. From the foregoing section on the fellowship of the Spirit, however, the points which stand out as clarifying this relationship are - 1. the gift of the Spirit to the Church at Pentecost; 2. God acts in the Church through the Spirit; Christ unifies the Church through the Spirit; 3. The Holy Spirit is the Creator Spiritus, Subject and Object of faith precisely as God the Father and God the Son are.

1. Throughout Scripture the pattern and plan of God's purpose for His world and for mankind are being revealed by Him. This is evident in the unique history and relationship between Him and His chosen people, Israel.¹ A new stage in this continuous revelation is reached when the Word became flesh and dwelt among us as Jesus of Nazareth and, as Messiah, gathered the People of God, the remnant of Israel, the Church, around himself.² After his resurrection and ascension a still further stage of God's revelation takes place when He gives to the Church, and Christ sends upon his Church, the Holy Spirit. "The Pneuma Hagion as Person and as Charisma meets us in the event of Pentecost."³ The fellowship of the

¹Revue. 2. p.144.

²TWNT. III. pp.509, 521; Festgabe. p.291.

³Eranos. XIII. p.235.

Church is made actual by the Spirit.¹ Christians, as the Church, are, and are to be, the Body of Christ and, as such, come under the 'guarantee of the Spirit'.² "It is God who establishes us with you in Christ, and has commissioned us; he has put his seal upon us and given us his Spirit in our hearts as a guarantee." (2 Cor.1:21-22).³ The Spirit "is the guarantee of our inheritance until we acquire possession of it" (Eph.1:14), and Paul can even say - "Do you not know that you are God's temple, and that God's Spirit dwells in you?" (1 Cor.3:16). So the Spirit guarantees and preserves the Church.

2. The One Who acts in the Church, through the Spirit, is God.⁴ The Spirit is God's Spirit, and in supplying the Spirit God works miracles. This is evident throughout the history of His dealings with the Church, with His people, miracles which have their climax in Christ.⁵ The story of Pentecost, indeed, is not about the spirit and acts of the

¹TWNT. III. p.512.

²Erbauung. p.17.

³cf. also "He who has prepared us for this very thing is God who has given us the Spirit as a guarantee" (2 Cor.5:5).

⁴TWNT. III. p.507.

⁵Galatians. p.28.

Apostles but about the Spirit and acts of God.¹ After Jesus' resurrection and ascension, the Spirit, present in him, is given to his disciples, and, through the Spirit, the Church is the continuing incarnation of Jesus Christ, the Head of the Church, so that the Church is the Body of Christ. From this flows the unity of the Church. In Christ alone Christians are one.² From Christ, through the Spirit, flows the fellowship and brotherhood of the Church. At Pentecost, barriers of language and nationality disappeared.³ The gift of the Spirit reveals God's way of restoring broken and scattered humanity into the unity of the People of God. The Spirit did away with all personal and local limitations.⁴ The Body of Christ even does away with the Temple itself. The Church is firmly centred in Christ.⁵

3. As God spoke through the prophets, He continues to speak and guide and reveal Himself in Jesus Christ and through His Spirit. The Spirit, the Pneuma, with its counterpart in the Old Testament ruach, is breath, life, movement, always

¹Eranos. XIII. p.230.

²Galatians. p.46.

³ibid. p.46.

⁴Festgabe. p.304.

⁵ibid. p.305.

active, always dynamic, the Creator Spiritus.¹ The Spirit stands in complete contrast to the spirit of man. He, the Spirit, is both Person and Charisma, both Subject and Object of faith, and, in this latter aspect always on one and the same level as the Father and the Son.² Indeed, it is the New Testament itself which raises the question of the Trinity. The Spirit as the Comforter, παράκλητος, and Christ as our Advocate, παράκλητος, both have the same office, the same office which God also has. "I will pray the Father, and he will give you another Comforter, to be with you for ever" (Jn.14:16).³ Christians are to walk by the Spirit (Gal.5: 25) and the promised 'fruits of the Spirit' which are given, which grow, thus precluding human self-will and self-effort, are a sign of the victory that comes, not through our spirits, but through the Holy Spirit.⁴

The Church is a Pilgrim People

The stranger, the sojourner, living in a country not his own, the πάροικος, had a special interest for Schmidt both

¹Eranos. XIII. p.199; Revue 2. p.128.

²Revue. 2. p.138.

³Eranos. XIII. p.209.

⁴Galatians. p.89.

from his own personal situation as an exile from his native Germany and from the importance of this notion of sojourning as a basic characteristic of the Church. In addition to his Basileia and Ekklesia for TWNT, he was also to author the πάροικος , παροικία , παροικεύω article as well, this time with the help of his son, Professor M.A. Schmidt.¹

"The Church of the New Testament is ἐκκλησία and παροικία, or, rather, - as ἐκκλησία it is at once παροικία ,"² he wrote, a conclusion which follows from the fact that "since he (the Christian) will one day become a citizen of the heavenly city, on earth he is an alien."³ This involves the goal of the Church, the apocalyptic tension between God's kingdom and the kingdoms of this world, and the relationship of the Church to the Kingdom of God.

