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ABSTRACT OF THESIS

This investigation treats of the origin of the Doctrine of Immortality. Was it implicit in the teachings of the earliest Jewish Christians or a later addition to Christian thought? Part One, examines this teaching in relation to the thought, practices and institutions of the pre-Christian hellenised Jews in the light of the Zenon Papyri, Maccabees, Dead Sea Scrolls, Enoch, Pseudepigrapha, Josephus and other relevant sources. With the following results: (a) Highly advanced teachings on the Resurrection of the Body and Immortality of the Soul were conjoined by pre-Christian hellenised Jews. (b) The important separation of these doctrines first occurs in the controversies between the Pharisees and the Sadducees: the pre-Herodian Sadducees rejected the Pharisaic General Resurrection and Judgment, but affirmed a doctrine of Immortality and Translation of the Elect.

Part Two, examines the Immortality-Resurrection Controversy as it emerged within the early Church and influenced the formulation of its two main Kerygmata, represented by the Immortality-Ascension Kerygma of the Urgemeinde; seen in the Urgemeinde traditions contained in the Gospels, particularly John and the Epistle to the Hebrews; and the Resurrection Kerygma of the Pauline Christians described in Acts and the Pauline Letters. A comparison discloses that: (a) The Urgemeinde interpreted pre-Christian Parousia expectations as already fulfilled in the Passion of Christ. Their Son of Man, Translation and Immortality Kerygma are closer to the
eschatology of the pre-Herodian Sadducaic-Essenes. (b) The Pauline Christians in their teachings on the Messianic Prophet and future Resurrection-Judgment, are shown to be closer to the basic Pharisaic eschatology; (c) Luke, unlike the other Evangelists, has sought to reconcile these differing Kerygmata which were both very much alive in his own day. (d) This Kerygmata Controversy was decisive in Paul's differences with the Urgemeinde. (e) The Fourth Gospel, although written later, discloses a unique continuity with the Urgemeinde Kerygma.
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Part I

Pre-Christian Jewish Beliefs in Immortality and Resurrection

A. Misconceptions Regarding the Sadducees
The purpose of this investigation is to trace back to their beginnings some of the earliest forms of Christian thought and belief about immortality and the afterlife. In this generation which has survived Religionsgeschichte, Form Criticism and the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, there is no longer very much doubt about the indebtedness of the first Christians to their Jewish surroundings. It is an indebtedness which extends to much of their thought, as well as the imagery and language with which they communicated that thought. Because it is often assumed that immortality was not a Jewish teaching, but one characteristic only of the Greeks, it is supposed that resurrection of the body was the accepted Jewish teaching on the afterlife. Therefore, resurrection of the body, with its implication of a general resurrection at the end of time, is said to be the "original Christian point of view". Thus the Pharisees, who believed in the resurrection of the body, seem to have a great deal in common with what Christians, today, teach about a general resurrection at the end of time. By contrast, the Sadducees are often dismissed as those enemies of the Church who appear in the Gospels without any hope, teachings or belief in a life after death. Previous to Qumran, the Essenes were also denied any claim to a theological or eschatological point of view, which might shed more light on the pre-Pauline Church or that little-known group in Jerusalem which existed before the Fall of 68-70 AD, known as the "Urgemeinde". Consequently, we have found little with which to disagree in the full and adequate representations of Pharisaic influence on Christian and pre-Christian eschatology. Those who are overlooked, and most often misrepresented in this matter, are the Sadducees and the important strand of pre-Christian Judaism of which they were a part.

The task of righting the balance of knowledge is not an easy one. Many of the Sadducean teachings, regarding immortality and the afterlife, have come to us from sources entirely inimical to and censorious of them. Unfortunately, a true understanding of earliest Christian thought cannot
be achieved until prejudices are overcome and full considera-
tion is given not only to the Pharisees but also to the Sadducaic
teachings on the afterlife and the extent of their influence on
the Early Church. The few passages in the New Testament and
Josephus which make mention of Sadducaic views on the afterlife
(Mt.22:23, Mk.21:18, Lk.20:27, Acts 4:1-2, Antiq.xviii.16-17
and B.J.ii.164-165) all fall into a class of late secondary state-
ments which take for granted, without example, quotation or expla-
nation, that the Sadducees rejected the resurrection of the body.
None of them says what the Sadducees did believe; none of them
states that they had no beliefs. This, however, has been the
supposition of modern critics. At a time when the original
Sadducees had ceased to exist, even Christian sources repeat neg-
ative assumptions about them as commonly accepted knowledge. In
all instances, these generalisations fail to distinguish between
the Sadducees in power in Herodian times (known as the Boethusians)
and their conservative priestly predecessors who formed the center
of normative Judaism in Hasmonaean times and earlier. They give
no account of the Zadokites, or Sons of Zadok, the Essenes, and
before them, the Hasidim, all of whom, as I shall attempt to show,
were connected in one way or another to the central strand of
Judaism. Of all these groups which preceded them, some undoubt-
edly existed simultaneously with the "Sadducees", who are mentioned
by that name for the first time in the reign of John Hyrcanus
(Antiq.xiii.171,293). Likewise, many of the true Sadducees must
have still existed when Herod appointed the weaker Boethusians
to the high-priestly offices to suit his own ends. In most inst-
ances, late Christian and Mishnaic sources fail to state, in a
positive manner, what the Sadducees of an earlier period did
believe. Consequently, it is assumed that they had no doctrinal
position whatsoever.

In their extreme conservatism, the Sadducees are
known to have opposed most of the innovations of the Pharisees,
particularly those innovations which stood without foundation
in the Pentateuch or written Torah. The history of their
long-standing dispute is well known. Because of this, they rejected the Pharisaic introduction of linear eschatology with its doctrine of future rewards and resurrection of the body to judgment at the end of time. Far from rejecting it, modern critics have seen this linear eschatology as the "original Jewish" element in early Christian thought. It is perhaps curious that long after Pharisaic resurrection eschatology has become well established in some circles as a "basic Christian tenet", modern Judaism has only in relatively recent times denounced the doctrine of the resurrection of the body as a "foreign intrusion into Judaism".1

Many studies of late Judaism, by Christian authors who are interested in the background of early Christian thought, tend to look upon the Sadducees as an appendage; "another party" which joined itself to normative Judaism or else was created by schism, as were the Pharisees in Hasmonaean times. Thus T.W. Manson has described them: "A body of leading men in the Jewish nation, who under the leadership of the Hasmonaeans formed an executive and administrative council", "a party without ideals or doctrines", "practical men running the affairs of the state doing their best for their people and for themselves".2 It has often been conjectured that because they were "primarily a political party", they "faded out of existence" when the Jewish state ceased to exist as a political power and the Temple was destroyed.3 One standard history of Christian backgrounds states: "Their (the Sadducees') great weakness was that they had recourse to barren negation and cavilling opposition; they stood for nothing positive, and, "Their materialism led them also to deny the existence of angels, spirits, and demons".4 Much of this misrepresentation is the result of oversimplification on the part of those, who for good reasons, have not had access to all of the facts. Many studies of Christian backgrounds thus stand in need of serious reconsideration and correction in the light of new document discoveries.
(as well as those already known) from the Sadducaic and pre-Sadducaic levels of Judaism.

**Josephus' Oversimplifications:**

Much of the misrepresentation about the Sadducees today, springs from an oversimplification on the part of the well-known Jewish historian, Flavius Josephus. In the most extensive statement Josephus makes about the Sadducees' views to his Roman readers, he says nothing of the resurrection of the body. Perhaps, such a doctrine was offensive to Greek and Roman intellectuals. Or perhaps, Josephus, like many of the Jews of his time, considered the soul inextricably related to the body and did not see the need to make this distinction which was later to become fashionable in medieval and modern theology. He does, however, impute to the Sadducees a highly sophisticated doctrine of "free will" (or "choice"). Among the things they are said to deny are the notion of Fate, the intermediate state and a doctrine of rewards and punishment based on the persistence of the soul (and, ex hypothesi, the body) after death.

"The Sadducees, the second of the orders, do away with Fate altogether, and remove God beyond, not merely the commission, but the very sight of evil. They maintain that man has the free choice of good or evil, and that it rests on each man's will whether he follows the one or the other. As for the persistence of the soul after death, penalties in the underworld, and rewards, they will have none of them."

(B.J. ii.164-5)

If it is not clear in his History of the Jewish War (B.J. hereafter), it is immediately obvious in the Antiquities that Josephus has "reconciled himself" with the teachings of the Pharisees now in power, particularly their eschatology. Regarding his own beliefs, he diplomatically says that despite his Hasmonaean ancestry and Sadducaic upbringing,
he has long since given these up to follow the Pharisaic way of life (Contra Ap. i.54). In his own life he thus presents the anomaly of being a priest of the aristocratic family of Hasmonaeans, who now agrees with the views of the Pharisees. That does not imply that Josephus was a Sadducee (although the Hasmonaeans did establish their relationship to the Sons of Zadok) or that the Sadducees still existed as an influential body at the time when he wrote. The Pharisaic councils of Jamnia (Yabneh, 90-118 AD), which began to fix the canon of the Old Testament about the time Josephus was editing his Antiquities, did not actually reject Josephus because of his associations and life under Roman patronage. They were content to emphasize the "peculiar" nature of his history of the Jewish nation which was to be found in the "Antiquities" and "Contra Apionem". Even in his earlier writings, Josephus acknowledged the power of the Pharisees whom he calls the "leading sect" (B.J. ii.162). Their priority and growing influence continued to dominate his writing and apologetic throughout his life.

Because of their refusal to go along with the popular notion of Fate, widely held among the contemporary Stoic schools, Josephus says of them, (ἡν μὲν ἐμφαμινήν παντόπλων ἀναμορφών B.J. ii.164). Because of this, the Sadducees have frequently been placed in the category of Jewish Sceptics and compared with the Pharisees' emphasis and development of the doctrine of Fate (B.J. ii.164, Ant. xiii.173). Josephus, himself, is largely responsible for this in his comparison of "Three Jewish schools of thought", which he describes in terms of three main categories of Greek philosophy. These well known categories may have provided the raison d'être for his oversimplification of the highly complex Jewish parties, for the sake of his Roman readers.

Josephus' analogy with the three main schools of Greek philosophy is unfortunate, not only because of its
gloss oversimplification, but also because the comparison is inappropriate. While the Pharisees reveal some similarity, in their views, to the Stoics, who believed in Fate and the final destruction (or judgment) of the world by fiery conflagration (Vita.12), the Stoics by no means believed in the survival or resurrection of the body. And while the Essenes may resemble the Pythagoreans (Ant.xv.371) in their belief in immortality (or survival of the righteous after death) the Pythagoreans stressed that it is only the "soul" which is eternal, pre-existent and divine (apart from righteousness or the sovereignty of God). And on the basis of what can now be known about them, the Essenes did not teach an intermediate state or "isle of the blessed". Nor did they distinguish between the body and soul in the Pythagorean manner. But the most inappropriate comparison is that of the Sadducees with the Sceptics. In their rejection of Fate, the final destruction of the world by fire and resurrection to judgment, the Sadducees by no means---without alternatives of their own, nor did they say that it was impossible to have knowledge of matters relating to the afterlife, as did the Sceptics. Also, unlike the true Sceptics of old, they did not seek to do away with the Temple, institutions or society in which they lived. We shall presently see that they were, in fact, the well established priests of the Temple from the time of Antiochus III, and earlier, who sought to maintain the Temple, its institutions and worship, but most importantly the integrity of the written Torah against the innovations of the Pharisees. They were, in effect, the embodiment of normative Jewish orthodoxy for several centuries before the rise of the Pharisaic lay-movement to power.

Sadducees and the Sons of Zadok:

The most widely accepted source for the common but etymologically obscure name, "Sadducee" (σάδουσιον)
is that it derives from Zadok, the high priest in the days of David and Solomon (IISam.7:17, 15:24, IKg.1:34, and IChr.12:28). As a basic working hypothesis, let us assume the essential continuity between those designated by the terms "Sons of Zadok", "Zadokites", "Sadduceans", and "Sadducees", along with the "Essenes", "proto-Essenes", and "Hasidim" in the high-priestly family of Zadok, established with central authority in Jerusalem and elsewhere since the days of Ezekiel. This continuity, first suggested by historian Emil Schürer and subsequently corroborated by a host of scholars, is occasionally thought to be misleading because it implies a priestly succession or blood relationship between the well known high priest Zadok and the Temple priesthood of Hasmonaean times. However, it cannot be contested that the Hasmonaean, in addition to the priesthood of their time, did have a blood relationship through Jojarib (IMac.2:1, 14:29) with the Sons of Zadok. If this blood relationship through Jojarib, brother of Eleazar, father of Zadok was not considered direct enough by some, it may provide a prima facie reason why the Sadducees were called "Sadduceans" or "Zadokites" rather than "Sons of Zadok". However, the most important continuity in the priesthood was in their doctrinal views and priestly obligations to preserve the worship traditions of the Temple and the integrity of the Torah.

Among the Dead Sea Scrolls, was found an important historical document. Although written later than many of the other scrolls, the Damascus Document (or Zadokite Document, CD, hereafter) describes some of the earliest history of this unique (Sadducean) side of Judaism from the time of Onias III. It is thus important for the light it sheds on the priestly Sadducees as well as the Essenes. The Damascus Document names the original covenanters, "who kept charge of the sanctuary when the children of Israel went astray", as the "Sons of Zadok" (CD v.7). This designation verifies their identification by Josephus and I and II Maccabees with the priestly hellenised Jews who did not flee but maintained the Temple during the Syrian conquest of
Antiochus III. They were shortly thereafter acknowledged and supported by the Syrian government until a change of policy during the reign of Antiochus IV forced them to flee from Jerusalem. These were the same priests who were later persecuted for their adherence to the Torah and possession of written scriptures. This Zadokite Document accords the Sons of Zadok the highest praise possible in terms of a present rather than future eschatology:

"And the Sons of Zadok are the elect of Israel called by the name, that are holding office in the end of days. Behold the statement of their names according to their generations, and the period of their office and the number of their afflictions, and the years of their sojournings and the statement of their works. The first saints whom God pardoned, both justified the righteous and condemned the wicked." (CD vi.2)

The Sons of Zadok are designated in this document as those who already have an eternal dynasty which extends back to, and includes, the "first saints" or "Hasidim". This latter term has been noticed by several critics to be the etymological source for the term "Essene". The relationship of these groups will be examined at length below, but suffice it here to point out that the eternal (or immortal) priesthood mentioned by the Zadokite Document also came to be applied to the exiled priests of the Seleucid period as well as those re-established in the Hasmonaean period. Thus, the Hasidim, Essenes, Zadokites, Sadduceans and Sadducees can be demonstrated to have a historical as well as a doctrinal and functional point of origin in the particular "Sons of Zadok", whom the manuscript states made a "new covenant" at some time in Damascus.

Both the Sadducees and the Essenes will thus be seen to stem from a longstanding strain of hellenised Jews of priestly and aristocratic character, unlike the separatist Pharisees (for that is what their name implies). One of the basic points of difference between this central stream of Judaism all the groups which we have here discussed in
relation to the term Sadducee) and the Pharisees is that the Sadducees were politically orientated to Egypt and the Pharisees to Syria. The significance of this fundamental orientation should not be minimised, for it had a great deal to do with both the causes of persecution and the manner in which the eschatological teachings of this period were given expression.

What Schürer stated some time ago, regarding the Zadokite (Sadducaic) aristocracy, has become significant in the light of recent documentary discoveries. He said they were: "The ancient high-priestly family which, at least in some of its members, represented the extreme philo-hellenistic standpoint." They were initially "pushed into the background" by the first Maccabees, but by no means did they cease to exist. Indeed, their high priestly function was not supplanted, but left vacant in the time of Judas. In 153 BC, Jonathan was unanimously elected high priest and thus founded a new dynasty of Hasmonaean (but Zadokite related) high priestly rulers. If the Hasmonaeans took the political office of high priest for themselves (which seems to have been the case) they, by no means, eliminated the long established priesthood of the Sons of Zadok which fulfilled an important function for them. Many of the Zadokite priests undoubtedly went into exile, especially in their time of persecution under the next ruler of Palestine (Antiochus IV) who was not as lenient as his father, Antiochus III. Perhaps some went to Egypt; perhaps some went to Qumran, but A.C. Sundberg has surely erred in holding that the Sadducees disappeared completely from the scene by the time of the Hasmonaeans. Emil Schürer has argued convincingly:

"The Hasmonaean parvenus had come to some kind of understanding with it (the old Zadokite aristocracy) and yielded to it at least a portion of the seats in the Garousia. Things remained in this position until the time of John Hyrcanus, when the Sadducees again became the really ruling party."

Those who have sought to view the Sadducees as
"another party" or an "intrusion" of foreign elements into Judaism during times of occupation, must somehow explain why Sadducees and Zadokites should be considered "sects" when they themselves upheld the longest-standing priestly functions from the second century B.C., and why they themselves should be the objects of foreign persecution, if they were the instruments of cultural collaboration? Etymologically, the objection falls on the basis of their name alone which links the Sadducees with the original Sons of Zadok, who were famed for not forsaking either the Temple or the Torah during foreign occupations.

T.W. Manson has taken exception to this origin of the name "Sadducee" on the grounds that the descendents of Zadok would have been called (ד"ס עַו) and not (ד"ס עַו), that is, "Sons of Zadok" with a single daleth rather than "Zaddokites." This is an important point, but one which should not be misconstrued. It is true that this is the earlier form of the name as it occurs in the Hebrew text of Ecclesiasticus (c.200 B.C.). It should also be noticed that the later Greek text of Ecclesiasticus (at the hand of a Pharisaic scribe) has altered this from "Sons of Zadok" to "House of Aaron" at 51:12 of the Hebrew manuscript. It appears that the fundamental problem which faced the Pharisaic redactor was not, Which group does this name designate? but, What is the legitimacy of their claim to Zadokite lineage?. This does not imply, as some modern critics have supposed, that "Zadokites" and "Sadducees" refer to entirely different groups of people. There is really no dispute whether the Zadokites held a central position of authority with a primary, if not exclusive, claim to the priesthood (at least in the second century B.C.). The name "Zadokites" thus appears to be a natural solution to the lineage question. It may even be a later Greek term of derision for those who claimed to be "Sons of Zadok", but it is not necessary to conclude that those whom the term designated had no
functional, doctrinal, priestly or historical continuity with the original Sons of Zadok. Prof. Manson's contention that the Greek term (Σαρόκαώκος) presupposes a dagesh forte in the daleth (ד) in the original name (רִתי) is not a serious objection when it is realised that Masoretic pointing in certain biblical documents did not become a practice until the 7th or 8th centuries AD, and furthermore, that the change makes little difference in the pronunciation of an oral tradition. Zaddok, Zadduk, Zaddouk and Zaddoukh are frequent spellings of the name Zadok in which "U" for "O" and the dagesh forte "D" bear no consequence. Early forms of (Σαρόκ) with two deltas for (רִתי) occur with frequency in the Septuagint and Josephus.

It only adds confusion to try to infer from post-Christian Talmudic and Gnostic sources what may be the original designation of the term. On this basis, T.W. Manson has conjectured that one avenue of research may lie in the term (Συνδικοί) or "Syndics", a body of archons and assistants responsible for enforcing tax laws. G.H. Driver has gone so far as to see a possible derivation of the name in a post-Christian Zealot named "Sadduk", a follower or colleague of Judah the Sophist, whose followers did not call themselves Judahites, but for some unexplained reason, "Zaddokites". Because his identifications and evidence deal mainly with post-Pauline groups they will not be given serious attention here.

However, T.W. Manson's conjecture is interesting, not for the premise of his argument, but for the conclusion he draws from it. As for the premise, it is next to impossible to draw a direct etymological line of connection between (Σύναγια) and (Σαρόκαώκος). In the historical context of the first centuries B.C, the theory has some elements which recommend it. The "Sundikoi" or "Saddukaioi" bear several marks of resemblance with the priestly Gerousia of the Hasmonaean and pre-Hasmonaean era. In late Byzantine times the term (Σύναγια) implied those who:
a) Gave legal advice in the assembly of the courts, b) Represented the to the Roman authorities and c) Looked after the fiscal affairs of the community. He thus reasons by analogy, that the Sadducees were the official interpreters of the written Law until this position was lost by the rise of the Pharisees and the preeminence of oral tradition. These characteristics can be applied directly to the Sadducees, on the basis of better evidence which is actually contemporaneous with them. Indeed, the Maccabean literature and Josephus disclose their being in charge of the Temple treasuries and taxation from the days of Antiochus III and earlier. There is no need to find late Byzantine or Talmudic sources to learn that the Temple treasury was a veritable banking institution for the whole nation and revenues were paid directly to the priesthood. Pre-Christian sources also shed considerable light on the diplomatic function which the Sadducees fulfilled on behalf of the Jews to Rome, both in Seleucid and Herodian times. This included such a prominent Sadducee as Jason, son of Eleazar, who was one of the ambassadors who succeeded in establishing an important alliance with Rome before the Seleucids withdrew from Jerusalem(IMac.8:17). Even in Herod's time the Sadducees initiated an official legation to Rome to win certain rights and immunities for the Jews.

Therefore, the conclusion that, "The Sadducees were a body of leading men in the Jewish nation, who under the leadership of the Hasmonaeans formed an executive and administrative council", does not at all seem incongruous with the facts as we have seen them. To this must be added that they were historically and functionally, priests. Manson's etymological argument, as well as Driver's Zealot theories, are rendered unnecessarily complicated by their recourse to late Rabbinical and foreign sources. Both the Zadokite Document (CD) and the portions of it recently discovered at Qumran speak of the "Sons of Zadok" as the "elect of Israel called by the name, that are holding offices in the end of days,"(CD vi.2). There is nothing
unusual or eccentric about this announcement. Earlier sources, such as Ezekiel, clearly establish the central priestly and sacrificial office of the Sons of Zadok: "The Sons of Zadok, who alone among the Sons of Levi may come near the Lord and minister to Him" (Ez. 40:46). Moreover, Ezekiel (43:19) states that the tithes and offerings should be given to the Sons of Zadok which clearly establishes their fiscal responsibility in the gathering of taxes, as the Temple was the main financial institution for the nation. The basis of Sadducaic loyalty to the Temple, as a well established tradition, is in all likelihood Ezekiel 44:15. This loyalty is also already seen as a tradition at 48:11, "The Sons of Zadok (יוֹאֵל Zədōḵ lxx) who kept my charge, who did not go astray when the people of Israel went astray, as the Levites did." Other references to the Sons of Zadok in early Hebrew texts, such as that of Ecclesiasticus will be examined in greater detail below.

Not a Party:

In view of the priestly, liturgical, financial, interpretive and administrative functions which the Sadducees clearly fulfilled, there is no reason to suppose that they considered themselves a "political party" or factional "sect" of Judaism. These terms are anachronistic. There is every reason to believe that the Sadducees considered themselves and called themselves by the name "Sons of Zadok" as the prophet Ezekiel prescribed, and later literature such as Ecclesiasticus and the Zadokite Document reflect. It is doubtful that they used the common term of derision or diminution, "Sadducee", found in later New Testament and Rabbinical literature. In a similar manner, the authors of the Dead Sea Scrolls refer to themselves, not as "Essenes", as they were designated after they ceased to exist, but "Sons of Zadok" and "Sons of Light", etc. However, their relation to the Zadokite and Sadducaic groups is based on more than their self designation, as will be seen presently.
Brief mention, perhaps, should be made here of one or two etymological theories which have been generally discarded for lack of support. Both Jerome and Epiphanius held that the term "Sadducee" derives from the adjective (Ῥ'Ἰγ) "righteous". It is grammatically unsuitable because its plural would be "Zadikim" (Ῥ’Ἰγ) and not "Zadukim" (Ῥ’Ἰγ). 26
Another theory which has not met with general acceptance, is that of W.O.E. Oesterley, following Cowley, who held that the term is a transmutation of "Zindik", which in modern Persian means "Manichean", but in 200 BC implied "Zoroastrian". Oesterley believed that it was used of a party in Judah which sympathised with foreign ideas and vigorously rebelled against the teachings which were fast becoming normative in Jewish orthodoxy. Without an examination of what that orthodoxy might include, previous to the rise of the Pharisees, he incorrectly concludes, "Sadducee never had any more definite sense than the general one of infidel". 27 It seems most unlikely that a late third century (A.D.), Persian term would be applied to a party which no longer existed after 70 AD. But such is the present state of criticism. Either the material which exists from pre-Christian Jewish sources is oversimplified to fit Josephus' "peculiar" categories of "three Jewish philosophies", or the other extreme is reached by taking great leaps in time and distance outside of Palestine to find evidence for a "foreign influence" theory, or proof of a "foreign intrusion" into Judaism which resulted in the Sadducaic Party. Neither approach is satisfactory.

Censorship:

If the Sadducees, and the groups which come within the scope of that name, included a large segment of normative priestly Judaism previous to the rise of the Pharisees, why have so few of their own writings remained, making a first hand evaluation of their teachings and eschatology so difficult?
Why has little, other than a Pharisaic view of eschatology remained, in the Christian literature which was nonetheless written at some distance from the time when the Sadducees ceased to exist? The answer lies partly in the dominant position which Pharisaic linear eschatology came to have in Christian circles, and partly in the censorship which was imposed on Sadducean literature, teachings, and indeed their name as the "Sons of Zadok", after the Pharisees came to power. This hiatus in Sadducean tradition becomes particularly noticeable after the councils of Jamnia (Yabneh), when the Pharisaic canon of "forbidden writings" was established.

W.F. Albright and Del Medico, have again called attention to a suggestion made by E.L. Sukenik, some years ago, that the caves near the Dead Sea, where the Dead Sea Scrolls were recently discovered, were an official burial place (genizâh) for books and documents considered uncanonical or undesirable, where they might be deposited without liturgical defilement. Although the council of Jamnia commenced in about 90 AD, and the Pharisaic canon of the Old Testament was well established by 100 AD, disagreement over individual books, based on contradictions and passages thought, by the Pharisees, to be heretical, continued well past the end of the first century AD. Works offensive to the Pharisaic Rabbis were then put away in secret places. These were called "concealed" or "apocryphal" books and their place of deposit was called a "place of concealment" (bêt genizâh). It is not surprising that such books included Ezekiel (who established the priesthood of the Sons of Zadok), Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, perhaps Jonah, the book of Job and several others. The book of Ecclesiasticus was expressly forbidden by the Pharisaic Rabbis as a book which "might not be read". Dr. P. Kahle, has called attention to a targum on the book of Job, which was also found among the Dead Sea Scrolls. This, along with various Aramaic texts of Enoch found at Qumran have been identified but, regrettably, still not published as late as fifteen years after
their discovery. It is curious that Gamaliel I, the teacher of St. Paul (who did not hesitate to proclaim his Pharisaic background, Acts 23:6), ordered an Aramaic targum on Job to be buried under a heap of bricks and mortar, and his grandson Gamaliel II, stated he would give orders for such a work to be "hidden".34

The nature of the Mishna's condemnation against those who read "external books" (i.e. non-Pharisaic and therefore heretical writings) is curious in itself. The Rabbis state that they shall "have no share in the world to come".35 Precisely this futuristic eschatology of the Pharisees is repudiated by the literature in question, and thus condemned by the Sons of Zadok, Essenes and Sadducees, as we shall see in an examination of their own documents. Commenting briefly on this literature, G.R. Driver states, "The lists of condemned works in the Talmud might almost have been based on the collections hidden in the caves round Qumran, so closely do they tally".36 If these so-called "heretical" (anti-Pharisaic) works may thus be associated with the Essenes (as they are now commonly designated), or at least the forbidden library at Qumran, the doctrinal and historical relationship of these documents becomes even more pertinent in view of the association which the Rabbis of the first century AD, appear to have made between Sadducaic and Christian writings. Rabbi Tarphon (c. 70-132 AD) declared he would burn the books of the "heretics" (יו''א) or "Sadducees" (יו''י) as well as the "Gilyônîm" (יו''א), in all probability the Gospels, or possibly Apocalypses).37 Occurrences of such banning of "external" (non-Pharisaic writings), including those of the Sadducees, are frequent in Rabbinical literature.38 Of particular importance is a passage in the Talmud which speaks of the "external books" as "books of heretics" forbidden to read. Here a variant reading for "heretics" (יו''א), as in numerous other places, is "Sadducees" (יו''י).39 Although this probably does not apply to the "Sadducees" or "Boethusians" of New Testament times, who did not, as far as we know, create a literature
of their own, there are grounds for holding that these passages do refer to the Sadducees of Seleucid and Hasmonaean times, who produced a literature imitative to Pharisaic eschatology.

In addition to the successful obliteration of their name, censorship of their literature and revision of all Sadducaic judgments and legal decisions, at the councils of Jamnia (Yabneh) held after the Fall of 70 AD, the Sadducaic priesthood has intentionally been confused with a small group of extremists who lived during Herodian times called the "Boethusians". From this small coterie of later Sadduceans, the derisive term "Boethusians" came to be applied to the whole Sadducaic wing of Judaism. However, it is well known that the term occurs no earlier than Roman times, as seen in Josephus (Ant. xix. 297). These Boethusians were the relatives of Boethos, the father of Simon the high priest. 40 This unfortunate claimant to the office was one of several imported and appointed by Herod the Great, and quite probably the father of Herod's third wife, Mariamme II. Although he may not have been without some priestly family connections, it is clear that he was one of several notoriously weak and mercenary office holders whom Herod imported from Alexandria, appointed to keep the high-priestly office well under his control. The name "Boethos" (βοηθος) also became an interchangeable name of derision for "assistants" (πράκτορες) or "tax collectors". The latter is the most familiar form in which we find them designated in the New Testament. Billerbeck, however, simply lists them as a group under the general heading of Sadducees. 41 He believed that the terms could be used interchangeably without creating confusion on the grounds that one of the early Jewish Fathers, Rabbi Nathan described both groups as coming into being at the same time. 42 However, it is by no means necessary to conclude that both groups came into being at the same time. The Rabbi-Nathan merely states that the Boethusians separated themselves from a conservative body which was already well established in its teachings; namely the Sadducees.
Aboth R. Nathan and the Sadducaic Schism:

The aboth R. Nathan is among the earliest Tosephta of the writings of the Jewish Fathers, but its actual composition must be placed at a time later than the tractates of the Mishna (c.135-200 A.D.). Schürer has placed it as late as post-Talmudic times (c.320-370 A.D.). But it is clear from both its form and content that it enjoyed a wide circulation in Pharisaic circles from a much earlier time. It has obviously been handed down in a collection of sayings intended to deprecate the Sadducees. An indication of its age is the claim which accompanies it, that it is a saying from the Jewish father Nathan (Aboth de-Rabbi Nathan), optimistically said to be the third in succession to receive an unbroken oral tradition of the Law of Moses. Nevertheless, the data it contains is undeniably Pharisaic and historically verifiable. If the reference it contains to "Simon the Saddik" (Rightful or Just) was Simon I, as Josephus indicates, then Antigonus of Socho, his last disciple, must be placed somewhere in the vicinity of 180 B.C. The original Sadducaic elements of the tradition clearly disclose an agreement with Ecclesiasticus, both in its references to the well-known Simon and its view of the afterlife, and thus also tend to place it in the context of 200-186 B.C. An important piece of evidence, which may corroborate both the dating and similarity of teaching, as well as link it with the Essenes (or Zadokite authors of the Manual of Discipline), may possibly be found in this version or paraphrase of the original in the Manuel:

"Eternal hatred against the men of perdition in the spirit of concealment. He shall leave to them property and labour of hands, as a slave does to one who rules over him, showing humility before the one who lords it over him. He shall be a man zealous for the ordinance and its time, until the day of vengeance. He shall do no pleasure in all his outstretching of hand and in all his reign, as He commanded. Then everything which is done, by that he will be accepted as a free will offering. Save in God's will he has no delight."

(IQS ix.21-24)
It is not suggested that the Qumran Manual was the source for the Aboth Nathan tradition, or that Simon the Just was the author of the Qumran document. But their similarity in teaching that the (righteous) should not serve as one seeking material reward or reward as such, but as a slave serving his lord in humility, as a free will offering, zealous for the ordinances of God, all suggest that the traditions had a common source. The Qumran passage shows itself to stand directly within the Sadducaic tradition with its repudiation of rewards, zeal for the Law, notion of free will and absolute sovereignty of God. The Aboth R. Nathan tradition, although mutilated and distorted as it stands in the Tosephta, is a choice piece of Pharisaic tradition for the light it sheds on their attitude toward the Sadducaic view of the afterlife. It is also an important source of information on a schism which took place within Sadducaic ranks. It is probably an early Sadducaic tradition turned to Pharisaic ridicule in its transmission and thus preserved from censorship.

"Antigonus of Socho received the tradition from Simon the Just. He said: 'Be not like servants, who serve their Lord for the sake of reward, but be like those who do service without regard to recompense, and be always in the fear of God, that your reward may be double in the future.' Antigonus of Socho had two disciples, who taught this saying. They delivered it to their pupils who in turn delivered it to theirs. Then they stood up and tampered with its meaning and said: What did your fathers think when they spoke thus? Is it possible that a workman should work all day and not receive his wages in the evening? If our fathers had known that there is a future life and a resurrection of the dead, they would not so have spoken. Then they stood up and renounced the Thorah, and a two-fold schism proceeding from them branched off: Sadducees after the name of Zadok, the Boethosees after the name of Boethos." (Aboth de-Rabbi Nathan C.5)
This Tosephta, which does not purport to be from the time of the incident it relates, discloses that the original Sadducaic teaching (one generation after Simon the Just, perhaps contemporaneous with Onias III, c. 180 BC) by no means denies the possibility of life after death. It simply admonishes, "Be not like servants who serve their Lord for the sake of reward." This became a "heretical" teaching both to Pharisee and Boethusian alike. The tradition openly admits that after three generations the original teaching was tampered with because it was mistakenly thought to deny the future life. A dispute followed; with a schism between the Sadducees and the Boethusians. It is important to notice that the Sadducees agreed with the original teaching and thus did not supply a new doctrine but defended a conservative position. The Boethusians, on the other hand, denounced the teaching for a more elaborate doctrine of reward and resurrection. Curiously enough, the tradition states, without further explanation, that the name "Sadducee" derives from the well-known "Zadok". This implies that they were the conservative group, already established in the teachings of the "Sons of Zadok", particularly, "Simon the Rightful" (or Just), predecessor of Onias III. The Boethusians, by contrast, are clearly the schismatics who broke away from the original teaching in favour of the popular doctrine of reward and resurrection. By no means does this narrative imply that the Sadducees and Boethusians came into existence at the same time. It merely states that the Boethusians broke away from normative Judaism at this time.

Mishnaic sources (Menachoth x.3) bear out the later arrival of the Boethusians (ר'דן)' who, by inference, derived their name from the high-priestly family of Boethos in the time of Herod the Great. These sources, along with Josephus' dating of Boethos, provide us with a rough
terminus a quo for the schism, no earlier than about 25 B.C.\(^4\)

There is no doubt whatsoever that the Zadokite wing of Judaism, with its well-known priesthood, was already known by the name "Sadducees" in the time of Alexander Jannaeus (103–76 B.C.). Therefore, even from the Mishnaic point of view, the Boethusians were the schismatics and the Sadducees already in existence for some time. The traditional reasons for dismissing the Aboth Nathan as containing nothing of historical value are groundless indeed. It is often held that the tradition is valueless because it was written after 70 AD. While most Mishnaic literature is post-70 AD, and the Aboth Nathan is post-Mishnaic, the original tradition which it passes on could, at least, be earlier than the first century B.C. If the post-70 rule were applied to New Testament literature, few of its traditions and quotations could be taken seriously for their historical value. Without additional evidence or support for his argument, Emil Schürer said of the Aboth Nathan, "What is said about the Boethusees is certainly erroneous", because "the account is a learned combination" and not an original writing.\(^5\)

That is the complete force of Schürer's objection to the value of the Aboth Nathan and the important data it contains. On the other hand, Rabbinic experts, such as Baneth, who has made a detailed (if not definitive) study of the Aboth, are outspokenly in favour of the genuineness of the historical data contained within this tradition.\(^6\) A large part of the reason Rabbinic experts do have confidence in this tradition, rests on its occurrence elsewhere, such as the Pirke Aboth (i.3), where it is also presented as a saying coming from Antigonus of Socho.\(^7\)

To this may be added the occurrence of a similar teaching in the Qumran Manual of Discipline (IQS ix.21–25). Although its transmission is not here suggested to be through Antigonus of Socho, the Qumran source is unquestionably earlier than both Rabbinic accounts.
It is thus reasonable to assume, as a working hypothesis, that the priestly Sons of Zadok, did have a historical existence at this time as a body of influential and aristocratic priests and high priests, whose name did not fall into obscurity and disrepute until after the rise of the Pharisees. Wellhausen has said: "A party which attached itself to the aristocratic priests might well be named the 'Zadokitan' or 'Sadducean' party." A strong indication that the name of Zadok and his descendants was widely known and fully established previous to the rise of the Hasmonaeans, is the dominant role they played in Jewish affairs, even as early as II Samuel, I and II Kings, Ezra, Nehemiah, Ezekiel and particularly I Chronicles 6:8,12. The author of Chronicles considered the Sons of Zadok to have first claim to the royal priesthood directly through Eleazar the father of Zadok, who was himself the eldest son of Aaron. This royal family did not remain the only one to lay claim to the ruling office of high priest, but they were among the first to do so. 

A brief but penetrating view of the Sadducaic attitude toward the afterlife is thus provided by the Aboth Nathan tradition. Brief as this view is, it reveals a theological position which shows considerable sophistication for its time. It strongly negates any notions of resurrection or immortality, in early Sadducaic thought, treated as the direct result or reward of human merit. It diametrically opposes the logic of Pharisaic eschatology in which human virtue is the cause and resurrection of the body is the effect. Its point is not the negation of belief in the afterlife, as is commonly supposed, but an emphasis on the absolute sovereignty of God in these matters:

"Be not like servants, who serve their Lord for the sake of reward, but like those who do service without regard to recompense, and be always in the fear of God."
A misunderstanding of this sovereignty and ignorance of God's power to rescue man from his plight, on the part of Antigonus' disciples (Boethusians) is thus imputed to the first Sadducees: "If our fathers had known, that there is a future life and a resurrection of the dead, they would not have so spoken." The force of the Sadducees' disagreement with the Boethusians implies both, a) That their fathers (the Sons of Zadok) were not in ignorance about life after death and, b) That they did not welcome the Pharisaic doctrine of reward and resurrection. The inference is that the Boethusians did compromise on these points and thus had more in common with the Pharisees than Sadducees. The opposition of the Sadducees was obviously strong enough to force the Boethusians to separate and form their own party. The Sadducees thus should not be said to lack a theological position. Their position can be formulated simply: Their fathers, the Sons of Zadok, did believe in an afterlife, but held that it should not be viewed in terms of earthly reward because that does not show a proper fear of God or, as one version states, "fear of heaven". An earlier form of the tradition, as it occurs in the Pirke Aboth, contains this variant, "and let the fear of heaven be upon you". 55

The peculiar development of the Aboth Nathan tradition, is a good example of how an early teaching about the "right attitude" toward the afterlife came to be distorted into a supposed denunciation of the afterlife altogether, on the part of the Sadducees. It was first distorted by those who did not understand the original teaching; secondly, by the enemies of the Sadducaic school who did not wish to understand it; and thirdly, by present day interpreters who wish not to credit any theological position to the Sadducaic school, whatsoever. The admonition to be "like those who do service without regard to recompense" may be an embarrassment to some modern critics because it attributes a highly
advanced doctrinal position to the Sadducees long before the Apostle Paul began to speak of "Grace" and "Justification by Faith". Its occurrence as a pre-Pauline teaching, provides the last reason why it is decried as "spurious", and a Sadducaic theology said to be "impossible", by those who believe the "Christian view of the afterlife" is inextricably rooted in the Pharisaic symbols and images of the Eschaton.

Did the Sadducees Deny Immortality?

Two forces have been at work to misrepresent the teachings of the Sadducees, carelessness or misunderstanding regarding their teachings and the heavy hand of censorship imposed by those who opposed them. A third factor may be added, and that is the inevitable oversimplification of those who have presented their point of view. Not only have post-70 AD. sources oversimplified the character and essential relationship of the Sadducees to normative Judaism, but they have also, regrettably, oversimplified their teachings as well. The negative and sometimes bald account of the Sadducees which comes from the hand of their critics discloses, often unintentionally, a qualitatively more spiritual and advanced eschatology than that of their Pharisaic opponents.

The Aboth Nathan demonstrates the inextricability of the doctrine of works-righteousness from the doctrine of resurrection in Pharisaic thought. This was observed in the relationship of the two statements: "If our fathers had known that there is a future life and a resurrection", and, "Is it possible that a workman should work all day and not receive his wages in the evening?" (Aboth Nathan, C.5). We have presupposed that the Sadducees vigorously fought against the basic notion of resurrection to this life, as a reward in itself for good works. So also, they fought against the notion of eternal punishment in the underworld, as a reward in itself for evil works.
Their rejection of resurrection, and indeed the misuse of resurrection which that entails, is also borne out by the Gospels and Acts. But New Testament sources say nothing about what the Sadducees believed regarding the soul or immortality.\textsuperscript{56} They do not imply that the Sadducees denied immortality, as such, or immortality of the soul. That assertion is made only by Josephus.

Strangely, in Josephus' discussion of the Sadducees, no mention is made of resurrection, or resurrection of the body. He has simplified the question to a matter of the "persistence of the soul". He says: "As for the persistence of the soul after death (\(\psi υξ\)τς τω νην \(\delta ιων\)ν) penalties in the underworld, and rewards (\(\gamma ιμωρίας καί \(\tau μάς\) they will have none of them".\textsuperscript{57} This may have been a slip, but it was probably an over-simplification, on Josephus' part, for the benefit of his Roman readers. The error has nevertheless swung the whole discussion from resurrection of the body, to immortality of the soul, in modern minds, leading some to conclude that the Sadducees therefore rejected both immortality and resurrection, and thus any belief in the afterlife, per se. Nothing could be farther from the truth. First of all, it should be noticed that the distinction between "body" and "soul" did not have the same significance to Josephus' mind (or any of the pre-Pharisaic Jews, for that matter) as it later came to have for Christian dogmatic theology. Although attributable to some forms of post-Christian thinking, the distinctions made by Greek philosophers between form and substance, essence and accidents should not be associated with the pre-Christian and Sadducaic understanding of body and soul. On the contrary, Old Testament literature frequently describes body and soul as a unity, often using the terms interchangeably. J.A.T.Robinson and others, such as Tresmontant and Boman have demonstrated this point in considerable detail elsewhere.\textsuperscript{58} They have provided sufficient grounds for knowing that the alteration was but
a slight one, as far as Josephus was concerned, for the benefit of his Greek-thinking readers. It is a distinction which neither the New Testament nor the Mishna has made regarding the Sadducees. On the basis of what they themselves say about the afterlife, in their own traditions; and on the basis of the New Testament and the Mishna's implicit assumption that the Sadducees did believe in immortality, but rejected the notion of resurrection, we must accept the alteration as coming solely from the hand of Josephus himself. The probability increases that the view of immortality which was maintained by the Sadducees, was one which was not readily understood by Josephus' readers.

Further evidence of the inseparable relationship of body and soul in Josephus' basic presuppositions, may be seen in the expansion of his original statement about the Sadducees after a great lapse of time, when he wrote again in the Antiquities: "They held that souls die with the bodies" (Ant. xvi.11.4). Hippolytus' source, which may be an earlier Josephus or an earlier source common to him and Josephus, states: "They deny all future punishments and rewards holding that the soul perishes with the body". This assertion by no means implies a Sadducaic rejection of immortality, pre-existence or the afterlife of man. It does imply that Josephus, along with normative Judaism (including the Sadducees) presupposed that the body and soul are an inseparable unity, as the New Testament Gospels in their use of the term (ψυχή) at various points also seem to presuppose (Mt. 6:25, Lk.12:19, etc.). What Josephus does seem to be saying in the Antiquities, is that the Sadducees denied that the body-soul is to be resurrected for the sake of future rewards and punishment. They denied the popular eschatology of the Pharisees which held that the soul, separated from the body at death, is to be united with the body after a length of time has elapsed and judgment has taken place, when the body is resurrected once again to this life to take part in the glories of a future (earthly) Kingdom. The Sadducees simply held
that the soul perishes with the body because they are a unity (by definition). Josephus was cognizant of the fact that the Sadducees repudiated the future eschatology of the Pharisees, which entailed, a) a separation of the body from the soul and b) a future resurrection of the body. His second remark is simply a fuller statement of that fact. The Sadducees refusal of the Pharisaic distinction, is by no means a denial of immortality, particularly, the immortality of the "Spirit" which they contrasted with the "body-soul". Their rejection of the Pharisaic "repetition" or "future" resurrection of the body (to this life again), is by no means a denial of "new life" after death, especially, in view of the "present immortality" (or Kingdom), which the Sadducees contrasted with the "future" resurrection (and Kingdom) of the Pharisees.

The whole notion of an "intermediate state" (or sleep), implied by the Pharisaic linear eschatology, in which the bodies of men lurk in the realms of the underworld awaiting either resurrection to this life (again) or oblivion, was totally foreign to the Sadducean outlook. "Present immortality" implied an "immediacy" of the Kingdom of God which did not provide for "intermediate states" or long drawn-out lines of futurity in their eschatological point of view. Sadducean refinement of thought is revealed in many other ways, including its emphasis on "Spirit", both the Spirit of God and the Spirit of man, which returns to its maker. Their "immortality of the Spirit" stands in sharp contrast to a reoccurrence and endless repetition of the "body-soul" in Pharisaic eschatology. It is just this understanding of "Spirit" and "free-will" which caused them to be repelled by the Pharisaic notion of Fate and what Josephus calls: (καὶ τὰς καθ' ἑαυτῶν ἀμαρτίας καὶ γὰρ) "penalties in the underworld, and rewards" (BJ ii.165). If by his "free-will" or "choice", man is responsible for what befalls him in this life (rather than Fate), he is not, according to Sadducean thought, the determining factor in what happens to him in the next.
That is the work of God. Thus their repudiation of "penalties" and "rewards" is a sharp criticism of the Pharisaic system of righteousness through which man demands salvation of God. Again, this does not imply a denunciation of immortality or life after death, on their part, but is a positive acknowledgment of the sovereignty of God. Their removal of "God beyond even the sight of evil" (ἐξω τοῦ θραύμα τοῦ κακοῦ ἂν ἐφόρον πλην τοῦ θραύμα τοῦ θραύμα, BJ 11.165) is both an extension of their understanding of the sovereignty of God, who is beyond whatever man may determine is good or evil, and it is an extension of their argument against Fate carried to its logical conclusion. Its positive implication is that God is not the cause of evil (or even a spectator). Misfortune and tragedy are therefore not the instruments of God, which He uses against the unrighteous as a "penalty" for their wickedness. Such thinking belongs to the Pharisaic school of thought. This wonderful intimation that God is not the cause of evil (a theme of Job, which the Pharisees also censored) was surely recognized by St. Augustine, who centuries later denied that God is, or ever could be, the cause of evil, an irreprensible wielder of the vicissitudes of Fate. St. Augustine has, consequently, not been denounced for detracting from the sovereignty of God or denying the hope of the afterlife. Perhaps the Sadducees, also, deserve less denunciation than they have received long after they have ceased to exist.