He deals with the complex relationship between Church and Kingdom in some detail in the last of the Copenhagen lectures - "Kingdom, Church, State and People"⁴ - though, naturally enough, most of his other writings concerning the Church also refer to the matter. Basileia and Ekklesia, he notes, are both Greek

¹TWNT. V. See p.42 above.

²ibid. p.852.

³ibid. p.849.

⁴Revue. 2. pp.145f.

secular terms. But in the New Testament, Kingdom, in almost every case where it occurs, has to do with God and God alone, its fundamental meaning being "the domain where God reigns".¹ To whom does this Kingdom belong? First and foremost to God, but also, and only, to those who are "poor in spirit" and those who are "persecuted for righteousness' sake" (Mt.5:3,10). Possession of the Kingdom, however, is of a special kind. God attributes the Kingdom to men in the same way as He attributes justification to the sinner.² The Kingdom is a Kingdom of "righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Spirit" (Rom.14:17). It is a "new world" (Mt.19:28), a Kingdom of the salvation and the power of God (Rev.12:10). It is to know God or, rather to be known by Him (Gal.4:9). Such descriptions and definitions of the Kingdom were not strange or new in the days of the early Church. Jesus, Paul's starting-point, did not say - 'I tell you that a Kingdom of God exists'. He said - 'I tell you the Kingdom of God is at hand'. Because of this nearness which he preached and which, as Messiah, he himself represented, man ought to do all he can to relate himself to this Kingdom, although its coming does not depend on any action of man's. The whole of the New Testament,

¹ Revue. 2. p.148.

² ibid. p.148. cf. also TWNT. III. pp.512-3. See p. 86 above.

Jesus himself, strongly opposes all attempts to calculate the signs and times of the Kingdom's coming. The hour and day are known only to God, Who is Alpha and Omega.¹ Man's relation to the Kingdom is that he receives the Kingdom as God's gift. "Fear not, little flock, for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom" (Lk.12:32). The decision demanded of us is whether or not we are willing to accept the gift, the invitation to enter the Kingdom. It is a serious matter, calling for sacrifice of self (even to extremes - cf. Mt.19:12), calling for carefully counting the cost (as in building a house or planning a campaign - cf. Lk.14:25f.). One, and One alone, was able to render such complete obedience to God - Jesus Christ.² So, only in Christ and out of the Easter experience grew faith in the Kingdom of God. "Christians are not the βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ except in a derived sense, in so far as they belong to Christ."³ The usual designation of Christians on the other hand, is the term ἐκκλησία Θεοῦ which has to be understood as the ἡγεῖα ἡγῶν, the emphasis in both cases being on God. The full meaning of Ekklesia is thus - "the assembly of men who have been called

¹Revue. 2. p.150.

²ibid. p.151. This was the origin of Origen's term - αὐτοβασίλεια. See p.246 above.

³ibid. p.151.

by God in Christ."¹ The Ekklesia is not the same as the Kingdom of God and the early Church was careful not to mix these terms. Knowing herself to be the Ekklesia she continued to proclaim the Kingdom.² Assembled on earth she is the ἐκκλησία Χριστοῦ, and this means that the glorified Christ is at the same time present in the living fellowship of his faithful followers. Paul's picture of the Body of Christ is not one of natural growth in human terms, but of a divine creation emerging first from God's initiative and call and then becoming visible in human form through those who hear and obey that call.³ So the Church is always visible just as an individual is visible, and always remains ecclesia militans et pressa and never, in this age, triumphans. One day the Church will come to an end when Christ delivers the kingdom of God the Father and God is all in all (1 Cor.15:24,28). The Kingdom is very different. It is invisible. It is not an assembly of men but God Himself. Once it was present In Jesus Christ, but then as part of the Messianic mystery and not then imposed.⁴ As Schmidt observed in his Cambridge talk, since "the beginning-

¹Revue. 2. p.153.

²ibid.

³TWNT. III. p.515. See p.106 above.

⁴Revue. 2. p.154.

time and end-time of the God of all eternity stand opposed to this time-series, because the other Kingdom, the Kingdom of God, breaks up this world and its kingdoms without being able here and now completely to supersede them," the Church, "conceived and created by God . . . struggles and endures in opposition to this world."¹ The Church looks towards the Kingdom, which is purely and absolutely to come, and in that sense the Church is eschatological. But she is not the *ἐσχάτον*. She remains a corpus mixtum, a designation which cannot be used of the Kingdom of God.²

The Church and the Kingdom, then, are inseparable but not identical. "It cannot be emphasised enough that the Church and the Kingdom of God are two different things", although both can only be understood in the perspective of eschatology.³ This does not mean, however, that man can now report on events that are to happen 'later'. It means, rather, that the Church as a present reality can only be understood in terms of the consummation already begun in Christ, and that it remains the pilgrim People of God until Christ comes again.⁴ "In so far as we live on earth as future

¹ SJTh. Vol.1. p.154.

² Revue. 2. p.154.

³ Erbauung. p.18.