In their doctrine of the "intermediate state", the Pharisees stand far closer to the teachings of the Greeks than do the Sadducees, who are commonly supposed to be tainted with foreign influences. The Sadducees were critical of the entire hellenistic concept of the underworld and the repetition, or resurrection, of the body after death. This has been evident from the above quotation in the Antiquities. It may also be seen in the fragments of Sadducean altercation with the Pharisees which are preserved in the Mishna. There the Pharisees are disclosed as the ones influenced by Hellenistic writings, particularly Homer:
"The Sāddukēm said to the Perushim: We must blame you, Perushim, for maintaining that — holy scriptures defile the hands, while antagonistic books (one early variant reads: סרי 'נמ' the books of Homer) do not defile the hands." (JadaJim iv. 6) 60

An earlier text of the Mishna appears to contain a specific reference to the books of Homer. Later Rabbis seem to have modified this reference to "antagonistic" books in general. Early Pharisaic Rabbis would indeed find in Homer support for their view of the underworld, and the notion of a return again from these realms, in the journey of Odysseus back from the dead. The books of Homer, with their teachings on the "Psychopompos", or guide of the soul, Hermes, and return from the dead also played an important part in the Orphic liturgy. It is not intended to exaggerate, here, the relationship of Homeric literature to the Pharisaic point of view, but it is important to see the nature of the Sadducee's complaint in this interchange of Rabbinic argument. Namely, that the Pharisees continued to multiply the restrictions, and thus curtailed access to the Torah, but freely permitted, and presumably used, the books of Homer. Nonetheless, it was with the books of Homer that the Pharisees' teachings on the "intermediate state" (or Sheol) and resurrection had the most in common.

One indication of the wider implications of this controversy among the Jews, is the evidence of its continuance well into the time of the Apostle Paul. Although Paul himself repudiated the title, in Lystra he was called by the name of "Hermes" (ἐν Ὑπότητον Ἔφσια, Acts 14:12). And on another occasion Paul took part in a public burning of a large number of "books of magic" possessed by both Jews and Greeks in Ephesus (Acts 19:19). The continued existence of this controversy is significant in view of the closeness of the Homeric view of the underworld to that of the Pharisees. It is therefore not surprising that a Homeric view of the underworld has occurred in several of
the biblical and extra-biblical books which were ultimately included in the Pharisaic canon of "permitted writings". These teachings thus may be found in Tobit, Psalms of Solomon, and Baruch, for example, but do not occur in the official writings of the Pentateuch. It is indeed an oversimplification of the basic controversy at hand, to suggest that this was merely a dispute over ceremonial cleanness. It is, in effect, a repudiation of the whole Pharisaic eschatology and view of the afterlife, which included an underworld, resurrection-judgment, and concept of reward described in terms similar to the Homeric Isle of the Blessed. The ground upon which the Sadducees rejected these teachings (and subsequently were accused of having no doctrine of the afterlife) was that they did not occur in the sacred books of the Jews, namely, the Pentateuch or written Torah. In none of the above arguments have we found sufficient grounds for the assumption that the Sadducees denied immortality and had no positive view of the afterlife.

**Positive Teachings of the Sadducees on Immortality and the Afterlife:**

What then were the positive teachings of the Sadducees regarding immortality and the afterlife? Part of the answer to this question can be inferred from their critics, as seen above, but an authoritative view of their teachings can only be achieved by a serious examination of those writings which are known to come from their own circles. These will be examined in detail below. Let us first construct a brief resumé of what we have found to be the positive teachings of the whole Sadducaic Tradition, on immortality and the afterlife, before we turn to more detailed evidence.

a) In their rejection of the notion of a future general (universal) resurrection of mankind to judgment, the Sadducees, in their own writings, have not rejected the possibility of "particular" resurrections, i.e. the return of particular
prophets of the past to this life for specific purposes. Regarding the plight of man after death, they speak in a positive manner of the "Spirit" returning directly to its Maker, of "seeing God face to face" and ultimately of being at one with Him. b) In their rejection of the distinction between the soul and body (thereby denying the immortality of a separated soul), the Sadducees reflect a pre-Pharisaic understanding of "soul" which is closer to our modern use of the term "mind". They therefore stressed a type of immortality and pre-existence of the Spirit known only to Jewish thought. c) Instead of resurrection, they affirmed a positive doctrine of "Translation" (or ascension) of the chosen of God, in a particular (and immediate) sense, rather than a general (and future eschatological) sense. These three positive teachings may be summarised as follows: The Doctrine of Translation, Sovereignty of God and Immortality of the Spirit as distinct from the body-or-soul. There are many other Sadducean teachings in addition to these, but most of them tend to come under these general headings in one way or another.

In defence of their distinctive doctrine of Translation, the Sadducees did not put forth a new teaching, like the Pharisaic notion of universal resurrection for judgment or reward at the end of (linear) time. They have maintained, what may be truly an ancient teaching because of its deep roots in the Pentateuch. From the first translation, which the Sadducees interpreted to be the translation of Enoch in Genesis (5:24), their literature came to include many others such as the translation of Noah (in the Noah fragments of Enoch), Elijah, etc. This teaching is consistent with their belief in heavenly "appearances" and "visions". But the doctrine of Translation does not imply that the Sadducees believed that there would be one occasion, at the eschaton, in which a general translation of all the righteous would take place, by a single act of God. They did believe that translation is an act of
God which occurs particularly (or individually) and immediately. This teaching does not deny death, but asserts that it is the experience only of the living and not of the translated, as is strongly reflected in one strand of New Testament thinking: "Let the dead bury their dead" (Mt. 8:22), "You shall be changed as in the twinkling of an eye" (I Cor. 15:51) (cf. Lk. 23:43, II Cor. 12:4), and the early traditions in which Jesus is said to his disciples that they should "never die", and those who keep his commandments "shall never see death" (Jh. 8:51). These and other similar New Testament beliefs will be examined in Part II of this work.

It should be made clear that the Sadducees rejection of the resurrection of the body was not as absolute and complete as their critics would like to have us suppose. They indeed praised Elijah because, "He raised a corpse from death and Hades, by the word of the Most High" (Eccl. 48:40), but they did not consider resurrection, as such, an eschatological event; that content had to be added to their teaching. Resurrection simply implied to them a return to this life, as in the case of the prophets of old, to warn, admonish or give expression to the will of God (by means of His Word, rather than Fate). They did believe in resurrection to this life, but this particular miracle was not expanded by the Sadducees into a general theory of resurrection for all mankind. Resurrection, for them, did not imply resurrection directly to heaven. Nor, for that matter, did it imply that for the Pharisees either. It simply implied resurrection to this life, and in the case of the Pharisees, a future life (or Kingdom) on this earth. The term, as it is used in pre-Christian times, should thus be made to imply more than the rescue of one from the dead to the realm of the living again. Nonetheless, we shall see evidence of an important wing of Sadducean Christianity, which held that a resurrection had taken place in Christ (and even the judgment of mankind), but it was a resurrection "to this life" which thus had to be followed by a "translation" (or ascension) in a particular rather than a
universal sense. Resurrection was thus the revival of that which is corruptible and capable of death once again, including the soul (mind). But such language cannot describe Spirit, which pre-exists and already participates in the immortality of God (in a non-Platonistic sense of that term). It motivates life, never dies and ultimately participates (returns) in the Spirit of God its maker. "Spirit" is the indelible mark of Sadducaic thought, which distinguishes them from the Pharisaic emphasis on "body" and the Orphic or hellenistic emphasis on "soul".

The strong loyalty of the Sadducees to the sovereignty of God, naturally caused them to distrust all notions of "merit", "reward" and eschatological systems of reward and punishment. Because they rejected "rewards" and "punishments", they were also said to oppose the notion of Fate. This is undoubtedly true, but it also springs from their belief in the sovereignty of a living God. And because they opposed the notion of Fate, they were said to be advocates of "free-will" and "choice". All of these arguments and the inferences upon which they rest, have and do give the wrong impression unless they are held in direct relation to the Sadducees strong loyalty to the Sovereignty of God. This sovereignty included the sovereignty of His Word, as expressed through the Law and Prophets. Although God did not interfere with the "choice" of man, or his "free-will" (as Josephus terms it), He was nonetheless sovereign in human life by means of His written Law, which man could choose to obey or disobey. This sovereignty of the will of God was thus diametrically opposed to any notions of natural law, necessity (chronological or otherwise), but most importantly, Fate. It provides an additional reason why the Sadducees chose to emphasize Spirit rather than body, (mind)soul or any aspect of human life to which man is limited. We shall thus see that the teachings of the Sadducees were closer to one aspect of Urgemeinde teaching than any other Jewish group. These teachings were suppressed by all of the forces mentioned
above, but most importantly by the popular Pharisaic eschatology which later became a dominant theme in post-Pauline Christianity.
Polis Immortality and the Zadokite Priesthood

Polis Immortality:

When the notion of immortality is traced back to its earliest occurrence in Greek literature, it is often seen to have a close relationship to the idea of the "Polis" or "city" among the Greeks. But immortality was not always associated with one's city or country. Homer and Hesiod believed that immortality consisted of the permanent name and fame that men achieved for themselves. When heroes came to be praised as frequently as the gods of a city, their memory thus became immortal along with those of the gods. Poetry soon became an important means by which man's "immortality" was assured. W. Jaeger has noted that the first time man himself was said to be immortal or capable of immortality was in martial poetry. One of the earliest examples of this type of immortality is found in the Spartan Elegiac Poet, Tyrtaeus (7th B.C.), who promises warriors a future lot with the valiant who have died for their country: "The hero, although under the earth, nevertheless becomes immortal".

Gradually, the Polis, or "city", supplanted the function of the Homeric singer whose job it was to create poetry which would eternally praise the virtues and feats of a hero. Prof. Jaeger has stated: "The 'Polis' as a new institution guaranteed the eternal memory of those who gave their lives for it." In the cult of the Polis, heroes in the tomb had a place next to the gods and their memories were perpetuated with them. New heroes were soon included in this immortality cult when public burial, monuments and perpetual remembrance were guaranteed to them by the Polis. With the plantation of new Poleis and the coming of the Polis way of life to Palestine, which the Zenon Papyri have disclosed as a widely distributed Palestinian phenomenon from 300-220 B.C,
there arose several distinctively Jewish developments, amounting to a unique departure from the ordinary view of Polis immortality, which I will attempt to outline on the following pages.

Polis immortality differed greatly from poetic immortality in that it had little to do with artistic or intellectual genius or even with the relatively modern notion of individuality. Those who were regarded immortal by the Polis, were those who sacrificed their individuality for the sake of the community. But in giving up one's life for the Polis one preserved his individuality in a higher sense. The seeming paradox of this teaching is perhaps illuminated by the later Christian tradition: "For whoever would save his life will lose it; and whoever loses his life for my sake and the gospel's will save it" (Mk.8:35). By the time this teaching emerged in early Christian circles, it had already experienced a significant theological transformation, as we will observe. The Polis was founded and fortified with special care, not only as a defence against external physical enemies (who might destroy the body), but as a defence against time. This is the essential meaning of Polis immortality. In the imperishability of the Polis rested the imperishability of the man. It is similar to the notion of political immortality only to the extent that a man's "meaning" (or virtue) was reflected by the "meaning" (or virtue) of the Polis, i.e. that higher value which gave it permanence. This concept of Polis immortality never died as long as hellenistic Poleis flourished. Pericles' Funeral oration has reflected this form of immortality (as has Plato in his Menexen) in which he implies that it is the Polis of Athens which bestows immortality on the fallen who "have no need of a Homer" (Thuc.2.43-44: cp.Menex.135; Phaedo 95-106). It was on the basis of what a man actually sacrificed and achieved for others (i.e. society) and not because of mere talents or birth that he became immortal. Plato thus attributed immortality, in this sense, to lawgivers, poets and
philosophers, in addition to warriors, as something which existed apart from their genius. But one must be careful not to infer from this, that the "others" or the society for which one sacrificed oneself implied "mankind" as it appears to have done in a later Jewish-Christian context. This immortality was limited to that which only the Polis was able to bestow on men.

Because Polis immortality was in each case a local phenomenon differing greatly from Polis to Polis, depending on each for its distinctive characteristics, one must be cautious about imputing the characteristics of one cult and its heroes to those of another. As there were differences between the immortality cults of the Greek Poleis, so there were even greater differences between Jewish Poleis of the hellenistic period and those of the Greeks. This was particularly true of Jerusalem which stood apart from all Poleis. The strong and distinctive views on immortality which have come out of the Jerusalem of this period, give rise to the question whether the doctrines of immortality and life after death were originally a Greek phenomenon. It is the trend of modern writers to blame the Greeks for the "erroneous notion" of the immortality of the soul. Dr. Oscar Cullmann has referred to the "radical difference between the Christian expectation of the resurrection of the dead and the Greek belief in the immortality of the soul". Such a clear-cut delineation not only tends toward an oversimplification of the problem, but often fails to recognize the extent to which the Jews had their own unique teachings on immortality in pre-Christian times. The question is, by no means, merely a matter of syncretism or a Hebrew versus a Hellenistic point of view.

It is the trend among ancient writers in this debate, including pre-Christian secular historians, who had strong reasons for being anti-Jewish than to exaggerate the facts, to assert in several early writings that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul sprang from Jewish sources.
These secular historians are important because they afford an independent third century (B.C.) judgment in the matter. Although it cannot be claimed that they provide any quantity of evidence to support their arguments that immortality as life after death was originally a Jewish rather than a Greek notion, they nevertheless represent a better-informed judgment which was closer to the sources than modern speculation.

One such ancient writer was Hermippus of Smyrna, a biographer of the Peripatetic School, whom Josephus has said was "always a careful historian". In his vast work on writers, philosophers, and law-givers, Hermippus included two books on Pythagoras. In the first of these books, often quoted by Plutarch and Diogenes Laertius, he has clearly mentioned that Pythagoras was well informed about the Jewish teaching on immortality, or more precisely, that it was Pythagoras who was dependent on the Jews in this matter, rather than vice versa. His words are: "In practising and repeating these precepts he (Pythagoras) was imitating and appropriating (μιμούμενος καὶ μεταφέρων εἰς ἔμωρόν) the doctrine of Jews and Thracians". To this quotation Josephus has added another element, which cannot be an invention of his own: "In fact, it is actually said that that great man (Pythagoras) introduced many points of Jewish law into his philosophy". This latter statement perhaps originated from Aristobulus and is supported by Eusebius. Although the basic supposition that Pythagoras was known, by this third century (B.C.) biographer, to have been influenced by the Jews in his views on immortality, seems to stand on firm ground, the supporting evidence which Josephus paraphrases, rather than quotes as from Hermippus, does not seem so convincing: "This author (Hermippus) states that the philosopher (Pythagoras) on the death of one of his disciples, named Calliphon, a native of Crotona, remarked that his pupil's soul (τὴν ἐκείνου ψυχὴν) was with him night and day". While it is difficult to accept the portion of the Hermippus tradition which Josephus paraphrases, with its implication that Jews in the time of Pythagoras believed
that the soul had a separate existence from the body after
deatb, because of its anachronistic use of terms, it
is not impossible to believe that Pythagoras, or his third
century biographer, was deeply influenced by the unique Jewish
teachings on immortality which were expressed during this time.
Origen has substantiated the judgment of Hermippus, that Pythag­
oras was influenced by Jewish thinking on immortality, but holds
that it was in the "first book on the lawgivers" that Pythagoras
was said to derive his philosophy from the Jews (πυθαγόραν τὴν ἐσωτὴρ
φιλοσοφίαν ἀπὸ Ἰουδαίων εἰς Ἑλλήνας ἄγαφειν). 72

Another educated judgment, from a period closer
to 250 B.C, by a non-Jew who was convinced that the process of
influence regarding immortality and the afterlife was from the
direction of the Jews to the Greeks, rather than the other way
around, was that of Clearchus of Cyprus, the disciple of Aristo­
tle. In his first book on "Sleep" (or death) this Peripatetic
philosopher has described a conversation of Aristotle with a
learned Jew on the subject of the afterlife. This remarkable
tradition, which was later to become the subject of a famous
painting by Rembrandt, is more interesting for its source in
Aristotle's own school, the early date of its origin and its
implication for the development of Aristotle's thought on immor­
tality, than it is perhaps for any actual historical data it
might well convey. As for this latter point, it is known from
the fragment of the first book of Aristotle's early dialogue,
"On Philosophy" (the remainder of which is now lost) that Aristo­
tle took a special interest in theology, particularly non-hellen­
istic religions, to the extent that he called his first philo­
sophical works "theologike" rather than philosophy. 73 W. Jaeger
has considered the actual conversation to be improbable, but
strongly underlines the influence of the hellenistic Jews on
on the Peripatetic School, particularly Clearchus. He has said:
"Although this is only a nice anecdote, Clearchus himself must,
of course, have met such hellenised Jews on Cyprus where many
Jews had their residence". 74 This influence is also seen in the
writings of Theophrastus (after 323 B.C.; perhaps contemporary of Simon the Just), who was one of Aristotle's greatest students. These writings disclose, long before Clearchus, that the Peripatetic School had already come under the influence of Jewish thinkers and tends to support the authenticity of Clearchus' quotation from his famous teacher on the learned Jew. 75 In this quotation, which—purports—to come from Aristotle and is also taken seriously by Eusebius, 76 it is clear that it was Aristotle who was the more impressed and influenced than the learned Jew:

"Their city has a remarkably odd name: they call it Hierusaleme. Now this man, who was entertained by a large circle of friends and was on his way down from the interior to the coast, was not only a Greek in his language, but also in his soul (Ελληνικάς ἄνω Τῆς Ἑβραίως μονής τοῦ δύνατον των τῶν ψυχήν). During my stay in Asia, he visited the same places I did, and came to converse with me and some other scholars, to test our learning. But as one who had been intimate with many cultivated persons, it was rather he who imparted to us something of his own." 77

There need be no doubt that what Josephus has related here is reliable, as far as the text of Clearchus is concerned. Josephus himself says critically of Clearchus: "He puts the words into the mouth of Aristotle himself". 78 Unfortunately, we no longer have Clearchus' book on "Sleep". It might well have indicated how Aristotle was influenced in a more specific manner on the subject of the afterlife. Whatever the truth of this may be, it is clear that Clearchus has given this possibility highest priority and that at least he, himself, was convinced of the Jewish influence on the Greeks regarding the nature of the Divine and the nature of the afterlife. Regarding this influence Josephus has added, "Not only did the Greeks know the Jews, but they admired any of their number whom they happened to meet". If applied to the hellenised Jews of Jerusalem in pre-Seleucid times, this does not appear to be an extravagant claim. So also, the author of II Maccabees indicates this influence by the high regard and mourning of the "Greeks" (and "other nations") when the righteous high priest Onias III was killed (II Mac. 4:35-36).
The remark would not be appropriate, however, if it were thought to apply to the general attitude toward the Jews in Josephus' own day.

The above examples should provide sufficient reason for caution in assuming that because Jerusalem was a highly developed Polis in pre-Seleucid times with distinctive views on immortality, that therefore, it must have been thoroughly dominated by external religious forces. If one must hold that immortality was the "error of Greek philosophy", then one must also hold that Jerusalem had neither the intellectual strength nor the theological poignancy to influence others. One of the misconceptions of our own time, is that Greek philosophy was from its origins, the struggle of human reason to invent modern science just as we know it today. The advance of Hellenism is often wrongly seen as the conquest of "superstition" and primitive religious beliefs by science and reason. Nothing could be more misleading.

In various examinations of the thought of pre-Socratic philosophers critics, as we have already noted, have found that the dominant theme of this period was a "concern for the nature of the Divine" (τὸ θεῖον). It is precisely this quest for the nature of the Divine which came to a "culmination in the philosophies of Aristotle and Plato", according to some experts, rather than the quest for the beginnings of modern science. It was thus in matters of "Theologike", i.e., the nature of the Divine and immortality, that the Jewish religion had much to offer Greek philosophy and apparently did exert a considerable influence in the hellenistic era, if Hermippus and Clearchus are taken seriously. Whatever the truth of this may be, it is not proposed to settle that dispute here. But it can be shown that the Jerusalem immortality cult was a unique phenomenon which developed in its own right. There is not the slightest need to doubt that the Polis immortality cult of Jerusalem exerted a unique influence on the hellenistic world. But to what extent was Jerusalem a Polis; and to what extent did she have an "immortality cult" of her own in pre-Christian times?
In answer to this first question we must turn to the earliest detailed evidence contained in the Zenon Papyri.

The Zenon Papyri:

Since the discovery and publication of several vast collections of pre-Christian manuscripts, such as the Zenon and Vienna Papyri, new texts of the Pseudepigraphical writings of the Old Testament, and of course, the Dead Sea Scrolls, the question of hellenistic influence or "syncretism" has been found to be an unsatisfactory means of defining what was unique in pre-Christian Jewish views on immortality and eschatology. The independent Polis system can be shown to be part and parcel of Palestine's, including Jerusalem's, social structure for several centuries before the advent of Christ. The relatively recent discovery of the Zenon Papyri makes it unnecessary to drift as far afield, either in space or time, as did the Religionsgeschichte Schule or its present-day spokesmen who have sought to prove "foreign influences" behind pre-Christian Jewish eschatology on the basis of Mandaean, Gnostic or Pseudoclementine evidence. This investigation will attempt to show why it simply cannot have been a case of syncretism, Gnosticism or even an "anti-Temple movement" which first divided the Jews and later gave rise to what became early Christian eschatology. It will also seek to demonstrate why these suppositions have hastily constructed inferential roofs rather than laid documentary foundations for a correct understanding of the earliest Christian views on the afterlife. This is particularly true of previous attempts to associate early Christian beliefs on immortality and resurrection with Gnosticism and a later type of Hellenism which came to Palestine in the post-70 A.D. era.

The Zenon Papyri, unlike most Gnostic manuscripts from the post-70 A.D. era, are not accompanied by the same sort of doubts concerning their date and authenticity. They are
the instrumental letters and documents relevant to the dealings of Ptolemy II (Philadelphus) with the territory of Palestine during the time of his planned economic and social development of the land through his chief minister Apollonius and his under-secretary, Zenon. This period of Ptolemaic administration of Palestine had remained, until the discovery of an extensive Ptolemaic archive near the village of Philadelphia in the Fayûm, under a veil of inference and speculation. This library was the property of Zenon, a fastidious and prolific under-official to Ptolemaic Egypt's best administrator and most successful finance minister, Apollonius. These documents are significant because Zenon went to Palestine, on the request of Apollonius in 259 B.C., and stayed there a year to supervise the plantation of a vast network of cities, or Poleis, which were intended to be a trade link between Egypt and Syria. He consequently sent back about forty documents and a large amount of detailed correspondence, which shed considerable light on the Palestine of the time. This archive is consequently a valuable source of information for the history of Palestine from 300 to 220 B.C. 81 Many details of the Zenon Papyri are happily borne out by another independent document called the Vienna Papyrus, which was published in 1936. This latter document contains several direct orders to Apollonius from King Philadelphus and reveals that Apollonius was one of the most important officials in Macedonian Egypt. 82

Some of the important points which these documents establish beyond reasonable doubt are: a) Contacts between Palestine and Alexandria were so numerous and frequent, that the post of Governor (στρατηγός) was unnecessary and Palestine was administered directly from Alexandria. b) The trade link between Egypt and Syria was so effective that fortified Poleis sprung into existence throughout the whole length of Palestine. c) Recognition as a Polis was the ambition of many communities during this time. Zenon, most likely, supervised a body of men who were eventually called, "The People of apollonius the Dioiketes".
They supervised the financial affairs of these Poleis, which stretched from Gaza to Beirut. The first function of the Dioiketes was to conduct an annual registration of property and livestock, according to Ptolemaic procedure, and to control trade in grain and olive oil, which was especially lucrative in Palestine. It is fortunate for historians that during Zenon's visit to Palestine in 259 B.C, he traversed the whole territory and examined nearly every town, hamlet and village. Although his first purpose was to set up economic centres and establish trade relations, he was soon joined by a large number of settlers who sought to win prosperity or public offices in the new Poleis, or fortified cities, which he created. Zenon's personal entourage often became a caravan of more than a hundred people, which eventually crossed the whole of Palestine and Transjordan several times. The Alexandrine and Jewish names of these travellers and office seekers are listed in these documents. While it is true that many of the old Phoenician and Philistine cities along the coast were the first to receive the honour of becoming Poleis, mainly because they already had some Greek population, various Greek cults and were modelled after the hellenistic pattern, it does not follow that new Poleis were required to have identical or even similar religious cults, rather than Jewish immortality cults of their own. Ptolemaic policy regarding the new Poleis, was not to confiscate lands nor change religious life, places of worship, the priesthood or social life. If offices were given to Alexandrines (who may already have been Jews), they were also given to local Jewish inhabitants. Positions of honour were given especially to those Jews who helped to establish their communities in conformity with the polis system. Tobias, the father of Joseph, was one of many such Jews appointed to high rank and is mentioned in the Zenon Papyri by name. The Macedonian soldiers and other settlers from Alexandria who married Palestinian daughters and settled in various Poleis are too numerous to mention by name. Manuscript C.P. Jud. I, discloses that the
Jewish father, Tobias, became the ruler of what was, in effect, a military cleruchy in Ammon. It also states that this settlement was manned by Greeks, Macedonians, and Jews, and mentions the new inhabitants of this settlement by name.