⁴ cf. "Eschatology" in the Concise Theological Dictionary. Karl Rahner. 1965.

citizens of heaven, that is the Church, destined to receive the Kingdom which she proclaims."¹ Amid the peoples of the world, the Church, the People of God, knows itself as a third race over against Jews and pagans, knows itself to be the true, the new People, based not on worldly States and their power, based not on ties of blood or race, but on the eternal promises valid for the People of God.²

As the House of God, the Church - as Schmidt was fond of pointing out - always has two sides, like a coin. It is built, and is to be built, by God in this aeon but is, at the same time, a paroikia of pilgrims and sojourners.³ Only God and Jesus Christ can build the Church, but this 'building' implies that Christians should also upbuild one another. Indeed "the sole purpose of life (Lebenszweck) of the Church, of the Gemeinde, of the individual Christian, is upbuilding (Erbauung)", the chief Subject of which is Christ, since upbuilding activity happens through the gift of his Spirit in the new life that he awakens and maintains in his Gemeinde."⁴ The Church has both a task and a goal. "The existence of the Christian Gemeinde means a via viatorum whose goal is the

¹Polis. p.167.

²ibid. p.172.

³Erbauung. p.25. See pp.164 f. above.

⁴ibid.

heavenly Polis, the heavenly Jerusalem."¹ There is teleology involved here as well as eschatology, and though Schmidt does not take up this problem in detail, it may in part account for his lack of interest in Realised Eschatology which tends to leave the teleological factor out of account.² For Paul, the preaching of the unsearchable riches of Christ was part of God's plan "that through the church the manifold wisdom of God might now be made known to the principalities and powers in the heavenly places." (Eph.3:10). Members of God's People, the Church, have arrived, i.e. they have laid hold of life in Christ and, like the Prodigal, have come home. Yet they remain the pilgrim People of God, an army on the march towards the goal set by God in Christ, a great company listening for and ready to obey the unfolding revelation of the task God has in His will for them to carry out in this world. To return to Schmidt's picture of the coin - the 'building of God' (i.e. what God builds) is the sole foundation of the Church and in His purpose the decision as to the goal that lies before us has already been made.³ The other side of the coin is that as strangers and pilgrims on earth we strive towards the

¹Erbauung. p.27.

²On telos rather than eschaton in the NT. cf. H.P. Kingdom in BKW. p.vi.

³Erbauung. p.28.

goal set by God. The final decision still has to be made. Anyone who allows himself to be 'built into' this household of God is no longer all at sea but is pointed to a definite, clear hope, the hope of the coming again of Christ, Christ who was once present on earth and who in the 'building of God' is even now present. To live in that perspective gives life and work, here and now, direction and force.¹

The Task of the Church

For Schmidt the doctrine of the Church was never an abstract, theoretical exercise but a practical, present, God-given call and mission. His Church studies had, in their day, a direct bearing on the battle waged by the Confessing Church within Hitler's Germany, according to Vielhauer.² Schmidt's writings, lectures and cooperation were also of great importance to the growth of the ecumenical movement. He felt strongly that the New Testament ekklesia, the dynamic of the basic unity of real Christian fellowship in the Messiah, Jesus Christ, that was able to overcome all differences, should and would play an effective part in breaking down rigid, static, fixed viewpoints so that all Christians, Catholic and

¹Erbauung. p.29.

²op.cit. p.207.

Protestants, for instance, could learn from one another.¹ Catholics, he said, refer back to Peter as the rock of the congregation of God.² Protestants have no right to take away from Peter what belongs to him in the framework of the eternally important primitive community. They do have the right, and the duty, to keep alert the protest of Paul against Peter and the primitive community, i.e. "that the Church presents herself as the People of God and not as the hierarchy of men".³ But we should remember that Peter's experience is to some degree the experience of every Christian and, therefore, be on our guard against any tendency simply to identify ourselves with Paul. The very human weaknesses of the 'pillar' of the Church point us to what the Church is - the Body of Christ, the People of God, i.e. God's concern. It is God's decision and action that calls for the response of our obedience. The Church, and the Christian, must always keep the Cross of Christ at the centre.⁴

Schmidt's doctrine of the Church as originating in God's

¹cf. Father Küng - "Neither Catholics nor Protestants can consider themselves exempt from making a continuous effort to model themselves upon the apostolic Church." Structures of the Church. p.98.

²Festgabe. p.319.

³ibid.

⁴Galatians. p.21.

action in history provides the basis for the task of the Church in the world. In the perspective of the coming of Jesus, from his birth through his public ministry in the Holy Land to his resurrection and ascension, and in the light of the hope of his coming again, the Church on earth, built by God and being built by Him, remains a sojourner like her Lord and, as God's instrument, remains always militant. This involves several ethical postulates for the common life of men:¹

1. The Christian congregation as the People of God over against man-made society and man-made States, have to be watchmen, caretakers, of God's honour, God Who will finally bring His future to pass.
2. This watching brief is carried out by praise and prayer to God and in intercession for one's fellow men who can in this way, as individuals and as groups in society, be won through the Church.
3. This service to God (Gottesdienst) of spoken and carried out intercession for one's neighbour both individually and collectively can only be, and must be, part of the unceasing battle for God's righteousness on earth. This is where social

¹Erbauung. p.29. See pp.165, 207 f. above.

and political action by the individual linked to Christ fits in.¹

The whole weight of the Biblical proclamation, Schmidt adds, is directed towards attacking the folly that fails to take God's righteousness into account, since in the end God will establish His righteousness. Death is the final and decisive sign that man, peoples, States, must all finally give way to God - a cause for joy to all whose view of the future is, like Paul's, one in which the last enemy, death, is destroyed by Christ when he delivers the kingdom to God the Father so that God may be all in all.²

In all that has been said of Schmidt's doctrine of the Church so far, there is one important factor missing to some extent at least, namely the Biblical references for each and every point. To have filled in all these might well have doubled the length of this chapter but their omission should not be allowed to let us forget that they are the most characteristic sign of his approach and method. Ad fontes! was like a motto for him and a Biblical theology could only be

¹Bonhoeffer, like Schmidt, understood this battle. The Church is always militant, he said, always fighting, always a community of sinners, yet always in the hand of God. "The sanctorum communio moved by the Holy Spirit has continually to be actualised in a struggle against two sources of resistance: human imperfection and sin." op.cit. p.20.

²Erbauung. p.30.

based on Scripture.¹ His careful investigation and exegesis of the texts still stand as a model for scholars. Here, too, he insists that a Biblical theology must rest on God's initiative. Man cannot turn to the Bible as to an almanac or dream-book for answers or proof texts to support their own particular dogmas. The more important part is to allow what is given in Scripture to question us. Indeed, "if God really has the initiative, no other possibility, no other method, exists."²

The New Testament ekklesia, filled with the Holy Spirit, a fellowship "of a quality entirely unprecedented",³ "open on the God-ward side in a way that is almost unknown today",⁴ did as a matter of sober historical fact turn the world upside down. There is no way back to it but the way forward is illuminated by the doctrine contained in Schmidt's writings. "The beginning is God's purpose, the end is the fulfilment of His purpose", as C.H. Dodd put it.⁵ The Church "is always a disturbing factor, upsetting calculations and opening up

¹See pp. 17, 359 above.

²Revue. 2. p.146.

³The God Who Speaks. B.H. Streeter. p.154.

⁴The Young Church in Action. J.B. Phillips. p.11.

⁵History and the Gospel. p.171.

unforeseen possibilities. It is a standing protest against any conception of history as a closed order, naturally determined. . . . It is in the Church, so far as it realises its vocation, that history is made, not by us but by the power of God."¹

¹History and the Gospel. p.180.

APPENDICES

1. **Biographical Outline of Karl Ludwig Schmidt.**

2. **Bibliography:**

A. **Works by K.L. Schmidt**

B. **Other works cited.**

KARL LUDWIG SCHMIDT

Biographical Outline

- 1891 Born in Frankfurt-am-Main, 5th. February.
- 1900-9 School years at the Lessing Gymnasium, Frankfurt.
- 1909 Student at Marburg University: Philology, then theology.
- 1913 Assistant to Adolf Deissmann in Berlin. Licentiate in theology.
- 1914 Lecturer in New Testament in Berlin. War service.
- 1915-6 Soldier in Königsburg, Prussia. Severely wounded in Russian Poland.
- 1916 In hospital in Küstrin, then to a reserve battalion. Resumes theological work.
- 1917 Assistant Pastor in Berlin.
- 1918 Again assistant in the Berlin Theological Faculty. Married Ursula von Wegnern, daughter of Minister of State Martin von Wegnern, a descendant of Martin Luther's.
- 1919 Publication of Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu.
- 1921 Professor of New Testament at Giessen University.
- 1922 Editor of Theologische Blätter (until 1937).
- 1925 NT Professor at Jena. Visit to Palestine and Near East.
- 1927 Publication of Die Kirche des Urchristentums.
- 1929 NT Professor at Bonn.
- 1932 Publication of the Ekklesia article.
- 1933 Discussions with Martin Buber in Stuttgart. Dismissed from his post as professor and expelled from Germany by the Nazis.

- 1933-5 Pastor of a church in Lichtensteig (Canton of St. Gallen), Switzerland.
- 1935 NT Professor in Basel University.
- 1936 Basel inaugural lecture.
- 1938 Series of four lectures in Copenhagen.
- 1939 Deprived of German citizenship.
- 1944 Series of 6 broadcast talks on the Apocalypse over Radio Basel.
- 1945 Editor of Theologische Zeitschrift, Basel University.
- 1946 First of the Eranos circle lectures.
- 1948 Lecture in Cambridge and in Manchester Universities.
- 1952 Suffered a stroke.
- 1953 Retired from his Basel NT post.
- 1956 Died in Basel, 10th. January, aged 65.