It is not intended to suggest here, that all of the Jewish Poleis came into existence at the time of Ptolemaic plantation. Several are much older as is indicated by various references to well-known Palestinian cities by such famous writers as Ovid, Pliny, Demosthenes, Pindar, Polybius, Herodotus and the Neo-Platonist Proclus. Numismatic and archeological evidence discloses well-established Greek colonies in Palestine as early as 500 B.C. However, it is now known, on the basis of the Zenon Papyri, that the greatest influx of hellenistic population into Palestine at this time came from Egypt, rather than from Syria or Greece. The papyri have also given the reason for this, in the strong commercial links which were established on the part of Egypt. On the whole, there were close to thirty recognised Poleis, in the technical sense of this term, planted or re-established in Palestine under the administration of the Macedonian kings. Thirty fortified, autonomous, religious, political and economic strongholds was a majority of cities for a small territory like Palestine. It is unnecessary to go into detail, for our purposes here, other than to point out that Poleis were established first, along the coast; then, in Transjordan in the North, and finally, the regions around the sea of Tiberias and the Lake of Semechonitis.

The status of Polis was one which many Jewish communities eagerly sought because it brought with it the rights of a "self-contained petty state", unlike the modern designation of the term "city". Emphasis, thus, must be placed on the relative independence of these Poleis to determine their own laws and religious cults which were as often Jewish as they were Greek. However, the self-perpetuating genius of the Polis was its educational system which provided a continuous stream of leaders, warriors and heroes, any one of whom might become
part of the Polis immortality cult. Autonomy certainly existed in matters of internal law and choice of city gods, which, in the case of Jerusalem, were the Torah and the God of Israel respectively. The latter was addressed as the "Lord above all gods", "Great king above all gods", and "God of gods". Even though Jerusalem was the most important Polis, with the Temple at the centre of its religious cult, it is known, on the basis of document — PCZ 59009, that numerous other Poleis were started throughout Palestine on a large scale from 259 B.C. onward. In spite of its detractors, and it is not here denied that many resented deeply the whole Polis movement in Palestine, many of the Jews adopted its ways. But this was not simply a one-way process. Among the many names mentioned in these documents is one example of a father who has a Greek name, but his son has been given a Hebrew rather than a Greek name (παρὰ Ζεινοδόρου πατρός Ἀρμαῖου). This tends to substantiate Clearchus' suggestion that things "Hebrew" were very much in fashion among the Greeks of his time. Another indication of the true spirit of the Ptolemaic times, in which the Jews exerted as much an influence on the Greeks as the Greeks on the Jews, was the great regard the Greeks are said to have had for the Jewish high priest Onias (a contemporary of Clearchus) who was known to them for his learning, and "moderation". When he was unjustly slain, the author of II Maccabees points out, "The Greeks shared their hatred of the crime", and, "were grieved and displeased at the unjust murder of the man"(IIMac.4:35-36).

One of the first slight traces of the notion of Polis immortality among these Jews, and admittedly it is only a slight one at this point, is found in the letter to Apollonius from the Jewish aristocrat, Tobias, father of the famous Joseph. He begins his letter with these words: "Many thanks to the gods" (πολλὴ χάρις τοῖς θεοῖς — C.P. Jud.4). It might be argued that this well-known Jewish leader has simply used a standard form of address. On the other hand, is it really out of step with the evidence we have seen for the existence of a purely Jewish
type of Polis immortality cult? This seems, also, to be reflected in several of the Psalms: "Before the gods I sing thy praise; I bow down toward thy holy Temple and give thanks to thy name". It is uniquely an immortality beyond the achievement of man: "There is none like thee among the gods, 0 Lord, nor are any works like thine". It thus seems plausible, and there is an abundance of evidence to suggest that this was the case, that Polis immortality beliefs of a distinctively Jewish nature had already come into existence by the time this letter was written.

Whatever may be concluded in this matter, it cannot be denied that during the 113 years, in which the Ptolemies administered the affairs of Palestine, the Jews, and particularly the Sons of Zadok, had ample time to develop their own political and religious institutions. Not only did the Temple priesthood give rise to immortality beliefs of purely Jewish nature, but they also produced a literature (including poetry) of their own, as we shall see. This same priesthood was also soon to establish Gymnasia (i.e. schools) within the precincts of the Temple of a particularly unusual character. The Zenon Papyri have dispelled once and for all the notion that Hellenism came to Palestine only through one or two wealthy Jewish families, or through the non-Jewish radical extremes of the hellenising Seleucids during the brief 33 years of their occupation which followed. But more importantly, they have dispelled the notion that Hellenism was only a Christian or post-Christian phenomenon among the Jews, or that it was merely a one-way process of influence. In the Zenon Papyri is first-hand documentary evidence of remarkable quality and detail which describe both the extent and the moderate nature of the Hellenism which came to Palestine with the establishment of trade and the rise of her Poleis.
Jerusalem's Transformation of the Immortality Cult:

Unquestionably the greatest centres of hellenistic culture and learning, in pre-Christian times, were Alexandria and Pergamum. But one must be careful not to over-rate either the depth or the Greek nature of that culture transmitted by the traders and mercenary soldiers who came into Palestine from Alexandria. The Palestinian Poleis developed in their own distinctive way, despite these influences from abroad. Greek became the official language of the Poleis and the language of the educated and aristocratic classes in Palestine. But they were still Hebrews, who thought as Hebrews and maintained the religious views of Israel. Their religious and legal teachings managed to exert a considerable influence on the hellenistic world. As no tradition of thought or belief, particularly an eschatological tradition, can continue to exist for 113 years without a literature to keep it alive, so a new type of Hebrew literature, expressed in the symbolism of the Greeks, began to appear. If it was, in fact, the Greeks who influenced the Jews in matters of eschatology, why were not their views on the afterlife, along with the writings of the Greek philosophers popularly translated into Hebrew? The evidence from this period, from both Greek and Hebrew sources, all points to the reverse of this process, namely, that it was the Jews who influenced the Greeks in matters of eschatology and the afterlife. It is not without significance, for this process, that Ptolemy Philadelphus commissioned the Septuagint to be translated into Greek during this time. The argument that he did this because Hebrew was already becoming a dead language among the Jews, appears as little convincing for Ptolemaic times as it does for our own age, in which Hebrew is not even yet a dead language, simply because modern Jews use other languages in the commerce of every-day life. It is thus unnecessary to that Greek speaking Jews did not know Hebrew in Ptolemaic times. The main
conclusion which follows from this, is that the translation was not made solely for the benefit of Jews, but also for interested Greeks. It substantiates the fact that Jewish teachings were not only fashionable, but did have the means whereby they could seriously influence Hellenistic thought, in the Ptolemaic period. This is particularly true in matters relevant to eschatology and the afterlife. There is no lack of evidence that Greek poets and philosophers made visits from Athens and Alexandria to Ptolemaic and pre-Ptolemaic Palestine. Through visits such as these, the influence of particular Jewish Polis immortality cults has left its traces, strangely enough, on several Greek myth cycles where the names of places such as Jaffa, Gaza, Ascalon and many others are linked with the heroes and immortality cults of the Greeks. 90

Ancient secular sources show that pre-Christian scholars of antiquity had a higher estimate of the culture and traditions of Palestine, particularly those relevant to the Jewish view of the afterlife, than is usually credited to them today. Strabo corroborated by Stephanus, in his well-known Gazetteer, have both mentioned the names of several philosophers and writers, apart from Hermippus, Pythagoras and Clearchus who were not only deeply influenced by Palestinian culture, but were themselves the products of the Poleis of Gadara, Gerasa and Ascalon. 91

Many Greek sources do not always distinguish between "Greek" in the racial, ethnic sense and "Hellenism" in the sociological and syncretistic sense. Such a distinction should not be confused or oversimplified regarding Palestine. The definitive sociological pattern which emerged in the Palestinian Poleis was indeed Hellenistic in form, but deeply rooted in Jewish religious traditions. These traditions were permitted to germinate and develop within the ingenious structure of each self-contained Polis, particularly the Polis of Jerusalem. During the important 113 years of Ptolemaic administration, the Jews acquired the form of their Hellenism from Alexandria, but the actual manner of their living and dying, or "religion"
in the strictest sense of this term, remained essentially Jewish.

Athens was a democracy. The whole people (δῆμος) thus had the right to express its consensus in the general assembly (ἐκκλησία), despite the fact that the "Council of 500" (ὁ πολίτης) had the power to decide which questions got on the agenda. Because this form of rule was popular, it was imitated by many of the hellenistic Poleis, but this was not always the case. Jerusalem, by contrast, had a council of 70 elders (γερουσία) but it did have a general assembly which met for important matters. And, likewise, even though many hellenistic Poleis conformed, in religious matters, to the popular gods of Athens, internal laws and religious cults were the free choice of each Polis. Jerusalem exercised this choice in the reaffirmation of the law of Moses, as the basis of its civil law, and the religion of the Temple, according to its Zadokite priesthood and the practice of their fathers. Thus hellenism and religious syncretism were not always synonymous, nor did they necessarily go hand in hand in the Palestinian Poleis. Jewish Poleis were also economically self-sufficient with their classes of farmers, who worked the surrounding lands, craftsmen and merchants. Jerusalem had a ready-made class of civil servants and public administrators in its Zadokite priesthood. Every Polis had its walls, which were as much a symbol of its autonomous rights and independence, as they were a means of fortification and protection. Thus Jerusalem's towering walls were frequently torn down and rebuilt under different administrations. When a city lost its rights because of rebellion or conquest in war, the symbol of its status was dismantled and the Polis degraded to a mere (ἄσιοκτα) or colony. This was the case when Antiochus(IV) Epiphanes, destroyed the walls of Jerusalem, which had only recently been reconstructed by his father Antiochus(III) the Great.
The word "city", in its nicest sense, has come to imply in modern times an abstract political or sociological phenomenon which has reference more to its citizenry than to its buildings. In hellenistic times, the term was inextricably bound up with the physical aspects of a common dwelling place, moreover, the very walls which surrounded the buildings and houses of men. The immortality cult differed from the Polis itself, in hellenistic times, in that it had to do with the inhabitants or "citizenry", be they gods or men, living or dead. The creation of a "citizenry" of warriors, heroes and leaders who would make great contributions to society was the sole aim of the self-perpetuating educational system of the Polis. The Gymnasia and the Ephebia, thus were an inseparable part of the immortality cult within the Polis. If the Polis was to be more than a defence against external physical enemies, namely, a defence against time, then the schools which perpetuated the fame and memory of the gods and heroes of the Polis were a sine qua non of the immortality cult. But in producing leaders and trained citizens, they also perpetuated the Polis wherein lay the eternal memory of the gods and heroes. Thus in both respects "immortality" can be said to have been the end of hellenistic education. It sought to produce men capable of making great sacrifices and contributions to society and it also perpetuated the means whereby the memory and fame of these men would live eternally. The remarkable departure which the Jews introduced into the Polis immortality cult was that immortality was that which man had in the mind and memory of God and the honour which God bestows, rather than the eternal recognition or memory of men. Such a fortress, or Polis, can never fall because it consists of God and God alone. Thus the Polis, or "kingdom", of God alone is eternal, and the cities, or kingdoms, of men are all "cities" of dust.

Hellenistic Poleis distinguished carefully between their own citizenry and mere residents (μητοικίαι, παροικίας)
The former came through the poetic and military education of the Gymnasium and Ephebium, or else were granted this status, outright, by the Council. Inherent in the Polis system, was the obligation on the part of prominent citizens to perform acts of public sacrifice or duty called "liturgy" (ἵερονγύ'α) when called upon to do so. This might require both the sacrifice of funds and the expenditure of their abilities, such as providing corn in times of famine or attending to the needs of the Gymnasium. It is thus not improbable that even priests might be asked to perform such duties. But the Gymnasium and Ephebium were the soul and perpetuating strength of the Polis immortality cult. They embodied and perpetuated the local cults of heroes, saints and gods, and also perpetuated the strength of the Polis itself. There is a sufficient amount of evidence to show that hellenised Jews, even outside of Jerusalem, both participated in and administered the affairs of the Gymnasia. Because of the apparent number of Jews who were doing so, even as late as the reign of Claudius, the emperor had to restrict Jews from being elected to the influential post of Gymnasiarch, in the Polis of Alexandria. One might well ask, Would not the Jews have reservations about participating in the cult of Alexandria? There is, however, an early tradition which seems to have gained a certain degree of acceptance that Alexander the Great was known to have brought the bones of the prophet Jeremiah to Alexandria during the founding of that Polis as her Palladium. Jeremiah, thus must have been considered to be an immortal and thus was treated as an official protecting (and founding) god of the city. Jews thus would have little difficulty in participating in the immortality cult of Alexandria. The tradition does not appear to be either exaggerated or inconsistent, considering that its source like that of Clearchus expresses a reverence, similar to that of their master Aristotle, toward the Jews.

Attention has been called by E. Bickerman to a Greek inscription at Lydia, in which Seleucus I commanded spec-
funds to be set aside for those "Jews citizens of Antioch, who were unwilling to use pagan oil." We note that these Jewish participants, between 312 and 280 B.C, did not find it incompatible with: their being Jews, or a contradiction of their beliefs, to participate in what were, in effect, the immortality cults of Alexandria and Antioch. Their wish was only to be ceremonially clean while doing so. The sacred oil was given by the "Gymnasiarch" for anointing during athletic games, which often involved a great deal of physical danger. They were in themselves religious ceremonies, of a sort, preceded by libations to the heroes and gods of the Polis. Needless to say, the immortality cult of Jerusalem differed greatly from that of Antioch because of its deep roots in the religion of Israel. Hellenistic education usually consisted of a type of physical and military training blended with, what was then called, "music", which now would probably be known as "mathematics". It also included a fair amount of "poetry", which was the heart of the immortality cult of heroes and gods. Such a course would probably be called "history" today. Not unlike the Greeks, the Jews had both a "history" and a "poetry" of their own, but it was a history and a poetry which reflected their own distinctive teachings. It also cannot be denied that the Jews had martyrs and heroes of their own, as will be seen when we examine the "Hasidim" in greater detail, but these saints were, by no means immortal simply because of their valour in battle. Jerusalem thus --- differed from other hellenistic Poleis in her lack of emphasis on military training. None of the education in a hellenistic Polis was compulsory, but because of its high cost, it was in most cases the privilege of the aristocratic classes. In Jerusalem, however, it is likely that there was a complete absence of such high costs, as the teacher Jesus ben Sirach, who may have been the founder of the Jerusalem school, wrote in Ecclesiasticus: "Draw near to me, you who are untaught, and lodge in my school...get these things for yourselves without
money." The Gymnasium and the elaborate rituals accompanying athletic contests in other Hellenistic poleis contained the main public expression and observance of the immortality cults. The large crowds who attended the contests, in a very literal sense, participated in a religious ceremony which consisted of the veneration or perpetuation of the immortality of the heroes and gods to whom the games were dedicated.

What evidence is there for such observances at Jerusalem? Are there any signs that there were a Gymnasium, Ephebium or any such liturgical games at Jerusalem? The evidence seems to indicate that there were. II Mac. 4:9, records a requisition on the part of the Jewish high priest Jason (brother of Onias III(4:7) who was forced into exile by Menelaus and was known by the Jewish name of Jesus) to the king of Syria, Antiochus IV, to establish again the status of Jerusalem as a Polis. For this right he paid the king a customary fee on the condition that he would be permitted to build a Gymnasium and Ephebium (γυμνάσιον καὶ ἐφηβίον). His second request was to register an elite of Jewish citizens to be called "Antiocheans" (Ἀντιστηνοὶ ἀναγραφαί). This more likely was a proposed name for Jerusalem, than an association with the city of Antioch, because of the significant walls, Gymnasium, Ephebium and Temple which Jerusalem would have. These developments were naturally opposed by those Jews in the outlying regions who were neither associated with the priestly and aristocratic Sons of Zadok, nor would benefit from life within the Polis. Consequently the Gymnasium and the Ephebium were the particular institutions which attracted special criticism from these sources. Nonetheless, Jerusalem still had a Jewish Hellenism which must be distinguished from the radical non-Jewish Hellenism which was later imposed on the city for a brief period of time. II Maccabees suggests that the right to found a Gymnasium was clearly synonymous with the right to found a city and to be recognised as a permanent Polis. However, in the case of Jerusalem, we
learn that the Gymnasium was built "under the fortress" (i.e., directly on the Temple hill) and probably associated with the Temple itself. Those sons of the Jewish aristocracy, who were privileged to attend, are accused by the Maccabean critic of too-quickly donning the Petasos (πέτασος), or broad brimmed hat of the god Hermes; a remark which was intended more as a double entendre, than to be taken literally (II Mac. 4:12). This seemingly trivial point is mentioned here because Hermes (with his broad hat and staff) was well-known to all Greek wayfarers. His unique place among the schools, however, was because of his power as a "guide of souls" (φυσιονομίτης) of the departed from the underworld to heaven. This only underscores the eschatological nature of the criticism and the eschatological nature of the issues at stake. There were few Gymnasia or Ephebia in the Hellenistic world which did not have a statue of Hermes with hat (πέτασος) and κηρύκειον travelling staff, but none is recorded to have ever been found in Jerusalem. When the source of this criticism is placed in its proper perspective, i.e., as from one inimical to the Sons of Zadok and the whole ruling priesthood who stayed on, rather than flee from Jerusalem, when Antiochus III first occupied the land, it throws a trace of light (albeit one which is scarred by the heavy censorship of later Pharisaic Councils) on the function and significance of the Gymnasium as a "school of immortality". It also begins to illuminate the nature of the Jerusalem Temple school for its distinctive eschatological teachings and essentially Jewish immortality cult of its own. But the direct comparison to Hellenistic cults with their pagan gods should not be taken too seriously, as nothing could be farther from the truth. On the other hand, if these criticisms were applied to Menelaus, who later usurped the high-priesthood, and whose five years of radical (non-Jewish) Hellenism were marked by the "Abomination of Desolation" (II Mac. 4:26) these complaints might then seem justified. But, by no means, do they characterise the legitimate high priests (including Jason)
who preceded him, with loyalty to the Temple, the Torah and the religion of their fathers.

Large numbers of young men are said, by the author of II Maccabees, to have streamed into Jerusalem to enroll in the Gymnasium. Its popularity was so great, that the priests of the Temple are said to have abandoned their services to take part in the formalities "after the call to the discus" (II Mac. 4:14). Participation in the Gymnasium and the liturgy of the games, even though it had, by now, been transformed into a uniquely Jewish phenomenon involving the Temple priesthood, would not receive the scalding criticism that it does, if it did not represent a unique eschatological development and uniquely Jewish view of immortality, which its detractors considered a threat to their own eschatological teachings. I will attempt to show that these opposing Jewish points of view included the notion of a future reward and resurrection after a universal judgment of the world, as distinct from the possibility of present immortality. The Maccabean detractor has complained that the aristocratic Jews of the Polis began, "putting the highest value on Greek forms of prestige" (II Mac. 4:15). Again, this seems to refer to the honour and eternal glory of Polis immortality which, nonetheless, became much more than Polis immortality by the time it reached Jerusalem. Another criticism was that the aristocratic Jews began to reject circumcision, as well. It is clear from Josephus, however, that it was not until the radical hellenisation of Menelaus that the Jews actually grew ashamed of their circumcision and sought to have it removed. This is, in all likelihood, the first indication of the sharp division between non-circumcising Jews and the "Circumcision Party", which was to continue well into New Testament times. It is a mistake, however, to assume that previous to Menelaus and his "Abomination of Desolation", that the hellenised Jews had already broken the old Covenant, of which circumcision was a sign. Neither did they forsake the Torah, Laws of Moses or
the Temple and its worship, because it was over these institutions that the Sons of Zadok had been appointed guardians since their anointings in the days of Solomon.

Archeological and numismatic evidence from Ptolemaic and post-Ptolemaic times bears out that hellenistic Poleis had at least one protector or guardian god, whose temple and cult constituted the centre of religious life in the city. Such traditions also existed among the Jews, but in a significantly different way, namely, that there was only one true God who, nevertheless, might be surrounded by myriads of lesser immortals. This theme of "Protector of the Polis" was, thus, not absent among the Jews. We have already called attention to one early tradition which has now reached a certain degree of acceptance, namely, that when Alexander re-established the city of Alexandria as a Polis, the prophet Jeremiah became its official "protector" and "guardian". As long as his bones were kept safe, presumably in an appropriate temple, it was believed that the city would remain safe. Evidence of this "guardian" theme in the Jewish immortality cult may be seen toward the end of II Maccabees. Here, two such immortals appear to Judas in a vision; they are Onias, the noble high priest, and Jeremiah. Onias speaks in the vision: "This is a man who loves the brethren and prays much for the people and the holy city (τής ἁγίας πόλεως), Jeremiah, the prophet of God" (II Mac. 15:14). Jeremiah then gave to Judas a golden sword with which he vanquished his enemies. Such heavenly visions were later severely condemned and the seer or visionary punished as a heretic by the Pharisees, because "present immortality" for the elect of God contradicted the whole Pharisaic eschatology of a "future" universal resurrection to Judgment in which the dead do not yet participate.

Other lesser Jewish "guardians", for which there appears to be a considerable amount of evidence, were such immortals as Elijah, Moses and Enoch. Although, any one
of the prophets in the Jewish immortality cult might be called
upon in time of need, it was the God of Abraham, Isaac and
Jacob who was the God of the "holy city", Jerusalem. So it was
from the days of David who built the fortified walls of Jeru-
salem and Solomon, who built the Temple of which Zadok was
the anointed priest. Later, in the days of Asa, all pagan
altars were removed from Judah except that of the one true God
of Israel at the time that Asa said: "Let us build these
cities and surround them with walls and towers, gates and bars;
the land is still ours because we have sought the Lord our God"
(IIChr.14:7). So it was in the time of Manasseh, who removed the
foreign gods and idols from the house of the Lord to restore the
altar of the Lord and "Afterwards he built an outer wall for the
city of David west of Gihon, in the valley and for the entrance
into the fish gate, and carried it round Ophel, and raised it
to a very great height"(IIChr.33:14).