Compiled from Karl Ludwig Schmidt's own writings (see especially p. 36 above); interviews and correspondence with his son, Dr. Martin Anton Schmidt, now Professor of Medieval Church History at Basel University, to whom my special thanks are due; Professor Oscar Cullmann's (Basel) funeral address on Dr. K.L. Schmidt, and his letters to me; Professor Philipp Vielhauer's (Bonn) 1968 tribute to Professor Schmidt in Bonner Gelehrte Beiträge zur Geschichte der Wissenschaften in Bonn, and his letters to me; and from correspondence with Professor W.G. Kümmel in Marburg.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Works by K.L. Schmidt

- 1919 Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu.
- 1922 Theologische Blätter (Editor and Contributor).
Theologie und Religion, Wissenschaft und Leben. Th.Bl.
No.1.
Eschatologie und Mystik im Urchristentum. Z.fur NT.W.
XXIII.
- 1923 Die Stellung der Evangelien in der allgemeinen Literatur-
geschichte.
Eucharisterion (Gunkel Festschrift Part 2).
- 1924 Die Stellung des Apostel Paulus im Urchristentum.
(Giessen).
Martin Buber und der Chassidismus. Th.Bl.3.
Der Apostel Paulus und die antike Welt.
- 1925 Abendmahl and Jesus Christus (for RGG. 2nd. Ed.)¹
Die Persönlichkeitsfrage im Urchristentum. ThBl.4.
- 1927 Die Kirche des Urchristentums. (In Festgabe für A.
Deissmann).
Das Kirchenproblem im Urchristentum. ThBl.6.
Das überweltliche Reich Gottes in der Verkündigung
Jesu. ThBl.6.
Die Notwendigkeit der christlichen Einheit für die
Darstellung der christlichen Wahrheit. ThBl.6.
- 1928 Heidenchristentum. (RGG).
- 1929 (onwards) Articles, in TWNT on ἀκροβυστία, απωθέω, ασφαλεία,
βάσιλειά, διδασκαλία, ἔθνος, θεμέλιος (etc.), θρησκεία (etc.).
- 1931 Die Verkündigung des NT in ihrer Einheit und Besonder-
heit. ThBl.10.
Der Fall Dehn, Der Fall Dehn und Schlimmeres. ThBl.10.
- 1932 Articles on ἐκκλησία (from καλέω), καίω, κολλάω, κύμβαλον,
in TWNT.
Kirchenleitung und Kirchenlehre im Neuen Testament im
Hinblick auf den Vertrag des Freistaates Preussen mit
den Evangelischen Landeskirchen. (Christentum und
Wissenschaft pp.241-256).

¹ Renewal of interest in Schmidt's writings can be seen in the appearance of an English translation of these two articles in Twentieth Century Theology in the Making, edited by J. Pelikan, 1969. Vol.1 (Themes of Biblical Theology) contains these and several other articles from RGG 2nd Ed.

- 1933 Zwiesgespräche im Jüdischen Lehrhaus in Stuttgart am 14. Januar 1933. on Kirche, Staat, Volk, Judentum. (with Martin Buber). ThBl. (Sept.)
- 1934 Zum Briefwechsel Karl Barth und Gerhard Kittel. ThBl. pp.328-334.
- 1935 Die jungfräuliche Geburt Jesu Christi. ThBl.14.
- 1936 Das Gegenüber von Kirche und Staat in der Gemeinde des Neuen Testaments. ThBl. (Jan.)
Wie spricht Gott zum heutigen Menschen? ThBl. (June).
Das Christuszeugnis der synoptischen Evangelien.
Der Jude und Christ Paulus als Mensch und Apostel.
(Schweiz.Monatsheft).
- 1937 Le Ministère et les ministères dans l'église du Nouveau Testament. (from the German Amt und Aemter). Revue 4.
- 1938 Le problème du christianisme primitif. Revue 1 and 2.
- 1939 Die Polis in Kirche und Welt. (Rektoratsprogramm der Universität Basel).
- 1941 Ein Gang durch den Galaterbrief. Th.St. 11/12.
- 1942 Die Judenfrage im Lichte der Kapitel 9-11 des Römerbriefes. Th.St. 13.
- 1944 Aus der Johannes-Apokalypse. (6 Radio-Vorträge, Basel).
Die kanonischen und apokryphen Evangelien und Apostelgeschichten. (Akademische Vorträge, Basel).
- 1945 Editor of Theologische Zeitschrift.
Die Verstockung des Menschen durch Gott. ThZ. 1.
Das Pneuma Hagion als Person und als Charisma. (Eranos Jahrbuch. XIII).
Der Todesprozess des Messias Jesus. (Judaica 1).
Israels Stellung zu den Fremdlingen und Beisassen und Israels Wissen um seine Fremdling- und Beisassenschaft.
(Judaica 4).
- 1946 Die Natur- und Geiſtkräfte im paulinischen Erkennen und Glauben. (Eranos Jahrbuch XIV).
Die Erbauung der Kirche mit ihren Gliedern als den 'Fremdlingen und Beisassen auf Erden' (Heb.11:13).
(Wesen und Aufgabe der Kirche in der Welt).
- 1947 Homo Imago Dei im Alten und Neuen Testament. (Eranos Jahrbuch XV).

- 1948 The Proclamation of the Church to the Congregation.
SJTh. Vol.1.
Articles on ὀρίζω, πρόοικος (εκ), παχύνω (εκ), πτείω, πύγμή, πικτεύω,
in TWNT.
- 1950 Jerusalem als Urbild und Abbild. (Eranos Jahrbuch
XVIII).
- 1951 Luzifer. (Akademische Vorträge).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

B. Other works cited.

- Adam, Karl The Spirit of Catholicism. 1934.
 Christ our Brother. 1934.
 Moralische Aufrüstung und Christentum im
 Westen. 1952.
 The Christ of Faith. 1962.
- Althaus, P. Communio Sanctorum. 1929.
 Das sogenannte Kerygma und der historische
 Jesus. 1958.
- Anderson, Hugh Jesus and Christian Origins. 1964.
Aquinas, Thomas Summa Theologica. III. (Theological Texts. 1955).
Augustine De Catechizandis Rudibus XX.
Aulén, Gustaf The Faith of the Christian Church. ET. 1960.
- Baillie, D.M. God was in Christ. 1961.
Baillie, John The Place of Jesus Christ in Modern Christianity.
 1929.
 The Idea of Revelation in Recent Thought. 1956.
- Barclay, Wm. The Promise of the Spirit. 1960.
Barrett, C.K. The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition. 1947.
 The Eschatology of the Epistle to the Hebrews.
 1956.
 Jesus and the Gospel Tradition. 1967.
- Barth, Karl Römerbrief. 1922 (2nd. Ed.)
 Theology and Church. 1928.
 God in Action. 1936.
 Church Dogmatics. 1942. (ET 1956).
 The Faith of the Church. 1960. (Original in
 French, 1943).
- Battifol, P. L'Eglise naissante et le Catholicisme. 1927.
Best, E. One Body in Christ. 1955.
Bettenson, H. The Early Church Fathers. 1956.
Billerbeck, P. See under Strack.
Bonhoeffer, D. Sanctorum Communio. 1930.
 Life Together. 1954.
- Bonsirven, J. Theology of the New Testament. 1963.
Bornkamm, G. Enderwartung und Kirche im Matthäusevangelium.
 1956.
 Jesus von Nazareth. 1956. (ET 1962).
 Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew. 1963.
- Bousset, W. Kyrios Christos. 1913.
Bromiley, G.W. ET of TWNT. Vol. III, 1965; Vol. IV, 1967.
Buber, Martin Die Schrift und ihre Verdeutschung. 1936.
 Königtum Gottes. 1956.

- Bultmann, R. Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition. 1921.
Jesus and the Word. 1926. (ET 1958).
Kommentar zum vierten Evangelium. 1940.
Die Frage der Echtheit von Matth.16:17-19. (Th.Bl.) 1941.
The Theology of the New Testament. 1952-5.
Kerygma and Myth. 1953.
Primitive Christianity. 1956.
The Bible Today. 1956.
Das Verhältnis der urchristlichen Christusbotschaft zum historischen Jesus. 1960.
- Burkitt, F.C. The Earliest Sources for the Life of Jesus. 1922.
- Brunner, Emil The Mediator. 1934.
The Misunderstanding of the Church. ET 1952.
Dogmatics. Vol.III. 1962.
Truth as Encounter. 1964.
The Word of God and Modern Man. 1965.
- Cadbury, H.J. The Peril of Modernising Jesus. 1937.
- Cadoux, A.T. Acts and Eschatology. 1956.
- Cadoux, C.J. The Parables of Jesus. 1930.
- Cairns, D. The Theology of Jesus. 1940.
The Historic Mission of Jesus. 1941.
- Calvin, John The Theology of Emil Brunner. (Exp.T. Sept.) 1964.
- v Campenhausen, H. Commentary on Acts.
Kirchliches Amt und geistliche Vollmacht in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten. 1953.
- Carrington, Archb. P. The Early Christian Church. Vol.I. 1957.
- Cerfaux, L. The Church in the Theology of St. Paul. 1959.
- Clarke, W.K.L. Divine Humanity. 1936.
- Clement of Alexandria Stromateis VII; Paedagogus I.
- Coates, J.R. ET of Ekklesia - The Church. 1950.
- Congar, M-J. Divided Christendom. 1939.
- Conzelmann, H. The Theology of St Luke. 1960.
- Cox, H. The Secular City. 1965.
- Craig, C.T. The One Church in the Light of the NT. 1952.
- Cullmann, O. Christus und die Zeit. 1946.
Königsherrschaft Christi und Kirche im NT. 1950.
Peter. 1953.
Die Mitte der Zeit. 1954.

- Cullmann, O. Karl Ludwig Schmidt, 1891-1956. (Th.Z.)
1956.
The Early Church. 1956.
Christologie des NT. 1957.
- Cyprian De Catholicae Ecclesiae Unitate.
Epistles.
- Dahl, N.A. Das Volk Gottes. 1941.
The Parables of Growth. 1952.
Christ, Creation, and the Church. 1956.
- Dahlman, G. Die Worte Jesu. 1930.
- Daniel-Rops, H. The Church of Apostles and Martyrs. ET 1960.
- Davies, J.G. The Making of the Church. 1960.
- Deissmann, A. Die Kirchen und die Völkerversöhnung.
(Th.Bl.) 1922.
The Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul.
Light from the Ancient East. ET 1927.
- Dibelius, M. Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums. 1919.
An die Philipper. 1925.
- Dodd, C.H. Essays Congregational and Catholic. 1931.
Present Tendencies in the Criticism of the
Gospels. (Exp.T. March) 1932.
The Framework of the Gospel Narrative.
(Exp.T. June) 1932.
The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments.
1932.
The Parables of the Kingdom. 1935.
History and the Gospel. 1938.
Matthew and Paul. (Exp.T.) 1947.
The Coming of Christ. 1951.
The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel.
1953.
New Testament Studies. 1953.
- Ebeling, G. Towards an Ecclesiology. (Theology and
Proclamation). ET 1966.
- Fascher, E. Die formgeschichtliche Methode. 1924.
Gottes Königtum im Urchristentum. 1957.
- Flew, R.N. Jesus and His Church. 1938.
- Florovsky, G. The Universal Church in God's Design.
- Fuchs, E. Zur Frage nach dem historischen Jesus. 1960.
- Fuller, R.H. The Mission and Achievement of Jesus. 1954.
The New Testament in Current Study. 1963.