The Polis immortality cult was, by no means,
abandoned by the Jews, but transformed beyond anything envisag-
ed by the Greeks. In the Psalms of David, we are carried
beyond anything the Greek poets had said about the relationship
of the gods to the Polis. God "is" the refuge and strength
"a very present help in trouble", the Psalmist declares(46:1).
Even "though the earth should change", God's city shall have a
permanence which will not be shaken. The immortality of the
Polis and its inhabitants, to the mind of the Jew, thus rests
on the steadfastness of God. God is not only said, in Hebrew
"poetry", to be a guardian of the holy city, but an inhabitant
as well:

"There is a river whose streams make glad the city of God,
the holy habitation of the Most High.
God is in the midst of her; she will not be moved;
God will help her right early.
The nations rage, the kingdoms totter;
He utters His voice and the earth melts."

(Ps.46:4-6)
A significant transformation of the Polis immortality cult has taken place in the Jewish notion of the "holy city". Immortality is still the property of the Polis, but with vastly different connotations. Jerusalem has now become the "city of the Lord of Hosts", "the city of our God, which God established forever." (Ps. 48:8). This is not a song in praise of mere beauty or physical strength, but of the immortality in which the inhabitant also shares in God's Polis. The Psalmist urges men to walk around the holy city, to number her towers, consider her ramparts and go through her citadels so "that you may tell the next generation that this is God, our God for ever and ever. He will be our guide forever" (48:14). Thus, the participant in the Jewish immortality cult does not claim immortality on the basis of human praise and honour which is short lived, but on the basis of God's election and the eternity and steadfastness of His nature. If one failed, in the Greek Polis, to achieve any degree of immortality, it was either because one missed the mark or did not have the moral strength to achieve great things. The Jewish immortality cult presents a stark contrast to this teaching in its understanding of immortality as the gift of God. Because it is the gift of God and exists only within the province of God, one fails to receive it only if one is cut off from God because of sin:

"No man who practises deceit shall dwell in my house; No man who utters lies shall continue in my presence. Morning by morning I will destroy all the wicked in the land cutting off all the evildoers from the city of the Lord." (Ps. 101:7-8)

The wicked are thereby condemned to separation from the city of God, or oblivion, because of sin. In this and many other ways, which will be examined in greater detail below, the hellenistic notion of Polis immortality was transformed, via Jewish theology, into something far more significant than anything the Greeks had yet envisaged. This transformation was
yet to come to a culmination, via the Temple school of the Sons of Zadok, in the teachings of the early Christian Church which later proclaimed:

"But you have come to Mount Zion and to the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and the innumerable angels in festal gathering, and to the assembly of the first-born who are enrolled in heaven, and to (God who is judge 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." (Heb.12:22-24)

The unique modifications of these teachings as they emerge and are transformed once again within the Early Church are a fascinating study in itself. But let us examine in greater detail the fragments of tradition and literature which have survived from this pre-Christian Jewish school of immortality before we proceed further.
Onias III, Jason and the Jerusalem School of Immortality:

The particular "school of immortality" and the unique quality of culture which developed in the Polis of Jerusalem under the high priesthoods of Onias III and his brother Jason, should be carefully distinguished from the radical non-Jewish hellenisation which followed during the brief administration of Menelaus (c.171-166 B.C.). The activities of Menelaus, who was perhaps one of Jerusalem's most notorious ruling priests, resulted in bloodshed, sacrilege and the infamous "Abomination of Desolation"(II Macc.6). This has often served to distort the fact that Onias III and Jason, although very much in contact with hellenism, remained loyal to the Torah, the Temple and its priesthood. The sharp difference between the "Hellenism" of these high priests; hellenised Judaism, as over against non-Jewish Hellenism, is occasionally described as the long-standing difference between the Oniads and the Tobiads. Menelaus and his followers were called the "Tobiads" because they derived their support from the non-priestly house of Tobias. On the other hand, the official name of the dynasty to which Onias III belonged was the "Sons of Zadok". It is with this priesthood and its teachings that we are mainly concerned here. The descendants of the famous Zadok, who we have observed was anointed messianic high priest at the same time that Solomon was anointed messianic prince(IChr.29:22), included most of the legitimate priests of Jerusalem as well as the particular dynasty of high priests known as the Oniads.101

Because Onias III was a properly anointed descendant of the messianic high priest Zadok, there are consequently a number of good reasons why he may well have been known as "The Rightful Teacher", or "The Teacher of Righteousness", or may even be the "Anointed One" alluded to in Daniel (9:26), who shall be "cut off" before the coming of the abomination that makes desolate. But these questions will be examined in full below. Menelaus, however, was a Benjamite who did not belong to the
priestly tribe when he seized office. Although Menelaus held the office of high priest after Onias III and Jason, he was never considered a legitimate successor, as suggested by the fact that he was never called "Onias IV". In spite of Josephus' warning that "Menelaus was the cause of all the mischief by persuading the king's father (Antiochus IV) to compel the Jews to abandon their father's religion", many have ignored Josephus' sharp distinction between the school of Onias III and Jason and the school of Menelaus; between the Oniads and the Toblads. Such a confusion of the true nature of these pre-Christian Jews has resulted in much misunderstanding regarding their teachings.

Part of the blame for this confusion can be traced back to the author (or epitomiser) of II Maccabees, who wrongly presented Jason as one who set about to abolish the Jewish religion. Because this view of Jason is not borne out by either I Maccabees or Josephus, it is likely that the whole matter has been oversimplified for the sake of convenience or that again discloses the hand of Pharisaic censorship. However, in fairness, it should be noted that in his denunciation, the epitomiser mainly confines himself to a severe criticism of Jason for his innovations, rather than any outright attack on the faith of his fathers. The new administration of Jason did not abolish the Mosaic Law; far from it. Most sources disclose that Jason and his followers held the Law and the books of the Law in highest regard, often paying a dear price for their loyalty to them. The Assembly and the Council of the Polis Jerusalem (or "Antiochida") had both the power and the authority to abolish the Mosaic Law, but under Jason they did not.

Let us suppose that Jason, quite honestly, sought to establish an academy which would contain the best elements of hellenistic culture but remain essentially Jewish in its outlook and eschatology. Josephus has indicated that some Sadducean schools in Alexandria were later inclined to
set aside the prophets (but not the Law) in order to teach Rhetoric, Physics and Music (i.e. Mathematics). A similar situation must have existed in Jerusalem. Also it is not impossible to believe that some of the sons of the Jewish aristocracy might go to extremes in wearing the Greek Petasos, just as the young are inclined to go to extremes in what they wear today. However, the denunciation does not state that the priests "abolished" the sacrifices, but specifically, (τῶν θυσιῶν ἀπελώνες) "they did not attend the sacrifices". That priests are said to frequent the school, or Gymnasium, of Jason strongly suggests that they also fulfilled a didactic function as teachers and instructors in the Temple School. As physical training was only one aspect of Greek education, it is more than likely that they were needed to teach the Law of Moses, which became the legal foundation of the Jerusalem Polis. They would also be the most likely tutors in matters of written Torah as well as the "poetry" of Israel. Attention has already been called to the inscription of Seleucus I, in which money was allocated for oil for those Jews, "citizens of Antioch", who were unwilling to use pagan oil. As oil was used mainly during the athletic games, this notice implies that Jewish youths took part, from an early date, in the strenuous physical training of the Gymnasia. But this aspect of the hellenistic schools should not be exaggerated as in the Jerusalem of Onias and Jason, the Gymnasium served primarily as a Temple school, a centre of intellectual activity, the foundation of Polis life and expectations among the aristocratic and priestly Sons of Zedok.

When Jason was granted permission, by royal edict, to establish a "gymnasium and a body of youth for it, and to enrol the men of Jerusalem as citizens of Antioch" (II Kac 4:9), he was fiercely attacked from both sides, but especially by the Tobians who felt he hadn't gone far enough. In one sense, what he did was not new but merely an extension of the policy of his father Onias II and brother Onias III who, nearly 25 years pre-
viously, had received a royal charter from Antiochus III to restore Jerusalem to the status of a Polis, immediately after his conquest and to "repeopel it" (Ant. xii. 139). As no Polis was complete without its school or Gymnasium, it is likely that the (στοάς) "porticos", built in connection with the Temple, were in fact places of learning similar to the places where the "schools" of philosophy gathered in Athens (Ant. xii. 141). If this was the case, it suggests that a "Jerusalem School" was already in existence in the time of Onias III. This is consistent both with the reputation of the Jews for their learning among the Greeks and the abundance of evidence which points to the existence of such a "Temple School" as well as its teachers in early New Testament times. It is thus not surprising that Jason had a majority of the Jewish population in support of his cause. Nevertheless, a small delegation of radical hellenisers, including Menelaus and some of the Tobiads presented formal complaints against Jason to the king in which they stated:

a) They did not desire to live by their "ancestral laws" (πατρίους νόμους καταλιπόντες) and the "old way of life", which Jason clearly favoured.

b) They wanted to live according to the laws of the king rather than according to the laws of Moses.

c) They wanted to found a Greek community (or Polis, τὴν Ἑλληνικὴν πόλιν ἔχειν) rather than a hellenised Jewish Polis.

d) Menelaus must be appointed high priest in place of Jason so that this might be accomplished.

Nothing could demonstrate more clearly the essential Jewishness of the Jerusalem Polis under the Oniads than these complaints against them. Menelaus' next request was to build a separate Gymnasium. This latter request suggests first that the school of Onias III and Jason was directly linked with the Temple in some way, or directly beneath it on the Temple hill, but not a separate building, and secondly, that what was taught in the school of Onias III and Jason was objectionable to the radical hellenisers. It is significant that Josephus mentions no attempt on the part of the Jerusalemites
to abandon the Jewish way of life, or hide their circumcision until the time of Menelaus. The displacement of Jason by the appointment of Menelaus, angered and divided the large population of Jerusalem. Josephus has stated that Menelaus had the sons of Joseph (the Tobiads, a small but wealthy minority) on his side. But Jason and the Oniads had the majority of the population on their side. Despite Jason's popular advantage as rightful high priest until Onias IV came of age, Menelaus won the appointment by a promise of higher revenues to the king. The Maccabean critic does not mention that Menelaus also promised Antiochus access to the vast Temple treasuries which were safely guarded by the Oniads. When Menelaus did, in fact, become high priest, the king attempted, once again, to seize the wealth of the Temple and this time succeeded in obtaining what was not accessible under Onias III and Jason.

When Menelaus was appointed high priest, bitter civil strife broke out because Jason refused to abandon his hereditary office. The Jerusalem population was divided between the pro-Alexandrine school of Jason and the pro-Antiochean school of Menelaus. Menelaus, brother to the Temple Overseer (Simon who accused the former high priest, Onias III, and forced him into exile in Egypt, IIMac.4:23) now accused Jason, the brother of Onias III, before the king. It is clear that the extreme hellenizers no longer trusted Jason and feared his popularity (Ant.xii.239). They also may have seen their chance to destroy the rightful Sons of Zadok once and for all. The majority rallied to his side, but Jason also was forced to flee; this Son of Zadok fled to Damascus.

Onias III was loyal to the laws of his ancestors, even while living in exile in Alexandria. There he built a Temple similar in design to that in Jerusalem, over which the Sons of Zadok officiated as levites and priests (Ant.xii.63). Jason, his brother, also became a leader of a unique Jewish movement (or development) which was nonetheless
strangely orientated to the hellenistic world. Over against this stood the radical Hellenism of Menelaus. Any explanation of the differences among the hellenised Jews of this period must therefore take into account: a) the Antiochean and Alexandrine loyalties of the Jews of this period, b) the distinctively Jewish character of the Jerusalem Polis in the midst of strong hellenistic influences, c) the place which the Law of Moses held, as a legal basis for society, in these respective groups and d) the radically differing nature of the immortality cults to which these groups adhered. To suggest that the issue which divided the Jewish people for many generations to come, was merely a feud between the Toblads and the Onlads, or between the hellenisers and the non-hellenising Jews, is a gross oversimplification.

The radical policies of Menelaus, which cannot be called syncretistic because they sought to eliminate Judaism altogether, provoked nothing but strong reactions. Apart from the fact that he was not a priest by birth, he resorted to brute force to implement a radical change in Jewish society. He was hated by both the Jewish population, which called him "tyrant", and by Antiochus, who withdrew his support from him because he kept none of his promises. His administration was characterised by the removal of the Temple treasures, and the murder of Onias III, who was well-known and praised throughout the hellenistic world. Under his high priesthood Jerusalem experienced some of the worst atrocities, desolation and sacrilege of her entire history.

Why did Menelaus become such a strong whip for the cult of Antioch against his own people? Why did he initiate such an intensive persecution against all those who possessed written scrolls of the Law of Moses, observed feasts or Sabbaths or remained loyal in any way to the teachings of their fathers? It has often been suggested that Antiochus Euphranes simply wanted to "hellenise" the cities of Palestine. But
such motives would have been pointless because most of them had been hellenised, to some extent, for several generations. The severity of the persecutions against the Jerusalemites has suggested to some, strong anti-Semitic motives on the part of Antiochus. If that were the case, why did he lavish favours on some Jews and punish others pitilessly? Was he a fanatic who destroyed Judaism in order to unify his kingdom into one political and religious cult? Polybius and other ancient writers seem to indicate that this was the case, but the answer remains veiled in obscurity for lack of substantiating evidence. However, the following facts are known and have an important bearing on the question: a) Antiochus Epiphanes was engaged in a massive war against Egypt in which his hold on Palestine was about to be broken. b) Many of the hellenised Jews had deep loyalties to Egypt and Antiochus was obsessed with distrust of his allies. c) Palestine was soon to become the kernel, ground between the forces of Egypt and Syria. d) Antiochus was desperately in need of all the funds he could gather as the whole future of his kingdom depended on the outcome of these wars. e) Antiochus saw the danger of Rome becoming a threat.

An Attempt to Impose a Foreign Immortality Cult on the Polis Immortality Cult of Jerusalem:

Under Antiochus(IV) Epiphanes, foreign(Syrian) religious views were directly imposed on Jerusalem and her Temple for the one and only time in the three centuries which preceded the coming of Christ. They were the short lived religious views of the immortality cult of Antioch. After sacking the treasury of Jerusalem, on his return from his second assault on Egypt, Antiochus Epiphanes "sent an Athenian senator (γέροντα Αθηναίων) to compel (ἀναγκάζων) the Jews to forsake their laws (πατρίων νόμων literally, the 'laws of their fathers', or Laws of Moses) and cease to live by the laws of God (τοῖς τοῦ θεοῦ νόμοις)."
Whatever might be said of the 144 years of hellenised Judaism which preceded this edict, it is unmistakably clear that until Menelaus, the Laws of Moses were the basis of the Jerusalem Polis and immortality cult. In spite of the political and cultural syncretism which flourished in this period, citizens of the Jerusalem Polis lived "according to the laws of God" and their immortality cult was deeply rooted in the eschatology and religious views of Israel. Consequently the written law, its interpreters and the "School of the Law" were all temporarily abolished in 168 B.C. by Menelaus. Antiochus Epiphanes' next step (carried out by Menelaus) was to convert the Jerusalem Temple, which was the centre of the Jewish immortality cult, into a temple to Zeus, after the immortality cult of Antioch. This was to change to the cult of Antioch like the temple on Mt. Gerizim. A supporting document which sheds light on the tenacity of the Jerusalem cult in opposing this rash procedure, is the letter of Epiphanes to Nicanor, his general. Here, he says of the Samaritans: "They are in no way concerned in the complaints brought against the Jews etc. but choose to live in accordance with Greek customs. This letter indicates that the Temple on Mt. Gerizim had already converted to the cult of Antioch by its rededication to "Zeus Xenios". It also discloses Epiphanes' obsessive distrust of those Poleis which would not show complete allegiance to the cult of Antioch, with its veneration of Antiochus as a divine and "immortal" being. The so-called "Samaritans" consisted largely of Syrians (Sidonians) who were living in Samaria, yet the king was ready to punish them as fully as the Jews for not showing their loyalty in adopting his particular immortality cult worship. Because of the transformation of their temple they escaped punishment.

One may conceive of grand political strategies on the part of Epiphanes, or even his great love for Hellenism, but none of these adequately explain his brutal and pitiless
handling of the Jews. It was treason and only treason which aroused his zeal and thus allegiance to the immortality cult of Antioch became imperative. Onias III was driven out of Jerusalem because of his sympathy toward Egypt and the pro-Ptolemaic party. He fled to Egypt and established there a new temple administered by Zadokite priests at Heliopolis (or Leontopolis). It is perhaps to this Jewish community that II Maccabees is addressed as an appeal to return to Jerusalem. When Jason, the brother of Onias, won a majority-following it was soon feared that revolution would break out, so he was ousted from Jerusalem. Jason returned, however, with less than a thousand men to unseat Menelaus. Antiochus, who was then at war with the Jews in Egypt, thought a revolution had occurred in Judea. He was thus outraged by this second occurrence of treason on the part of the Jerusalemites. II Maccabees (5:11) says: "he took it to mean that Judea was in revolt, so raging inwardly, he left Egypt and took the city (Jerusalem) by storm...killing 40,000 Jews and selling 40,000 more into slavery." Josephus modifies this figure and states that only 10,000 were taken alive. It was only by means of such drastic measures as these, that any foreign cult gained access to Jerusalem, in pre-Christian times, and then only for a brief duration.

The essential difference between the immortality cults of Jerusalem and Antioch, represented respectively by Jason and Menelaus, is frequently overlooked or misunderstood. Jason, and the Oniads before him, were consistently Jewish, pro-Torah and loyal to the Temple and its priesthood. Menelaus, on the other hand, was the first to abolish all of these institutions, and particularly the written Torah, as we have already observed. The pro-Torah party was thus identical with the pro-Jason party, and indeed, a treasonous one in the eyes of Antiochus.
Thus began a bitter scourge against any, who as much as retained a written copy of the Law of Moses:

"The books of the Law which they found, they tore to pieces and burned with fire. Where the Book of the Covenant was found in the possession of anyone, or if anyone adhered to the law, the decree of the king condemned him to death." (1Mac.1:56)

The wicked priest, Menelaus, sent around inspectors monthly and on the 25th day of each month made an unspeakable human sacrifice to the gods of Antioch. Those put to death were any who possessed sacred scriptures, observed the Sabbath or had their children circumcised. 1Mac.1:60, 2Mac.6:10, and Ant.xii.254-256, describe in extenso how circumcised children were strangled and crucified with their parents, as well as any who possessed "sacred books or a copy of the Law"(xii.256).

What was the nature of the foreign immortality cult, which was unsuccessfully imposed by these means on Jerusalem under Menelaus? We have already observed that the concealing of circumcision does not occur in any of the sources until Menelaus. The author of I Maccabees associates this practice with the actual "building" of a separate Gymnasium (apart from the Temple) which did not take place until the time of Menelaus. The nature of the cult from Antioch may be inferred from the coins of Antiochus "Epiphanes"(the manifest), who was proclaimed divine in the name of "Zeus Olympias", and for the benefit of Semites, "Hadad"(or "Baal"). As an immortality cult, the cult of Antiochus had much in common with the mysteries of Mithras. As Mithras was believed to have ascended to immortality (the gods) after an earthly struggle and was thought to guarantee immortality to those initiated into his mysteries, so also, upon the death of Epiphanes, his son and successor Antiochus(V)Eupater, claimed that his father had similarly ascended(eis θεοῦς μεταστάντος), i.e., "is translated to the gods", or was now immortal.
Also characteristic of this immortality cult, which is held by many to have originated with Antiochus Epiphanes, was its initiation by a type of "baptism", purification by honey, the use of bread, water and wine consecrated by priests called "fathers" who prescribed a very stringent code of ethics. Tertullian was surprised by the striking similarity of these practices to Christian liturgical forms and thought that they were a deliberately devised parody on the Christian sacraments. An outstanding characteristic of this curious cult of Antioch was its excessive borrowing and eclecticism. The main trouble with Tertullian's suggestion is that the cult appears to have been a pre-Christian phenomenon, as well. It is more likely that even this cult of Antioch (as with the rest of the hellenised world) was strongly influenced by the very hellenised Judaism it sought to subdue. If that was the case, as it may well have been, it throws an interesting but refracted light on the nature and practices of the Jerusalem immortality cult. It is fairly certain that the cult of Antioch did not flourish until after the Seleucids' extended contact with the hellenised Jews. Such a hypothesis does not contradict the judgment of ancient scholars, that the hellenised world derived its various doctrines of immortality from the Jews. One is cautioned, by the scarcity of evidence, not to suggest more than this, nor to infer that the religion of the hellenised Jews was, therefore, similar to the cult of Antioch. If there was any relationship between them, it was one of reaction. As Menelaus was but a parody of a Jewish high priest, so his version of the Jerusalem immortality cult would only have been a parody of true hellenised Jewish thought.

It, therefore, does not appear that Menelaus, in the less-than-five years of his priesthood, succeeded in imposing a foreign cult on Jerusalem. There is some evidence that the influence might well have been the other way around. Although I Maccabees states: "Many of the people, everyone who forsook the Law, joined them and they
did evil in the land; it is clear that normative Judaism and particularly the Sons of Zadok did not adopt the ways of these "Sons of Darkness" (Dionysus and the Underworld\textsuperscript{131}). Of those who remained in Jerusalem, most participated in the Antiochean cult only under protest: "On the monthly celebration of the king's birthday they (the Jews) were taken under bitter constraint to partake in the sacrifices" (IIMac. 6:7). Clearly, those who could abandon Jerusalem, did so as quickly as possible.

\textbf{The Zadokite Documents and the Sons of Zadok:}

When the first fragments of what is now a large collection of Jewish scrolls from the Hellenistic Period came to light, R.H. Charles was one who suggested of the Zadokite Document, "This book represents the beliefs and expectations of a body of reformers who sprang up in the 2nd century B.C."\textsuperscript{132} Examination of Charles's hypothesis in the light of what has been discovered since his time, suggests that many aspects of his general thesis must now be taken seriously, but, of course, with several modifications.

While the term, "body of reformers" is descriptive of the function which the Zadokites fulfilled, it is necessary to make several qualifications on the basis of more recent information. Although they became a highly advanced and non-reactionary "reformation", they were one which: a) emerged from within the central and normative body of priests and levites which, in this period, consisted mainly of the Sons of Zadok, b) consisted of hellenised Jews, as far as political and economic matters were concerned, but Jews who remained loyal to the Temple, the Torah and the priesthood and thus remained relatively free from "foreign" influences in religious matters, c) became the object of a great persecution because of its loyalty to the Law of Moses and rejection of Antioch and its cult, d) reflected a uniquely Jewish cult of immortality in the Polis
of Jerusalem which eventually included heroes of its own
and a specific belief in resurrection and immortality in a
non-contradictory manner. But why were these immortals of
the Sons of Zadok scarcely mentioned after the rise of the
Hasmonaeans? And finally, what was the relationship of the
Sons of Zadok and the well-known Teacher of Righteousness, of
the Dead Sea Scrolls, to the Jerusalem school of immortality?
To these questions we will now turn.

It has been known for some time that the "Qovenan-
ters", mentioned in the Zadoxite and Qumran documents as those
who fled into the desert, were more than a schismatic lay re-
volt. Various experts, such as M.R. Segal, have called atten-
tion to a significant reverence for the Zadoxite priesthood
which occurs throughout all levels of Qumran literature.133
This name has subsequently become a technical term by which the
Manual of Discipline has been associated with the Zadoxite
document and a general corpus of Qumran literature gradually
established. Because of their self-appellation as "Sons of
Zadok",134 and their high regard for the priesthood, e.g. "praise
him who chooses the Sons of Zadok to be priests",135 it is commonly
agreed that they were a levitical and priestly community which
claimed to be descended from the messianic high priest who was
anointed high priest at the same time that Solomon was anointed
prince.136

In addition to disclosing their central position
in the stream of normative Judaism, "True Sons of Zadok" also
suggests a polemical relationship toward Menelaus who usurped
the office of high priest, without any priestly lineage of his
own, and sought to impose the cult of the city of Antioch on
the city of Jerusalem. It has occasionally been argued that
these Zadoxites could not possibly be an early or modified form
of Sadducaism, because of the supposed incongruity between the
Zadoxites and the descriptions of the later Sadducees given by
Josephus and the New Testament. We have observed that these
later Sadducees were in all probability Boethusians, who had but little in common with the original Sons of Zadok of pre-
Christian times. The Zadokites were thought to differ from what is known of the later Sadducees because of: a) their strong views on the afterlife, including a doctrine of resurrection and immortality (compared with the Sadducees' presumed denial of both), b) their belief in a coming messiah (or messiahs), c) their ritual purity and ascetic life, d) their reverence toward other sacred writings in addition to the written Torah (to which the Sadducees were thought exclusively to adhere).

This line of reason is often concluded with the question, "If they were "hellenised" Sadducees, how could the Sons of Zadok criticise those who went over to the hellenistic cults of the Syrians?" Needless to say, such an approach to the question reduces the whole issue to a matter of hellenised Judaism (Sadducæism) versus non-hellenised Judaism, which is a gross oversimplification of the problem at hand. On the basis of these, or similar arguments, an association of the Zadokite Document with the Sadducees is often dismissed without further thought. Since the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, however, much more is known about the Qumran Covenanters and their beliefs, than is known about the Sadducees. We have already seen several reasons why much of what is known about the Sadducees is either untrue or intentionally misleading. I will attempt to show that there were both historical and doctrinal grounds for holding a close relationship between the people of the Scrolls and the Sadducees and that it is possible to shed some light on the eschatological views of the Sadducees from the eschatological views of the Zadokites and Covenanters of Qumran. At this advanced stage in the Qumran discussions, it is indeed the Sadducees' side of the ledger which has been in need of closer examination.

J.T. Milik, who along with a great number of present-day critics believes the Qumran Covenanters can now be identified with the Essenes in a positive manner, has recently
called the Essene movement "A pietist movement, combining nationalism and messianic fervour, drawn from the religious laity with origins which go back as far as the post-exilic period". Without differentiating the stages or historical gaps in their development, he has presupposed a group similar to those called the "Hasidim" (or "Saints"). The suggestion of a "religious laity" is an important one even if it cannot be established that the Hasidim were ever a movement or party as such. His hypothesis unfortunately rests on the faulty premise that they were a lay movement because they broke with the Maccabees to support Alcimus who was of Aaronic priestly lineage. The argument is weak because, a) Alcimus himself dealt them treachery and violence and, b) he was not, in fact, a true priest of Zadokite lineage, with whom they might ally themselves. One reason why the Essenes should be taken seriously as the lay wing (levites) of the priestly Sons of Zadok is that their writings appear outspokenly in favour of the legitimate priesthood, as over against fraudulent priests with no lineage whatsoever. Their support of the Hasmonaeans at the start of the war was not yet a matter of endorsement of what was to become the Hasmonaean priesthood.

However the specific denunciations contained in the fragments of the Dead Sea Scrolls called the 4Q Testimonia, both make reference to the "Wicked Priest" and shed a little more light on the relationship of the hellenised Jews to the Revolt of the Maccabees against Antiochus Epiphanes and the cult of Antioch. This alliance appears to be self-evident to many who identify Judas Maccabeus with the figure in the Scrolls called "The Lion of Wrath". One of the main charges against the Wicked Priest was that he confiscated the "property of the righteous". We have already observed that the aristocratic and priestly families who were pro-Torah and pro-Egypt in their sympathies, had to abandon most of their property and possessions and flee. When the monthly purges in Jerusalem began, many
who could not travel as far as Egypt fled to the hills and caves near the Dead Sea. The charge in the Qumran commentary on Habakkuk (4QpHab.11.6) reads: "The Wicked Priest... plundering and amassing for himself the kind of wealth usually acquired by criminals who have rebelled against God." This identification is corroborated from another source in II Macc.4:32, which relates the actual instances in which Menelaus confiscated the gold vessels of the Temple for which he was publicly accused by Onias III. The incident resulted in a plot against Onias, in which Menelaus succeeded in murdering his opponent. II Maccabees also names Menelaus responsible for permitting Antiochus Epiphanes to completely empty the Temple treasuries. It will be recalled that the Temple with its great vaults functioned as a kind of national bank. It also contained private monies which only intensified the cause for grievance and created the need among those who fled for sharing what little they had. It is logical that these priestly and aristocratic Jews would flee to any safe place beyond the reach of Menelaus, including the nearby Dead Sea communities and villages with their surrounding caves. Evidently they took their forbidden scrolls with them, because it was for these that they had suffered so great a persecution. Several of the Dead Sea documents reflect this period of evacuation from Jerusalem. The Habakkuk Commentary (pHab.x.9-13) is one which contains a vivid denunciation of Menelaus with allusions to the Dionysian cult which II Maccabees (6:7) names specifically as the particular abomination which emerged in Jerusalem at this time:

"The man who drips lies and made many go astray so as to build a city of vanity amidst murders and to form a congregation——deceitful for the sake of its glory involving many in a vain cult and instructing them in deceitful acts." (4QpHab.x.9-13)

This quotation is particularly suited to the context of Onias and Jason in their struggle against Menelaus. By no means, is there any indication that these Sons of Zadok were separa-
tists in the sense of the later Pharisees. In this respect they more closely resemble the Sadducees, but perhaps as a levitical community directly related to the priestly Sons of Zadok. If there is little resemblance between these Zadokites and the descriptions of the later Boethusian Sadducees, neither do they appear to espouse the so-called doctrinal beliefs of the later Essenes, who are claimed by later writers to have repudiated resurrection and syncretism in any form.

The distinguished ones, of these Sons of Zadok, were often at this early date simply called the "Hasidim", or "assideans" as they are designated in I and II Maccabees. It is not impossible that in these times, those now called Essenes were originally known as the (םיִדְיוֹ) Hasidim. The later separatistic Pharisees, or (פִּיסְלוּ) "Perush" were not yet known. The Hasidim, on the other hand, were already known by many names such as "Pious", "Saints" or "Martyrs". They were distinguished more by their outstanding leaders, such as Simon the Just, Qnias III, Jason the high priest and the council of 60 Zadokite priests martyred by Demetrius, than by any organised party or separate sect as such. It can be demonstrated, as we will observe below, that the Hasidim were not a party, as such, but an immortality cult and one which was unique for its time in the hellenistic world. The literature of this period describes a great number of the Zadokites and hellenised Jews who suffered martyrdom under Menelaus, Antiochus Epiphanes or his successor Demetrius as "Hasidim" or Saints who are among the immortal and the eternal city of those who hoped for immortality. An illuminating passage from the Qumran literature which discloses these events as the proper context of these documents is contained in the Pesher (commentary) on Nahum. It is a rare text because it mentions, without symbolism or pseudonyms the actual names of the current Syrian rulers of this time. This not only serves to locate the Zadokite literature historically, but enables us to evaluate these docu-
ments in relationship to the radical hellenisers and thus as a source for immortality beliefs within normative Judaism previous to the Maccabean Revolt.

"This refers to Demetrius, the king of Yawan, who at the instance of them that sought smooth things, sought to enter Jerusalem. Never from the days of Antiochus until the time when the ruler of the Kittim arose, has the city daunted the kings of Yawan and eventually it will be trodden under." (pNah.11.11) 148

Although the actual composition of this Pesher may have been slightly later than several of the other Qumran documents, there need be little doubt that its contents refer, by name, to the reigns of Antiochus Epiphanes and his successor Demetrius I. Their greatest value rests in the data they provide relevant to the history and beliefs of the Sons of Zadok after their evacuation from Jerusalem by Antiochus (through Demetrius) and the wicked priest Menelaus. Cecil Roth and G.R. Driver have argued, on the basis of the Qumran Manual of War, that much of the Qumran literature should be placed in post-Christian Zealot times. But this position, particularly their interpretation of the Kittim as first century (A.D.) Romans, is extremely difficult to maintain. 149 One reason is that the author of the Pesher uses precisely the same terminology as the book of Daniel (11:23-31), which also mentions the Kittim by name, and directly in relation to Antiochus Epiphanes and the Abomination of Desolation. The reference to the "ruler of the Kittim" is revealing because of its possible reference to the second great humiliation of Antiochus Epiphanes on his return from Egypt. The ruler of the little kingdom of Cyprus (Citium) accomplished the defeat of the superior forces of Antioch by diplomatic collusion with the Roman ambassadors; the very ambassadors who succeeded in snatching Antiochus's victory from him in Egypt. 150 Another alternative, which we will examine shortly, is that the "ruler" of the Kittim was not a king but the governor of Cyprus, Nicanor, whom Antiochus transferred from Cyprus, after his ignominious
diplomatic defeat there, to become the task-master of Jerusalem.

Further reference to the same Antiochus Epiphanes is found in Daniel's allusion to the "king of the North", who sends an "exactor of tribute", a " contemptible person to whom royal majesty has not been given".¹⁵¹ So our sources all depict Menelaus as an exorbitant extractor of taxes, by which means he obtained his royal office without royal or priestly blood; the notorious "man of lies" and "wicked priest", as he is described by the Scrolls. Daniel's reference to Antiochus Epiphanes is by no means oblique. He states that the "King of the North" shall "do what neither his fathers or his fathers' fathers have done, by way of plunders and spoils."¹⁵² It is precisely in this respect that Epiphanes did outdo his father, Antiochus III, in his confiscation of the treasury and sacking of the Temple down to its very curtains. Daniel continues, "And he shall stir up his power and his courage against the king of the South with a great army".¹⁵³ This is a particularly appropriate reference to the first great campaign of Antiochus Epiphanes against the Ptolemies of Egypt. Regarding the second campaign, Daniel cryptically states: "At the time appointed he shall return and come into the South; but it shall not be this time as it was before. For the ships of the Kittim shall come against him, and he shall be afraid and withdraw."¹⁵⁴ Although there is no indication, in other sources, that it was by means of ships that Antiochus was beaten by the Kittim during his retreat from Egypt after his second campaign, it is clear that he was forced to withdraw his own ships from Kittim(Citium or Cyprus) through a humiliating diplomatic defeat. Secular verification of both the Scrolls' and Daniel's account of the Kittim may be seen in Polybius.¹⁵⁵ Polybius relates the details of how Egypt was lost politically in spite of Epiphanes' military victory, as well as his shameful retreat along the coast of Palestine. But he presents, as even more shameful, the loss of Cyprus through the skillful alliances of the Kittim with Rome at a time when
the Kittim forces were vastly outnumbered by those of Antiochus. G. R. Driver has argued that the "Kittim" were synonymous with the "Romans". But this assumes that because there were Roman ambassadors in Egypt, who thwarted Antiochus' designs, and because there were Roman ambassadors in Cyprus who did the same, therefore, the Romans were really known as the "Kittim" (rather than Romans) despite the fact that the name of Cyprus was "Kittim" and later "Citium". According to that view, which has not been adopted here, the Ptolemies would also be called "Kittim" because of the diplomatic protection which they enjoyed from Rome. There is no evidence that this ever became a common practice.

Because of the precision of detail which the book of Daniel provides, there can be little mistake about the identification of the events which it describes as from the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes. Daniel has stated in the same passage: "Forbes from him shall appear and profane the Temple and the fortress...And they shall set up the abomination that makes desolate." In the light of the evidence we have examined, it is difficult not to conclude that both Daniel and the Zadokite Documents refer to one of the most infamous periods in Jewish history under Antiochus Epiphanes. I will not repeat here the arguments of all those who place these events at a later time in Jewish history and hold that the "seekers after smooth things" and the "Lion of Wrath", in the Scrolls, were the Pharisees and Alexander Jannaeus respectively. That position disregards both what can be known about Jannaeus and what the sources themselves actually state: a) that the Pharisees were the bitter enemies of Jannaeus and b) that the Scrolls depict the "Lion of Wrath" as the friendly avenger, not the enemy of the Covenanters. These are but a few of the many reasons why one stands on firmer ground when one applies the historical narrative contained in the Zadokite Document, and much of the data contained in the Scrolls, to the context of Antiochus Epiphanes, Menelaus and Onias III. It is certainly in this historical
context that the greatest amount of light is shed on the teachings and beliefs of the Sons of Zadok, especially their view of the afterlife, and the normative Jewish understanding of immortality during this time. Surprisingly enough, the documents do provide answers to many hitherto unanswerable questions in this matter and stand up to scrutiny when examined in this light.

Onias III, the Jerusalem School and the Teacher of Righteousness:

Long after the Zadokite Document was first published one critic, J.C. Dancy, suggested that Onias III might be the leader of what was then called the "Zadokite Sect". This supposition was based mainly on the fact that Onias was the main object of Menelaus' violent opposition and was eventually murdered in a most dramatic manner, in 175 B.C. This suggestion still remains the most logical many years after the discovery of the Zadokite Document (1896) and subsequent discovery of related documents in the Dead Sea Scrolls (1947). It is indeed worthy of reexamination even after a multitude of theories have been put forth since the appearance of the Teacher of Righteousness in the Dead Sea Scrolls. It is not intended here to add another theory to the myriad of suggestions regarding the identity of the Teacher of Righteousness. That subject could easily provide material for a full-length dissertation in itself. To even list all the theories in a comprehensive manner would require more space and time than is permitted here. It can, however, be hoped to demonstrate here how the scanty information about the Teacher of Righteousness, which has survived in the Dead Sea Scrolls, fits into the larger historical context of the Jerusalem school of Onias III and Jason, with its uniquely Jewish teaching on immortality. Although it is not possible to do justice to the full scope of Professors H.H. Rowley and W. Black's on the Dead Sea Scrolls, they have been
among the first Scroll critics to associate the Teacher of Righteousness with the high priest Onias III. 

Their important reasons for this association have developed along lines which differ widely in their method of approach, as does this present investigation, but nonetheless they have concurred on this point. In spite of the endless and intricate debates which have surrounded the identification of the mysterious figures in the Dead Sea Scrolls, the high priest Onias III, brother of Jason who won official endorsement to form a Jerusalem school, remains on historical grounds alone, the only outstanding figure with a wide enough reputation for wisdom and righteousness and of sufficient prestige throughout the Jewish and hellenistic world, in pre-Christian times, to be compared with the Teacher of Righteousness.

Numerous "wicked priests" have been suggested in the period leading up to the Christian Era, but the reputation of Onias III as the opponent of the notoriously wicked priest, Menelaus, is the only one of sufficient bearing and historical stature to mark the turning point in the particular Jewish history described by the Zadokite Documents, II Maccabees and Josephus to have taken place in the first quarter of the 2nd century B.C. The death of Onias III, so the author of II Maccabees has indicated, was mourned by many nations outside of Judah. And there are few pre-Christian Jewish leaders about whom that can be said. When Onias was fatally deceived by Andronicus, at the instigation of Menelaus, and put to death in his exile at the temple at Daphne (near Damascus), the entire Jewish population is said to have grieved and many of the Greek nations as well. "The Jews appealed to Antiochus for the outrage and the Greeks shared their hatred of the crime." The reputation of this teacher of righteousness was so great for his wisdom and piety that the king (Antiochus), himself, is said to have been outraged and grieved at his death. "Therefore was Antiochus grieved at
heart and filled with pity, and wept because of the moderation and good conduct of the deceased (μετρακότος σωφροσύνης καὶ πολλὴν εὐταξίαν).

II Maccabees states that Antiochus was so outraged at the dead that he rent the purple robes from Andronicus, led him about in public disgrace and had him executed at the very spot where he murdered Onias. In the Scrolls these events appear in the context of the Teacher of Righteousness. So the Habakkuk Commentary (pHab.) states that the Wicked Priest "pursued the Teacher of Righteousness to the house of his exile" (pHab. xi). And God punished (the Wicked Priest) by delivering him "into the hand of his enemies" so that he should be humbled by a destroying scourge; in bitterness of soul; and they took vengence upon his body of flesh" (pHab. ix).

When Menelaus died, he is said to have been informed upon by his enemy, Lysias: "This man was to blame for all the trouble". He thus was ordered to Beroea and put to death "by the method which is the custom in that place". This consisted of suffocation in a tower fifty cubits high filled with ashes. There victims "guilty of sacrilege or notorious for other crimes" perished without even a burial in the earth. The author of II Maccabees considered it just, "because he had committed many sins against the altar whose fire and ashes were holy", that he should "meet his death in ashes" (13:8).

The association of Onias III with the Teacher of Righteousness is suggested by the following facts: a) Onias was mourned by the Greeks, which indicates the scope and extent of his reputation for righteousness despite the opposition he received from some of his own countrymen, as seen in II Maccabees and the Zadokite Documents (CD 1 and v). b) Unlike any other Jewish leader, Onias III was singled out by the notorious Menelaus, himself, as his particular enemy. c) Onias was, in fact, unseated by false charges and lies from the "spouter of lies" (CD viii) and "the liar" (CD B.1), viz Menelaus, who "sinned against the Teacher of Righteousness and his disciples"
(pHab.ix). d) Onias's public denunciation of Menelaus for his plundering of the Temple and rejection of the Law also seems to be reflected in the Qumran denunciation of the "Lovers of wealth" (CD viii), "who robbed the poor" (pHab.xii), and "the last priest of Jerusalem" who "amassed money and wealth" (pHab.ix). e) As II Maccabees complains of Onias and Jason, so the Teacher of Righteousness, himself, is said in the Scrolls to "wallow in transgressions" and (liturgically) "unclean ways", but was "wondrously pardoned" because he "dug deep the well" (of the law, CD v).

Our purpose here is not to suggest a theory of identification of the Teacher of Righteousness or to disprove all those which have already been put forth, but merely to place the "Teacher" of the Scrolls in the context of the Jerusalem school of Onias and Jason and to demonstrate that the documents will provide answers and stand up to scrutiny when questioned regarding the history and doctrines of this particular strand of Judaism. When the Hodayot (Psalms, or "Thanksgiving Hymns") are read in the context of Onias III, some of their more obscure parts are greatly illuminated. But they in turn shed the greatest amount of light on the immortality and resurrection beliefs among the pre-Christian hellenised Jews.

The author of the Hodayot (or at least a good portion of them) is now generally thought to be the Teacher of Righteousness. Without presenting detailed arguments for and against this conclusion, it has seemed appropriate to accept the agreement of Qumran experts and test its suppositions against what is known about Onias III. One finds that a degree of clarification can be achieved in several relatively obscure passages, when the Hodayot are interpreted in the context of Onias and the Jerusalem priestly Council. One example is the following:

"I have been brought near (to Thee with the community) together with all the men of my council, (each member) I approach according to his understanding and according
to his understanding and according to the greatness of his inheritance I love him. And I honour not a wicked man nor acknowledge corruption. I shall (not) exchange Thy truth for wealth (nor) any of Thy judgments for bribery." (IQH xiv.17-19) 169

This hymn, by no means, would be incongruous from one who was a high priest and head of the Jerusalem Polis Council (or Gerousia). He reflects a profound understanding of man and a deep respect for priestly inheritance, or descent, as did most of the Sons of Zadok. It could well have been written by one who openly challenged Menelaus' confiscation of Temple funds, as well as the corruption and bribery with which he bought his holy office, as did Onias III. Such an application, however, requires that we suspend, at least momentarily, placing this hymn in the historical context of a sectarian, monastic or reclusive environment.

To what extent can these writings be applied to the Jerusalem school of immortality, such as the Gymnasion created by Onias and Jason in the Temple precincts at Jerusalem before its desolation? It is not difficult to see the author of this document as the head of such a school. The Teacher reflects a deep sense of responsibility regarding his example to a select body toward whom he appears to have a teaching relationship. IQH 11.13 states: "But Thou hast made me a banner to the chosen of God —— (γενναίος)," 170 and "an interpreter of knowledge by wonderous secrets (mysteries)." 171 In spite of the seemingly Gnostic and hellenistic tone of this passage, it should not be inferred that this is evidence for a Persian or Iranian Gnosticism which brought a direct influence to bear on the school of Onias and Jason. Along with the numerous hellenistic nuances which may be detected in these texts, there is a strong and obvious revulsion from Syrian religions and "vain cults" of any sort. Moreover, had the Onias-Jason (or Jerusalem) school of immortality been characterised by Syrian cults, there would have been no need for their
forcible removal by the Antiocheans. The "Gnosis" and "mysteries" referred to, may indeed suggest a kind of Hellenism, but if it can or should be called "Hellenism" it is a uniquely Jewish variety closer to the hellenised Judaism of Onias the high priest than the non-Jewish Hellenism of Menelaus and his friends. The contents of these writings, however, disclose a dominant teaching role on the part of their author, which strongly suggests the existence of those taught, or a school. That such a school existed in the days of Onias III, is more than probable as we have seen above. The clear evidence of both the Maccabean sources and Josephus, is that Jason, the brother of Onias III, obtained an official endorsement or recognition for his school (perhaps with the proviso that it conform to Macedonian standards) immediately after Onias fled from Jerusalem. It is likely that the school had already in existence for some time within the precincts of the Temple, because immediately after Jason obtained his endorsement, Menelaus sought and received permission to construct a separate building for a separate school. A separate school was necessitated both by the new trend of Menelaus' non-Jewish Hellenism, and the Antiochean cult of immortality which he sought to establish, and the fact that another type of school was already in existence, and perhaps had been so for some time. Whether in the formal setting of his school, or in the midst of a Polis Council, the author of the Hymn was a teacher of a uniquely Jewish school of immortality, as the next verses disclose:

"And according to Thy word, in order to instruct them the men of Thy Council (יוו), in the midst of the sons of men, to recount Thy wonders unto everlasting generations."

Both a Polis and a poetic(or Homerlc)concept of immortality are contained in this Jewish praise of the eternal God. The universal and non-separatistic character of the Teacher's school is stated in the purpose of their study, "That all peoples shall acknowledge Thy truth, and all nations Thy glory."
Moreover, if a pre-Christian type of "Gnosis" is suggested by these passages, it would have been one which was radically distinguished from later Persian Gnostic cults which were characterised by their limitless "mediators". This same hymn rejects the notion of mediators altogether:

"To all the men of Thy Council (יוו), and in the lot together with the angels of the Presence(ויו). And there is no intercessor (ו י"ע)."

The eisegesis of Gnostic angelologies into this passage is prevented by two factors: a) The "men of Thy Council" are lumped together in one lot with the angels of the Presence, which is contrary to the general understanding of the remoteness and inaccessibility of God. b) It asserts that there is no intercessor and no need for one. This tends to repudiate the elaborate Gnostic systems of the 2nd and 3rd centuries (A.D.) which indulged in elaborate speculation on the numerous gradations and degrees of angels which bridged the gap between man and God. The true Gnostic's view of God was so abstract and remote that intercessors and mediators were man's only hope. More importantly, this heavenly Council is spoken of as one which already exists. Perhaps they were the Council of martyred Hasidim who were now already seen as immortals before the presence of God. But these immortals must be examined in greater detail. Rather than a future eschatological hope, the author refers to two present realities: a) the Council "in the midst of the sons of men"(IQH vi.11) and, b) the Council "in the lot together with the angels of the Presence(IQH vi.13), between which there is "no mediator". This should not be construed to imply a future possibility at the end of the ages contingent upon strict obedience to a Pharisaic ethic, but a real and present state of immortality which already exists for the Saints(Hasidim) and martyred Council of the Jerusalem Polis. "Between which there is no mediator", however, may either refer to an intercessor between a heavenly and an earthly Council, or between the
heavenly Council and God. It is not impossible that the Sons of Zadok thought of the holy city as one which was ruled directly by a heavenly Council. But it seems more likely that an intercessor between the heavenly Council and God is implied here. More attention will be given to this "Council of immortals" below.