- Gloege, G.
Goguel, M.
Guignebert, C.A.
- Reich Gottes und Kirche in NT. 1929.
Le problème de L'église dans le christianisme. 1938.
Unité et diversité du christianisme primitif. 1939.
Jesus. ET 1935.
- Hamilton, Kenneth
Harnack, A. von
- What's New in Religion. 1968.
Lehre der zwölf Apostel. 1884.
Outlines of the History of Dogma. 1893-9.
(ET 1957).
Das Wesen des Christentums. 1900.
Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten. 1923.
The Origin of the NT. 1925.
The Organisation of the Early Christian Churches. 1881.
- Hatch, E.
- Headlam, A.C.
- Hegel, G.W.
Heidegger, M.
Henderson, G.D.
- The Doctrine of the Church and Christian Reunion. 1920.
The Philosophy of History. 1848. (ET 1890).
Unterwegs zur Sprache. 1959.
The Nature of the Church. 1948.
Church and Ministry. 1951.
- Hendry, G.S.
Holl, Karl
- The Holy Spirit in Christian Theology. 1956.
Der Streit zwischen Petrus und Paulus zu Antiochen. 1920.
Der Kirchenbegriff des Paulus in seinem Verhältnis zu dem der Urgemeinde. 1921.
Gesammelte Aufsätze zu Kirchengeschichte. 1928.
- Hort, F.J.A.
Hoskyns and Davey
Hunter, A.M.
- The Christian Ecclesia. 1898.
The Riddle of the NT. 1958.
The Unity of the NT. 1943.
The Work and Words of Jesus. 1950.
Introducing NT Theology. 1957.
Interpreting the Parables. 1960.
- Jeremias, J.
- Die Gleichnisse Jesu. 1952.
The Eucharistic Words of Jesus. ET 1966.
Abba (NT Studies). 1966.
- Johnston, G.
- The Doctrine of the Church in the NT. 1943.

- Käsemann, E. Leib und Leib Christi. 1933.
Neutestamentliche Fragen von heute. 1957.
- Kattenbusch, F. Der Quellort der Kirchenidee. 1921.
Die Vorzugstellung des Petrus und der
Charakter der Urgemeinde zu Jerusalem.
1922.
Der Spruch über Petrus. 1925.
Early Christian Doctrines. 1958.
- Kelly, J.N.D. Bible Key Words - Basileia (K.L.S.) ET 1957.
- Kingdom, H.P. The Church and the Reality of Christ. 1963.
- Knox, John Das Formgeschichte Problem des NTs. 1927.
- Köhler, L. Die Eschatologie der Evangelien. (Th.Bl.)
1936.
Kirchenbegriff und Geschichtsbewusstsein
in der Urgemeinde und bei Jesus. (Stud.
Th.) 1943.
- Kümmel, W.G. Verheissung und Erfüllung. 1953.
Jesus und die Anfänge der Kirche. (Stud.
Th.) 1953.
Das Neue Testament. 1958.
- Küng, Hans Heilsgeschehen und Geschichte. 1965.
Structures of the Church. ET 1965.
Die Kirche. 1967.
- Lewis, C.S. Christian Reflections. 1967.
- Lewis, E. The Ministry and the Sacraments. 1960.
- Lightfoot, J.B. St Paul's Epistle to the Galatians. 1865.
- Linton, O. Das Problem der Urkirche in der neueren
Forschung. 1932.
- Loisy, A. L'évangile et l'église. 1902.
- de Lubac, H. Catholicisme. 1938.
- Lundström, G. The Kingdom of God in the Teaching of Jesus.
1963.
- MacGregor, G. Corpus Christi. 1959.
- Mackintosh, H.R. The Divine Initiative. 1921.
Types of Modern Theology: Schleiermacher
to Barth. 1937.
- Manson, T.W. The Teaching of Jesus. 1935.
The Church's Ministry. 1948.
The Sayings of Jesus. 1949. (first pub-
lished as Part II of The Mission and
Message of Jesus. 1937.)
The Servant-Messiah. 1953.
The Life of Jesus: some tendencies in
present-day research. 1956.