One of the most mysterious passages in the Hodayot, or Thanksgiving Hymns, which is illuminated by the historical context of Onias and the Jerusalem school of immortality and one which sheds considerable light on the belief in immortality among these pre-Christian Jews, is found in the eighth plate (or psalm) in this collection:

10 "And the budding of the holy sprout unto a true plantation shall be hidden,
11 Neither to be accounted, nor the seal of its secret to be known.
But Thou, (O God), Thou didst surround its fruit with the secret of the mighty heroes(ד"כ ה"ה) in strength
12 And the holy spirits and the fiery flame that turns every way.
No (stranger shall approach) the fountain of life.
13 He shall not drink the waters of holiness with the everlasting trees or bear fruit with (the plantation of heaven,
who seeing has not discerned,
14 and considering has not believed
in the fountain of life,
who has touched the everlasting (sprout נ[מ"כ נ' ת'] ר'א'י')."

H. Bardtke has said, rendering this passage on immortality: "Und ohne dasz erkannt wird sein geheimnisvoller Siegel". The eternal secret to which the Teacher has had access will soon be "sealed"(מ' נ"כ נ'); a secret which is bound up with the holy sprout(or root)which God causes to grow into the eternal plant of truth. In verse 6, the well-known Jewish symbol for a school, namely the "tree", is described in such terms as to suggest a "school of immortality": "Trees of life on the mysterious fountain concealed amongst all the trees by the
water. And they shall be for the purpose of making the sprout to bud for a perpetual plantation." 178 Ezekiel has used the symbol of the tree in a similar manner but distinguishes it from other types of trees which are given over to "death, to the nether world among mortal men". 179 Verse 8, continues the analogy: "And their roots shall be exposed to the living waters and it shall become an everlasting source and on the sprouting of its foliage all the beasts of the forests shall feed." When we come to verse 11, we have indeed a uniquely Jewish school of immortality. The holy root or eternal plant of truth, by the mysterious fountain (יָדוֹן שָׁבָחוֹ), is a fruit which has been nurtured in "the secret of the mighty heroes 180 in strength and the holy spirits" (v11.11). This term for "mighty heroes" ( נכדו, חטי) in Joshua(6:2) is often translated as "mighty men of valour" as it is in Neh.11:14. But are these mere mortals? In Isaiah(9:6) similar terms are used, in a prophetic sense, of Christ as a "mighty God" and in Psalm:(24:8) "mighty in battle", but he is also called the "king of glory". So also the "heroes" denoted by these terms in Genesis(6:4) were half divine and half human (נְכָדַי הַקְּדוֹשִׁים יָדוֹן שָׁבָחוֹ) "These are the heroes, those who were famous of old".

What the Teacher intended should be nurtured at the "fountain of life", was clearly destined for immortality and nothing less: "And Thy princes shall be in the lot of the holy ones. (They)shall flourish as the blossom of the field unto) eternity, to enlarge a twig(sprout) unto foliage(branches) of everlasting planting. And it shall spread (its) shade upon all... Unto heaven)...(and all) its roots unto the deep"(v.14-16). The immortality connotations of this and the above passage are clarified by the later Christian tradition regarding "living water", in which Jesus states: "The water that I shall give him will become in him a spring of water welling up to eternal life". 181 Significantly, the above Qur'an reference to the mysterious fountain(or spring) directly associates this phenom-
enon with the Holy Spirit, or Spirits (ในใน ,IQH viii.12), as has the Johannine strand of Christian tradition: "He who believes in me, as the scripture has said, 'Out of his heart shall flow rivers of living water'. Now this he said about the Spirit, which those who believed in him were to receive". It is already noticeable, at this early stage, that this Jewish school of immortality does not seem to have spoken or thought in terms of an "immortality of the soul". We will observe below that its most consistent emphasis was upon the everlasting or eternal nature of the Spirit, but this will be discussed in full below.

That this was in fact a school, in addition to being a mere 'school of thought', is strongly corroborated by the Zadokite Document: "He built them a sure(lasting) house (ץזק י" כ יז) the like of which never arose from of old nor until this day. They who hold fast to Him are for the life of eternity. And all the glory of man is for them"(CD v.5-6). The essential Jewishness of this school of immortality is indicated by their faithfulness to the Law. That they were also a school of the Law is shown by the well-known use of the term "well": "They digged a well of many waters"(i.e. they "studied the Law") and he that despises them "shall not live"(CD v.3). From the bitter controversy in which Menelaus publicly denounced the Law of Moses for the first time, it need not be doubted that Onias and Jason were strong advocates of the Law. This is clear from the pains with which Onias sought a special edict to establish the "laws of their fathers"(i.e. the Law of Moses) as the constituting law of the Polis Jerusalem. It thus seems safe to assume that these particular laws (and the language, reading and interpretation, thereof) comprised the basic subject matter, or at least a major portion of the instruction in the school of Onias and Jason.

But more than a mere interpreter of the Law, the Scrolls describe the Teacher as a "unique" Teacher.
"Unique" reflects the Teachers understanding of himself as a means through which God reveals His mysteries to those he teaches:

"And through me Thou hast illuminated the faces of many and Thou hast become mighty infinitely, for Thou hast made known to me Thy wondrous mysteries." 184

But these "mysteries" did not consist of a revelation of God's perfection, or even that of man. Despite the asceticism and perfectionism which is generally attributed to the Essenes, the Teacher of Righteousness, here, repudiates any original state of perfection. He has described himself as a sinner "from the very womb", announcing that he is not "perfect righteousness nor is integrity of way to a Son of man". 185 Such a view could not be farther from a Gnostic, Platonic or Idealistic notion of a "heavenly" or perfect man. Nonetheless, the Teacher's unhellenistic designation as a "son of man", as well as his admitted imperfection is in no way inconsistent with the later Christian tradition in which the later Jesus (also called Son of Man) said: "Why do you call me good?" (Mk.10:18). There are other striking similarities between the words of the Teacher and the teachings of Christ, which are now already well-known. An example is the Teacher's doctrine of Atonement: "But God wondrously pardoned their sins, and for save their transgressions" (CD v.5) and "In order to pardon their sins, so shall God make atonement for them" (CD v1.6). Thus the Teacher has said of the first immortals of the Jerusalem Polis that they were "the first Saints whom God pardoned, who, both justified the righteous and condemned the wicked" (CD v1.4).

The exalted place which has been given to Onias III by the author of II Maccabees is, in itself, recognition of the high status and wide reputation he held as a righteous teacher. In 3:31, he has attributed to Onias, what was construed in his own day as miraculous powers of healing: "Quickly some of Heliodorus' friends asked Onias to call upon the Most High and
to grant life to one who was lying at his last breath". When this enemy of Onias, who "was deprived of any hope of recovery" was healed by the prayers of Onias, "he bore testimony to all men of the deeds of the supreme God" (3:36). Although this was a tradition which was based on an historical event of some sort in Jerusalem, it is obviously one which grew in legendary or mythological proportions. It is nonetheless, taken with utmost seriousness here as a tradition which gained wide circulation throughout the Hellenised world regarding the righteous teacher and high priest Onias III. In the Thanksgiving Hymns, the Teacher seems to recall such a deed as this, but expresses scepticism about the lasting effectiveness of his miracle: "And they esteemed me not when Thou hast wrought mightily through me. For they banish me from my land as a bird (that is banished) from its nest." (1v.8-9).

One of the arguments against attributing any messianic function or role to the Teacher of Righteousness, is that there appears to be no evidence in the Scrolls that he died either a violent or sacrificial death. However, one would hardly expect the Teacher to describe his own death if he was, as so many experts now hold, the author of many of the Qumran writings including many of the Thanksgiving Hymns. On the other hand, there is little question about the manner in which Onias III met his death. II Maccabees(4:1-6) relates that Simon, the overseer of the Temple, leveled treasonous charges against Onias. Onias then went to Antioch to plead his case to the king. He was subsequently granted his freedom, but not permitted to return to Jerusalem, "banished" in every sense of the term. The high priesthood was then given to his brother Jason, who was also accused of treason by Menelaus, who was a brother to the same Temple overseer, Simon.

IQH v.23-26, fits this setting so precisely, that II Maccabees may well have given a clue to the place of composition of this Hymn as the place of Onias's final banishment.
in the region of Damascus. The last we hear of Onias III, is his death by treachery at a "place of sanctuary" near Damascus. Like the deception of Christ by Judas, "Andronicus came to Onias, and resorting to treachery offered him sworn pledges and gave him his right hand, and in spite of his suspicion persuaded Onias to come out from the place of sanctuary; then, with no regard for justice, he immediately put him out of the way"(II Mac.4:34). Regardless of where various theories may place the actual composition of the Zadokite and Dead Sea Scrolls, and the region of Antioch and Damascus are indeed a strong likelihood, not all of them were written by the Teacher of Righteousness. Of those which were not, their composition must extend well over a period of a hundred years. A good number of them must have been composed at some distance (both in time and space) from the place where they were hidden in the caves near the Dead Sea. Nonetheless, we may be certain that several of them, including the Zadokite Document and various Hodayot, have described events similar to those presented by II Maccabees and Josephus as the historical context of OniasIII, Jason and the wicked priest Menelaus. But more importantly, they have shown themselves to be an important source of information regarding beliefs about immortality and the afterlife among the pre-Christian Sons of Zadok.
Saints, Immortals, and the Zadokite "Heavenly Council":

Among those who are said to be the first to take a stand against the cult of Antioch were the Hasidim, i.e. the "Pious" or the "Saints", who provided outstanding examples of courage and heroism for the persecutions which they suffered. Some have held that it was from the Hasidim that the later Essenes have sprung. Others have argued that certain aspects of the Pharisaic Party may be traced back to the Hasidim. Still others have recognised them as the Sons of Zadok who remained in Jerusalem, when the Seleucids first occupied the holy city, and thus have considered them the forerunners of the Sadducees. There is probably an element of truth, to a greater or lesser degree, in all these suggestions, but we will see that it was with the Sadducees that they had the most in common. It is consequently not in the least surprising that in the earliest sources they are not designated by any of the later party names: "Pharisees", "Essenes" or "Sadducees". They are simply called the "Saints". The Talmud refers to them as the "First Hasidim" and clearly distinguishes them from the later Pharisees. It would indeed be anachronistic to call them anything else.

One indication that the term "Saints" was used as a specific designation for those who suffered persecutions not unlike those when Onias III was killed, during the Abomination of Desolation, is its frequent use in the Psalms.

"O God, the heathen have come into thy inheritance; they have defiled thy holy temple; they have laid Jerusalem in ruins.

They have given the bodies of thy servants to the birds of the air for food, the flesh of thy saints to the beasts of the earth. They have poured out their blood like water round about Jerusalem, and there was none to bury them." (Psalm 79:1-3)
The same Psalms which speak of the saints as the noble class, thus linking them with the aristocratic priestly Sons of Zadok, also speak of them as immune to death or immortal:

"As for the saints ( particulière saints) in the land, they are the noble, in whom is all my delight. Those who choose another god multiply their sorrows; their libations of blood I will not pour out or take their names upon my lips."

"For Thou dost not give me up to Sheol, or let Thy godly one see the Pit (corruption). Thou dost show me the path of life". (Psalm 16:3-4,10)

A variation of verse 3 in Psalm 30, has affirmed the belief in immortality among the saints: "(Thou hast) restored me to life that I should not go down to the Pit. Sing praise to the Lord, O you His saints". Another says of the "saints of the Lord" that they will be "preserved forever" (37:28). They are thus immune to death, but it is an immunity or immortality which God, rather than the Polis, gives to His saints: "He preserves the lives of His saints" (97:10). We have already observed how God, himself, is described as the fortified city or fortress, as in 18:2, 31:2,3,46:4,5, 48:3,14, etc. It is of particular significance that the execution of God's judgment and vengeance is given to the ( ἐκκλησία ὁadvert), the assembly or congregation of the saints in Psalm 149:1, "Sing unto the Lord a new song, His praise in the assembly(congregation) of the faithful (saints ΠΝ as in v.5 and 9)". It is clear from the previous verses that this is more than an earthly council because the praise is "above the earth" and in "heaven" on the part of the saints and people of Israel who are near His presence (148:13-14). So also the function of the saints is a heavenly and eschatological one:

"Let the high praises of God be in their throats and two-edge swords in their hands, to wreak vengeance on the nations and chastisement on the peoples, to bind their kings with chains and their nobles with fetters of iron, to execute on them the judgment written! This is glory for all His faithful(saints ΠΝ )."

(Psalms 149:7-9)
Almost universal agreement has been reached among critics that the writing of the canonical book of Daniel must have taken place at a time much later than previously thought, perhaps between 168 and 165 BC.\textsuperscript{189} This is mainly because of its place in the Canon of Scripture, its late doctrinal point of view, its unusual mixture of languages which includes passages in both Aramaic and Hebrew, a number of historical errors which make it impossible to believe that it could have been written in the 6th century B.C., and finally its fairly detailed description of the Abomination of Desolation which presupposes knowledge of the persecutions of the Jews under Antiochus Epiphanes (175-163 B.C.). So also, since the discovery of a large body of poetical writings or Hymns (Hodayot) among the Dead Sea Scrolls which bear a striking resemblance to the canonical Psalms, even more serious consideration be given to whether or not several of the canonical Psalms attributed to David and others, were not, like Daniel, written in the time of the Seleucids. These should be compared with those purported to come from the hand of the Teacher of Righteousness and reflect the historical context of Onias III and the Seleucid persecution of the Jews. But we are here interested in those which reflect in their poetry the unique Jewish immortality cult, relevant to the saints, martyrs and heavenly council, found also in the Qumran Hodayot.

It is unlikely that these Hasidim, or saints, existed before Antiochus IV., it is also unlikely that they existed long after the Maccabees gave rise to the Hasmonaean Era of Jewish history. The evidence tends to place them in Seleucid Period, contemporaneous with Daniel and clearly suggests that the type of inspiration which the Hasidim gave the Maccabees, at the start of the Maccabean Revolt, was not that of a political movement or religious party, but the inspiration of martyrs, saints and heroes of the uniquely Jewish Jerusalem Polis. The lasting example which the Hasidim provided was the
courage of valorous and immortal saints of God to whom the whole of Israel rallied. It is thus both illogical and anachronistic to attempt to draw a direct line of connection between the Hasidim and the later Pharisaic Party. Illogical because they are two entirely differing phenomenon. Anachronistic because the rise of the separatistic Pharisaic Party cannot be documented any earlier than the rule of John Hyrcanus (135-104 B.C.).

W.O.E. Oesterley, along with R.H. Charles, has suggested that the notion of "Hasidim" may be traced back as early as Micah(7:2), Proverbs(2:18) and II Chronicles(6:41). Here we find its beginnings in such terms as "righteous branch", "upright men" and "priests= saints"(ןְחוּן), i.e. "Thy priests are clothed in salvation" and "Thy saints rejoice in goodness"(6:41). It is not impossible that the "righteous" in many of the Psalms may have reference to the Hasidim, but Oesterley's argument does not permit one to carry this any further than a conjecture. It should be remembered that he and R.H. Charles have established no more than an etymological explanation of the origin of the term, "Hasidim". They have not provided an explanation of the Hasidim themselves. But it is perhaps significant that the earliest occurrence of the term should appear in the historical context of David and the Zadokite priests. That many of the Psalms describe Hasidim from among the Zadokites of the Seleucid Era is also becoming evident from the increasing number of experts who would date the composition of various Psalms in the second century B.C.

As for the Hasidim themselves, we have already seen some evidence that they consisted of more than outstanding individuals. I Maccabees(7:12-17) has recorded what may be one of the most important turning points in the history of the pre-Christian Jews. The leaders of the exiled Zadokite priests forced out of Jerusalem, who formed a temporary alliance with the Maccabees, were the first to come forward as the
representatives of the Jewish people to negotiate and seek peace, immediately after the first battle of the Maccabean Revolt. For this gesture sixty members of this most distinguished council were ignominiously slain on the spot. The reason given for this tragedy is that the displaced Zadokites (without the help of the Maccabees) sent offers of peace to Demetrius (also named in pNah.11.11). Demetrius thereupon responded with a false promise of peace which he sent to Judas. The courageous but unfortunate Zadokites (Hasidim) thus took the initiative and sent their priestly council to meet his envoy, "because Judas did not trust Demetrius". Instead of peace negotiations, Bacchides arrived at the meeting place and slaughtered three score of them at once. Within the same historical setting, Hagiga (18.b) states that the number in this martyred Council was 70.

We have already called attention to the distinction which the Qumran Hodayot make between the Council "in the midst of the sons of men" (IQH vi.11) and the Council "in the lot together with the angels of the Presence" (IQH vi.13). It is not clear from the Qumran text whether these two Councils were thought to exist simultaneously without a mediator, or whether the reference is to the absence of a mediator between the heavenly Council and God:

"To all the men of Thy Council (_יִה יִה ), and in the lot together with the angels of the Presence (נַעֲשָׂנָה), and there is no intercessor." (IQH vi.13)

The immortal and heavenly nature of this Council is illuminated by IQH 111.21-22:

"For him Thou didst fashion from the dust for the everlasting Council (נַעֲשָׂנָה יִה יִה’). And a perverted spirit Thou didst cleanse from much transgression to stand in array with the host of the Holy Ones and enter into fellowship with the congregation of the sons of heaven. And Thou hast apportioned an eternal lot to man..." (IQH 111.21-2)
A contrast between this heavenly Council and human Councils is suggested by this same Hymn:

"And the host of heaven shall utter its voice (and) the foundations(councils) of the world(shall)melt and quake and the battle of the mighty ones of heaven(saints) shall be waged abroad in the universe." (IQH 111.35)

This same term is used both in the sense of "foundation" and "Council" in reference to the immortal Polis of God:

"And (I approached) the gates of death and I was as one who comes unto a fortified city and strengthened by a high wall unto deliverence. And I (rejoice in) Thy truth, O my God, For Thou settest a foundation(Council) upon the rock And a plummet on the line of judgment." (IQH vi. 24-26)

Thus the individual martyr is not unrelated to the Heavenly Council and immortal "Spirits" who stand before the presence of God, as is seen in Hymn xi:

"Thou hast cleansed man from transgression so that he may consecrate himself for Thee. (Thou hast cleansed him) from all impure abominations and guilt of evil-doing, to be united (with) Thy true sons in the destiny of the holy ones (saints). To lift the worm of man from dust unto (eternal) Council(ωμ) And from a perverted spirit unto the understanding of (God). And to stand in array before Thee, with the eternal host and the (true) spirits(and)to be renewed with all creatures And with those who know to rejoice in the community(city)." (IQH x1.10-14)

The Qumran Thanksgiving Hymns, or Hodayot, appear to have much in common with what the canonical Psalms have to say about the "saints" or Hasidim, but particularly the famous Heavenly Council. This again suggests that the contemporaneity of these documents is not unreasonable. Although it is clear that they believed in a Heavenly Council, perhaps presided over by the martyred Hasidim, this does not deny that they had an earthly Council as well. The author of the hymn appears to be, himself, the high priest or leader of the Jerusalem Council.
who became the object of the jealousy of Menelaus(II Mac.7:23) or his brother Simon(II Mac.3:4-15) who betrayed both Onias III and Jason to Antiochus. IQH v.23-27, appears to clearly reflect this historical setting:

"And contention to my neighbours, envy and wrath to those who have come into my covenant, and murmuring and complaint unto all my confederates. Also they that eat my bread have lifted up their heel against me, and they have sneered at me with lips of wickedness, all who are adhered to my(γυνὴ) Council and the men of my counsel(μνημοσύνη) are in rebellion and complaining round about; and concerning the secret which Thou hast concealed in me, they go as talebearers to the Sons of Destruction." 195

The technical terms of this passage have been taken by some to have only narrow and sectarian meanings such as "Those who have come into my covenant(יהוה )." This is likely only if one presupposes a narrow and isolationist view of the Sons of Zadok. On the other hand, "all who are adhered to my(γυνὴ) Council; and the men of my counsel" seem to place it in the larger context of the Jerusalem (γερουσία), as presided over by the high priest and the author of this hymn.

The almost universal veil which seems to enshroud the origins, function, evolution and structure of the "Great Council" (συνεδριον) is not surprising when one considers that until recently scholars had recourse to nothing but late Jewish sources in their attempts to trace the origins of this typically hellenistic institution which became an important part of the Jerusalem immortality cult.196 Late Jewish sources are not helpful, because Rabbinical literature tends merely to romanticise the origins of the Sanhedrin by comparing it with the "Seventy Elders of Israel"(71 with Moses) whom Moses gathered in the "tent of meeting"(Num.11:16). This comparison became useful to later Talmudists as an apologetical proof for the divine origin of the Sanhedrin. It is, of course, historically impossible to establish any continuous line of connection from Moses' "gathering of the elders" to the(συνεδριον)
of the Gospels, and the Sanhedrin of the Pharisees, known to the post-Christian redactors of the Talmud. Historical comparisons may be made with less strain between the "Great Councils" of 500 and 600, which can now be identified by means of inscriptions, belonging to such prominent Palestinian Poleis as Gaza and Tiberias in Ptolemaic times. The number, "70" Council members, may well have been sacred to the (γερουσία) of Jerusalem and the Council (βουλή) of Alexandria as the Mishna suggests. But this number does not establish any direct line of historical connection between the "71", whom Moses convened to deal with the problem of food supplies in the wilderness, and the Polis Council of Jerusalem.

In contrast to this fiction of the Rabbis, it should be remembered that Jerusalem was granted specific permission by edict from Antiochus III, to re-establish its name, its status as a Polis (and thus create a Council with all the offices that required) as well as a Gymnasium and at the same time to retain its Temple worship and the "laws of its ancestors" (or written Torah). This arrangement was consistent with the policy of Antiochus III toward other Poleis and did not seem in the least disagreeable to the literate priestly aristocracy of Zadokites in Jerusalem who became the ruling class when he rebuilt the city, wall and Temple. These general privileges regarding a Council, the Temple and ancestral laws remained the status quo for nearly 31 years, under the Antiochene administration until they were suddenly revoked by Antiochus Epiphanes, in 168 B.C. This latter Seleucid decided to employ force and persecution rather than privileges as a method of maintaining his hold on Jerusalem. When Seleucid policy toward Jerusalem changed it was eventually this Polis Council of Zadokite priests who suffered first and became the famous "Martyred Council of 70" mentioned in the Mishna (Hagiga 18.5), who died at the hand of Demetrius, mentioned in the Qumran Pesher Nahum (pNah.11.11), and are the subject of the narrative in I Maccabees (7:12-17).
Because of the faithfulness and courage they demonstrated in the face of persecution, these martyred Sons of Zadok soon ranked among the immortals, or "Hasidim" (Saints). Because of their martyrdom they have been described as a heavenly as well as an earthly Council in the Scrolls. 201

Were there not individual saints and martyrs among the Sons of Zadok, in addition to the immortal Heavenly Council? The answer to this question seems to be yes. It might be well to give one or two examples of these, mainly because they illustrate that early sources do not agree with the modern notion of immortality as a Greek, and resurrection as a separate and distinctly Jewish phenomenon. One early tradition from the time of Onias and his school discloses that the Jews, in some respects, were capable of going beyond the teachings of the Stoics. This tradition appears to resemble the Stoic view of suffering but reflects a uniquely Jewish outlook in its combination of resurrection and immortality. One of seven martyred brothers says to his executioner:

"You accursed wretch, you dismiss us from this present life, but the King of the Universe (κόσμου βασιλεύς) will raise us up (ἠλπίζω, ἀναστήσετε) who have died for His laws to an everlasting renewal of life (εἰς αἰώνιαν ἀναβίωσιν ζωῆς)." 202

Another, courageously stretches forth his hands to be cut off and unlike a Stoic, but also unlike one who cringes before death, states:

"I got these from heaven, and because of His (God's) Laws I disdain them, and from Him I hope to get them back again." 203

Another, reflecting the fundamental Sadducaic doctrine of Free Will or "Choice", as distinct from the Pharisaic notion of Fate, combines the doctrine of "Translation", or change, with the notion of resurrection to this life:
"One cannot but choose (αἰρέτων μεταλλάσσονας) to be changed at the hands of men and to cherish the hope that God gives of being raised again by him (πάλιν ἀναστήσεθαι ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ). But for you there will be no resurrection to life (σοι μὲν γὰρ ἀνάστασις εἰς σωήν οὐκ ἔσται)."