- Manson, Wm. Jesus the Messiah. 1943.
Eschatology in the NT. (SJTh. occ.papers No.2) 1952.
- Marcel, G. Jesus and the Christian. 1967.
Un Changement d'Espérance à la rencontre du Réarmement Moral. 1958. (ET 1960).
- Marxsen, W. Der Evangelist Markus. 1956.
- Mascall, E.L. Christ, the Christian and the Church. 1946.
Corpus Christi. 1953.
The Secularisation of Christianity. 1965.
- Mersch, E. Le corps mystique du Christ. 1933 (ET 1938).
- Mohwinckel, S. He that cometh. 1956.
- Morrison, J.M. Honesty and God. 1966.
- Nelson, J.R. The Realm of Redemption. 1951.
- Newbigin, L. The Household of God. 1953.
- Nygren, A. Corpus Christi. 1943.
Christ and His Church. 1957.
- Oepke, A. Der Herrenspruch über die Kirche Mt.16: 17-19 in der neuesten Forschung. (Stud. Th.) 1948.
- Origen Das neue Gottesvolk. 1950.
- Origen Commentary on Matthew, Commentary on John. Homily on Joshua 8; on Jeremiah 34. Contra Celsum.
- Otto, Rudolf Reich Gottes und Menschensohn. 1934.
- Overbeck, F. Ueber die Auffassung des Streits des Paulus mit Petrus in Antiochen bei den Kirchenvätern. 1877.
Ueber die Anfänge der patristischen Literatur. 1882.
Christentum und Kultur. 1919.
- Percy, E. Der Leib Christi. 1942.
- Peterson, E. Das Buch von den Engeln. 1935.
Patristic Studies on the Church of Jew and Gentile. 1936.
- Phillips, J.B. The Young Church in Action. 1955.
- Ragaz, L. Judentum und Christentum. 1922.
Israel, Judentum, Christentum. 1942.

- Rahner, Karl Theological Investigations Vol.II (Man in the Church) 1963.
Concise Theological Dictionary. 1965.
- Rawlinson, A.E.J. The Gospel according to St Mark. 1925.
- Rengstorf, K.H. Apostolos in TWNT I. (c.1929).
- Richardson, A. Introduction to the Theology of the NT. 1958.
- Robinson, J.A.T. The Body. 1952.
- Robinson, J.M. The Problem of History in Mark. 1957.
- Schlatter, A. Die Kirche Jerusalems von Jahre 70-130. 1898.
- Schleiermacher, H. The Idea of the Church in Ephesians. (Th.Bl.) 1927.
- Schlink, E. The Coming Christ and the Coming Church. ET 1967.
- Schmid, J. KLS in Lex.für Th. u K. 1964.
- Schmidt, T. Der Leib Christi. 1919.
- Schnackenburg, R. God's Rule and Kingdom. 1963.
- Schoeps, H.J. Jüdisch-christliches Religionsgespräch in 19 Jahrhunderten. 1937.
- Schürer, E. Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi. 1886.
- Schürmann, H. Der Einsetzungsbericht Lk.22:19-20. 1955.
- Schweitzer, A. Skizze des Lebens Jesu. 1901.
The Quest of the Historic Jesus. 1910.
The Kingdom and the Messiah. 1911.
The Gospel and its Tributaries. 1928.
The Validity of the Gospel Record. 1938.
The Nature of the Early Church. 1941.
- Snaithe, N.H. The Passover (in A Companion to the Bible) 1939.
- Sohm, R. Kirchenrecht, Vol.I. 1892.
- Spoerri, Th. Sprache, Denken und menschliches Wesen. 1967.
- Stauffer, E. Die Theologie des NTs. 1941.
Agnostos Christos. 1956.
- Strack, H.L. Kommentar zum NT aus Talmud und Midrasch (with P. Billerbeck) 1922-28.
- Streeter, B.H. Studies in the Synoptic Problem. 1911.
The Four Gospels. 1924.
The Primitive Church. 1930.
The God Who Speaks. 1936.

- Taylor, V. The Formation of the Gospel Tradition. 1933.
Jesus and His Sacrifice. 1937.
Formgeschichte (Second Thoughts. Exp.T. Sept.) 1964.
- Temple, Archb. Wm. Christ in His Church. 1925.
Tertullian De Praescriptione Haereticorum.
- Thornton, L.S. The Common Life in the Body of Christ. 1941.
- Torrance, T.F. Kingdom and Church. 1956.
Theology in Reconstruction. 1965.
The Mission of the Church. (SJTh. June) 1966.
- Vielhauer, P. Oikodome, das Bild vom Bau in der christlichen Literature vom NT bis Clemens Alexandrinus. 1939.
Gottesreich und Menschensohn in der Verkündigung Jesu. 1957.
Karl Ludwig Schmidt. 1968.
- Vischer, W. Die Hoffnung der Kirche und die Juden. 1942.
- Weiss, J. The History of Primitive Christianity. 1937.
- Welch, C. The Reality of the Church. 1958.
- Wellhausen, J. Das Evangelium Marci. 1909.
- Wendland, H.D. Die Eschatologie des Reiches Gottes bei Jesus. 1931.
- Wingren, G. Gospel and Church. 1964.
- Woodhouse, H.F. The Authority of the Holy Spirit. (SJTh. June) 1967.
- Wotherspoon, H.J. The Ministry in the Church. 1916.
A Manual of Church Doctrine. 1920 (and 1960).
- Wrede, W. Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien. 1901.
The Origin of the NT. 1909.
- Zahrnt, H. The Historical Jesus. ET 1963.