This notion of "change", which has a great deal in common with the view which the Apostle Paul reflects in his letter to the Corinthians, will be examined in greater detail in relation to the Sadducaic doctrine of "Translation", below. It should be mentioned in passing that the tradition of the seven martyred brothers appears to have been well known in early Christian times, as is reflected in the Synoptic Gospels. It is significant that it was also discussed among early Christians in relation to the unique teaching of resurrection and immortality as a combined and present rather than future eschatological phenomenon.

Brief mention might also be made of Razis, another Hasid and hellenised Jew who was accused by the Seleucids of "Judaism" (κρίσιν εἰσενηγμένος ἱουδαϊσμοῦ). This is a charge which no unhellenised or separating Jew, such as a Pharisee, could possibly be accused, because there would be no doubt or question as to whether or not he was a Jew. There is good reason to believe that he was an aristocratic son of Zadok, as is indicated by his "noble birth". Because he was one of the Zadokite elders, presumably a survivor of the Gerousia who was widely respected among the hellenised Jews, Nicanor had to send five hundred men to arrest him. When wounded by his own sword, Razis announced his absolute belief in the immediate restoration of his life before the crowds gathered, by calling upon the "Lord of life and Spirit" to give back to him the portions of his body which he himself tore out of his own flesh before he died (II Mac. 14:46). Indeed, this is a most literal and immediate belief in the afterlife, without any future "Day of the Lord" connotations; moreover a particular (rather than universal) restoration of the body totally unparalleled in any classical doctrine.
of immortality; Syrian, Greek or Egyptian. Perhaps it was this Hasid, or the others before him, whom our Lord had in mind when he said, "And if thy hand offend thee cut it off; it is better for thee to enter into life maimed, than having two hands to go into hell...where the worm dieth not. And if thy foot offend thee, cut it off...if thine eye offend thee pluck it out, etc."(Mk.9:43-48). Apart from the conspicuous absence of any specific reference to a general resurrection at the "end of time" or the "end of the ages", this narrative, which is probably an original tradition from the Jason (the epitomiser, Jason of Cyrene) source, is placed in close proximity to the "Heavenly Appearance of Onias III" tradition (II Mac.15:15ff). As with the "Seven Brothers" tradition, it is not implausible that the Razis and Onias traditions have experienced certain editorial accretions or alterations at the hand of the epitomiser, although it is next to impossible to know precisely where. One thing which the epitomiser could not easily change is the subject matter of these immortality cycles. He has thus placed the Razis tradition alongside the immortality tradition which views Onias III as already resurrected (not at the end of the ages) and already in heaven with the Prophet Jeremiah. Here the famous Teacher and high priest who has already become an immortal along with Jeremiah, the defending Spirit of Israel, manifested himself to Judas in a vision-like appearance to deliver to him a holy sword.210 This narrative might almost be considered apocalyptic in nature if it were not for its uniquely present rather than future character. This tradition which cannot be dated any later than 160 B.C., discloses a "Translated" Onias who is already in heaven and already in a state of immortality before any notion of a "final" or "general" resurrection has been articulated anywhere in Jewish literature. It may thus be concluded that if the Hasidim believed in the resurrection of the body, and it appears that they did, they believed in a doctrine of resurrection and immortality.
To these Hellenised Jews of about 168 B.C., it is by no means possible to attribute the modern distinction between the so-called Greek doctrine of immortality and the "Jewish-Christian" doctrine of the resurrection. Prof. O. Cullmann has argued this on the grounds that the Greek philosophers welcomed death as a "friend" and the Jews abhorred death as an "enemy"; unnatural and the curse of God. These Hasidim and Sons of Zadok welcomed death courageously and were soon numbered among Jerusalem's own immortal heroes. They combined with their doctrine of Translation and faith in immortality, a profound (and non-Pharisaic) belief in a resurrection of life and Spirit (II Mac. 7:9, 14, 23). The enemy was there, but the enemy was not death because death was the means by which God would "change" them. So these Jerusalemites expressed their belief in resurrection and change, or Translation, to a state of immortality. Again we have found the distinction between Greek and Jewish beliefs, here, to be greatly oversimplified, if not actually misleading.

The Council of Saints and the Zadokite View of Immortality:

Discussion about immortality and resurrection in the Zadokite and Qumran documents has not been characterised by complete agreement. Among those who deal at any length with the subject, both van der Ploeg and M. Delcor have arrived at some surprisingly positive findings. However, R.B. Laurin has failed to find what he believes to be any teaching relevant to personal immortality or resurrection in the beliefs of Qumran. He builds his case on the supposition that the Teacher is merely "thanking God for delivering him from temporal difficulties", i.e. protecting him from enemies, making his way secure and granting special favours. He has concluded that because there are no references here to a future universal judgment and resurrection or future state as such, that therefore, the Scrolls contain no doctrine of immortality. But is such a conclusion warranted on the basis of what the texts do say, particularly
IQH iii. 20-23:

"And know that there is hope for him whom Thou didest fashion from the dust unto an eternal Council(foundation). And a perverted spirit Thou didest cleanse from much transgression to stand in array with the host of Thy holy ones and to enter into fellowship with the congregation of the Sons of Heaven. And Thou hast appointed an eternal lot to man amongst the spirits of knowledge." 215

This passage, which is free of lacuna and reconstruction, gives a clear indication of both a present and future hope of immortality, in that man progresses by the hand of God, "dust"(death) to the "eternal Council"(ηψώμενε τίτλοι). In his critical edition of the Qumran Hodayot, M. Mansoor has preferred "foundation" of the four basic meanings(Council, foundation, counsel and secret). S. Mowinckel, on the other hand, indicates that any one of these designations can be applied to (τίτλοι)in this particular text. 216

An important occurrence of this expression appears in Proverbs (Prov 10:25) where "eternal foundation(or Council) is associated with the "Sadduq"(a root from which "Sadducee" is frequently said to derive). But in either case, the term clearly implies an immortal state by the presence of the term(τίτλοι). In stating that the process of man is "from the dust unto an eternal Council", this unique teaching bears a striking contrast to contemporary Stoic philosophy which held that "dust returns to dust, fire to fire, etc.", in other words, that man returns to the elements from whence he was made(Epictetus, Disc. III. xiii). It is again possible to see from this the distinctively Jewish character of the Zadokite doctrine of resurrection and immortality; also to see what is specifically implied by the term "dust"(ΨΩΜ). It is by no means synonymous with the later teaching of a universal resurrection, "at the end of the ages", but specifically from the dust to a state of immunity to death, which is no less a resurrection of the body on that account.

"Eternal Council" as a technical term, occurs in numerous passages. IQH iii.20, iii.10, xi.11-14 and IQS x.25 for example, imply an eternal state, or immortality, in each
instance in a most definitive manner. Although the texts, on occasion, make good sense with the translation "foundation stone", there are occurrences where the designation "Council" must be employed, particularly in reference to the Heavenly Council and the martyred Hasidim. As with "Holy Ones", a term with which this word is frequently interchanged, it has both eternal and temporal connotations. Eternal, in terms of the Council of martyrs or Holy Ones who already stand in the presence of God, and temporal in terms of the "shadow government" which was driven out of Jerusalem and forced to re-establish itself in temporary exile. It is also eternal in a corporate sense like the immortality of the Polis, "which needs no Homer", as over against the temporality of the individual.

The contrast of the individual with the corporate is particularly evident in IQH iii.20: "There is no hope for him (the individual) whom Thou didst fashion from the dust unto an eternal council (the corporate)." Whatever is taken to be the meaning of (ינון) must be the opposite of the man of dust (or death), namely, an eternal man, or men. The concept of an individual eternal man was, in all likelihood, outside Zadokite thinking because the title "Son or Man" does not occur with any frequency among their writings. Even the portion of I Enoch, which contains several "Son of Man" teachings, does not appear to have yet been identified among the many fragments of Enoch found with the Scrolls. However, in contrast to the individual man of dust, the "eternal body" or "eternal Council", does appear with considerable frequency in the manuscripts. The antithetical parallelism of the Hodayot places in opposition the (individual) one or "perverted spirit" and the (corporate) "host of the Holy ones". From the "one", or state of being only an individual, the author is transferred or Translated to: "fellowship with the congregation of the Sons of Heaven". To these are given an "eternal lot", or immortality, IQH ii.20-22. It thus follows that what was considered mortal and temporal, in the Scrolls, has been sharply contrasted with that which is immortal.
"Foundation stone" would not be an appropriate translation of (יִדְיּוֹן) in IQH 11.22, because of the synonymous parallelism: "And they, a Council (יִדְיּוֹן) of worthlessness, and a congregation of Belial". It would not be a misuse of the term to interpret IQH 11.20, in terms of an "eternal congregation". In view of the connotation which "Garousia", "Sanhedrin" and "Ecclesia" had to the Hasidim and exiled Zadokites, "Council", in an eternal and corporate sense, is the more appropriate and accurate translation.

In the light of the history of the martyred Hasidim and their Heavenly Council, there is no manifest need to hold that "eternal Council" has anything to do with a future Parousia. Thus, "to stand in array with the host of Thy holy ones...the Sons of Heaven", is not necessarily a projection of hope regarding a future Parousia, but the already extant hosts (ten thousand times ten thousand) "Holy Ones", of which Enoch also spoke (IEn.14:22ff; cp.60:1) when he was translated to heaven in his own particular and present (rather than universal) parousia. By rejecting any teaching on life after death in this document, Laurin has had to maintain that the expression: "stand in array with the host of Holy Ones", implies only a "desired" fellowship with God, "in this life" and that when the Covenanters died that was the end of it. Prof. Mansoor has interpreted (נִבְטַחַר נְבוֹע) as "angels", rather than "Saints" as it occurs in the Psalms. Lambert, holding that the Qumran eschatology was "no more advanced" than that of the Sadducees (without defining what the Sadducaic eschatology was) is required to interpret the "Holy Ones" in the narrow sense of members of the Dead Sea "sect". "Sons of Heaven", however, has parallels in Enoch 6:2, which calls the sons of God mentioned in Gen. 6:2, "Sons of Heaven". A similar "heavenly" designation is given to them in IQH v1.13 and Enoch 13:8. Here, "Sons of Heaven" is synonymous with "eternal watchers of heaven", which implies a timeless and eternal character, perhaps the immortal beings whose guiding example is symbolised elsewhere by the term "star", as the Zadokite
lawgiver is called, symbolically, the "star". Limbert may be correct in supposing that "Sons of Heaven" refers to the members of the community or holy city, but this does not preclude or deny that they considered themselves to already be living in a state of immortality, as did one element of the Sadducees and an important group of early Christians, as we shall see.

From dust (death) to the eternal and "eternal lot", as in II Maccabees (chapter seven), suggests a distinct combination of both resurrection and immortality beliefs among these pre-Christian Jews. There are, nonetheless, those who still view these sayings in the context of a reclusive community, and hold that "angels" is merely an oblique reference to the limited members of a secret community and nothing more. With this latter interpretation of the text we cannot agree, and certainly not in the light of the history to which these documents themselves bear witness.

Those who have denied any doctrine of immortality in Qumran beliefs, have found it necessary to weave complicated and tenuous theories around the interpretation of IQH iii.21-22 (as well as IQH iii.19, iv.18-21, IQS iv.7-8). They have dismissed the references to those who stand before the presence of God with the hosts of Holy Ones and the congregation of the "Sons of Heaven" as the author's theologomorphic tendency to describe a purely earthly kingdom in heavenly terms and exaggeratedly attribute to the Covenanters an "equality with angels". The Annex to the Manual of Discipline (1QS b iv.24-28) may suggest disguised theologomorphic terms for ordinary earthly members of the community as Laurin asserts, but that is not a necessary conclusion if these terms are employed in the sense of "Holy Ones" or "Saints" as in Zechariah (14:5) which comes from an earlier philological stratum. It seems quite right to take seriously the caution Laurin has given regarding any search for a doctrine of "future" immortality or "future" resurrection in these Scrolls, particu-
larly because of the "timelessness" and "boldness" of the author's vocabulary. Nonetheless, it is as serious an oversight to infer from the absence of futuristic eschatological language, that the Covenanters had no belief in life after death, or immediate or present immortality, as it is to say that the Sadducees had no doctrine of the afterlife.

Critics who deny any doctrine of immortality or resurrection in the Scrolls, fall significantly into the same category as those who deny that the Covenanters were Essenes. This suggestion may be embarrassing to them because both Josephus and the early Christian Fathers have defined the Essenes as having definite beliefs regarding the afterlife; albeit, Josephus relates these beliefs in somewhat Platonic-Stoic categories: "The soul, once detached from the ties of the flesh ... takes its joyful flight toward the heights," etc. Presumably Josephus has described a group, known by him to be antagonistic to the Pharisees, who held an alternative view to the well-known Pharisaic belief in a resurrection and judgment at the end of time. But references to either of these parties cannot be dated earlier than John Hyrcanus (135-104 B.C.). If Josephus was, in fact, thinking of a group similar to the Qumran Covenanters and the author of the Thanksgiving Hymns, as is now often claimed, then he has attributed to them an almost Platonic concept of the afterlife. We are further cautioned both by the fact that Josephus, himself, has stated that he had a particular interest in Platonic philosophy, and by the lack of evidence that Josephus had access to any of the Qumran writings when he composed his histories.

However, neither Maccabean nor Qumran sources give such an oversimplified impression of Zadokite and Hasidic view of immortality. Both sources disclose positive Zadokite and Hasidic beliefs in resurrection and immortality, in a unique manner, but not in the Pharisaic sense of resurrection and judgment at the end of time. Nonetheless, many yet labour
under the difficulty disclosed by van der Ploeg's syllogism:
a) the Covenanters were Essenes, b) some ancient authors state
that the Essenes believed in immortality of the soul, c) there­
fore, the Qumran "sect" believed in immortality of the soul
without regard for the body. 224 This is generally followed
by the simple conclusion that they had not yet had the advantage
of exposure to the "Christian" doctrine of resurrection. This
approach to the problem ignores the fact that some pre-Christian
Jewish elements, such as the Pharisees, had specific resurrection
eschatologies of their own. It thus results in an oversimplifi­
cation as unsatisfying as the "foreign influence" theories
of the Religionsgeschichte School which held that immortality
was a purely Greek phenomenon, basically, which eventually dis­
placed Jewish teachings on the afterlife.

To what extent did the Zadokites of the Scrolls
have a belief in the resurrection similar to that of the Hasidim? Again, there is little general agreement about the existence of resurrection teachings in the Dead Sea Scrolls. If sheer con­
sensus of opinion determined the truth of the matter, one might
find the scales slightly tipped in favour of those who ac­
knowledge the presence of these teachings in the Scrolls. On the
basis of IQH vi.29-33: "all his true children shall be aroused..."
and IQH vi.34: "those who lie in the dust have lighted up their
standard pole and the worm of men have raised the ensign",
Nötscher has accepted the "sect's" belief in resurrection to be
proven satisfactorily. 225 On the basis of these passages, with
the addition of IQH xi.12:"To lift the worm of men from dust
unto eternal foundation" and IQH viii.31:"and to destroy my flesh
until the appointed times", C. Rabin has concluded that there is
no question about a clear-cut doctrine of resurrection in the
Scrolls. 226 This last piece of evidence which Prof. Rabin adds
appears to be more explicit than the rest regarding the condi­
ton of the flesh, if (xi.12) is agreed to be the conclusion of
the narrative which begins at (viii.31) on this theme.
Along with these, there are several others who have presented evidence of various kinds for a doctrine of resurrection of some kind in the Scrolls. One has even held that the prophecy that the Wicked Priest would arise to a type of judgment is evidence for a belief in a resurrection. Others categorically deny any such claim to general resurrection teachings. A few have stated that the graves of the Covenanters were the end, beyond which they had no hope. In G. Vermes's valuable study of the subject, resurrection is not clearly rejected, but he holds that because they expected the final judgment before the end of their generation (and this point should not be ignored) the Covenanters were not concerned about resurrection. Without saying why resurrection should not be just as important, whenever the end came, he has concluded that they held a doctrine of the whole person "which shall be taken up into heaven" in a purified body. This, nevertheless, is a well-known doctrine of resurrection.

Because there is no pronounced emphasis on resurrection or immortality as separate entities in themselves, or even in general universal terms, apart from the immortality of the Saints and the Heavenly Council, it should not be concluded that these teachings are not implicit in their beliefs regarding those who will arise to enter the eternal city of God:

"And those who lie in the dust have lifted up their standard pole and the worm of men have raised the ensign...And the tyrants shall be cut off in the wars of strangers. And the one who brings on a scourging scourge shall not enter the fortress."

IQH vi.34

"And those who lie in the dust strongly suggests a quotation from Isaiah 26:19: "Thy dead shall live their bodies shall rise. O dwellers in the dust awake and sing for joy". In the Isaiah passage there is no doubt about the resurrection from the dead implied. It is also similar to the language of Job(21:16): "They lie down alike in the dust, and worms cover them". This implies a real death from
which "the worm of men have raised their ensign". In either case, these do not occur in the Qumran sources as literal quotations, but they do bear a strong enough resemblance to suggest quotations from memory. There is enough philological similarity to conclude that the above passage from the Hodayot is speaking of a true state of death. The expression "worm of men" is used of Israel in Isaiah(41:14): "Fear not, you worm, Jacob, you men of Israel, I will help you says the Lord". The expression is also used in IQH x1.12, Ps.22:7, and Job 25:6. "A scouring scourge"which shall not "enter the fortress", does not sound like a private community of monastics, but the Seleucid affliction throughout the whole of Judea. The word "fortress" would not apply to Qumran, because Qumran was not a fortress. But it is consistent with the teachings of the canonical Psalms regarding the eternal city of God, Jerusalem, in which God is the bulwark against the decay of time and outward physical enemies.

On this passage, Nötscher has strongly commended an interpretation of resurrection. "A resurrection which would give access to eternal joy, to eternal honour, to eternal salvation and would put man into eternal proximity of God".232 That interpretation may imply slightly more than its author intended, but it is certainly not out of keeping with the historical context and the uniquely Jewish transformation of Polis immortality beliefs in this time. The announcement is preceded by words which suggest a Pharisaic doctrine of judgment:

"At the time of judgment, all the Sons of Truth will awake(IQH vi.29)

"Time of judgment" would be better translated as the object of the preceding verb, "to hasten". Thus it does not actually connote a future general Day of Judgment and resurrection as taught by the later Pharisees. Prof. Rabin believes that this passage is a quotation from Daniel(12:2): "And many of those who sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting
life and some to shame and everlasting contempt."234 But it is not impossible that this hymn pre-dates the writing of Daniel. What the Scroll here omits, in contrast to Daniel, i.e. the notion of a future day of universal reckoning when both the righteous and the wicked will be resurrected for the purpose of judgment, is a small but significant point which should not be overlooked. The differences are slight, but enough to cause Prof. Mansoor to translate: "that lie" instead of "that sleep", as in Daniel, and "dust" instead of "dust of the earth", as in Daniel.235 But in its essential terminology, the above passage bears a strong resemblance to Daniel, but with the significant omission of a Pharisaic eschatology of resurrection for judgment at the end of time. Further down in the same Scroll, we see this "judgment" as an event already accomplished in the present tense with reference only to the particular righteous, devoid of Daniel's universal and eschatological terms:

"Thou hast cleansed him from all impure abominations and guilt of evil doing, to be united(with) Thy true sons of destiny of the Holy Ones. To lift the worm of man from dust unto an eternal Council(foundation), and from a perverted spirit unto the understanding of God and to stand in array before Thee, with the eternal host and the (true) spirits, (and) to be renewed with all creatures." IQR x1.11-14 236

This passage bears some superficial resemblances to Isaiah (28:15-16). But where it differs, it provides its own historical allusions which shed considerable light on the meaning of its expressions. These include, "from all impure abominations", which suggests the historical context of the infamous Abomination of Desolation and seems to place this hymn in the company of a large collection of biblical documents which refer to this tragic turning-point in Jewish history. "To lift the worm of man"(or,"bodies gnawed by worms"),237 immediately following the reference to the "Holy Ones", looks like an allusion to those who were martyred, i.e. the "Holy Ones" called the Hasidim, as indicated by the term "eternal Council", which seems to be more
intelligible here than "eternal foundation" as some have translated. In translating "eternal Council" (תִּכְלָת), the word "eternal" has to be restored, but the idiom occurs with frequency throughout the Scrolls (cp. 1Q1 11.20, 1Q11.10, 1QS x.25). However, the term (תִּכְלָת) is clearly visible here. If this term designated "Council" in the earthly sense, how then could the resurrection suggested be from "dust" or death? This philological dilemma is one of appearances only. Whether this designation implies an earthly or heavenly Council is again illuminated by placing these texts in their proper historical setting which is the sequence of events relevant to the martyred Council of Hasidim, described above. In this context, the eternal Council of Holy Ones, or Hasidim, takes on a special significance. To the mind of this Jewish Homer, they are, in fact, not an earthly Council, but already a heavenly and immortal Council whose immortality will continue in the body of the faithful (Covenanters) of the Polis of God.

The probability of a direct historical relationship between the founding of the "New Covenant", described in the Zadokite Document and Qumran 4QD 239, and the persecuted Hasidim (Asideans) described in I Maccabees (2:42, 7:13) and II Maccabees (14:6, 6:18-7:42), is important for the light it sheds on the Zadokite understanding of immortality and the afterlife. But if this relationship is a valid one, should it not also apply to the Essenes, as the Covenanters are now commonly designated? Yes, and moreover, any purely etymological explanation of the name "Essene" which does not take into account these historical links cannot be considered adequate. Apart from these historical considerations, but relevant to the view of immortality implicit in the philology of these texts, we have noticed with curiosity the frequency with which the men of the Scrolls are called the "Holy Council", "Council of God" and the "Council of the Community". A. Dupont-Sommer has already asked if the Essenes were not originally known as the "Men of the Council of God". We have noticed in considerable detail above that it
was their martyred Gerousia which distinguished the Hasidim. Thus the term "Council" provides a strong etymological link with the Hasidim. As these expressions for the Community occur with the greatest frequency, such as in IQH vi.11, v.23-27, vi.13, cp. iii.20-23, and especially, IQS i.3, IQS b iv.24, we notice that they derive mainly from (ם) "assembly", "Council" or "foundation", or from (שם) "Council", "Gerousia" or "assembly", with the term (ם) "ezah" occurring with the most frequency throughout the Qumran literature. Gesenius has also pointed out that this term has a variety of meanings which subsequently have occurred in various translations of the Scrolls as the "whole community", a "select Council", a "deliberative assembly", similar to the Gerousia or "Sanhedrin" of Jerusalem. Hab. v.10-11, is often mistranslated "men of their counsel", but the words (ם) in the historical context of the betrayer ("Absalom"), as we have seen, suggest the rival "Council" in Jerusalem which usurped control of Jerusalem by betrayal and annihilation of the Hasidim. The implication of this for their view of immortality is that their was not merely an earthly Gerousia, for which they had entrance requirements far stricter than any Greek Ephebium or Gymnasium but an "eternal Council" (IQH xi.11), they were the "True Sons in the destiny of the Holy Ones" (IQH xi.11), who will be cleansed from much transgression to stand in order with the "Host of Thy Holy Ones" (IQH iii.21). Thus not only the martyred Council, but the whole subsequent company of "sons" were included among the elect in the "lot together with the Holy Ones of the Presence" (IQH vi.13).

There should therefore be little doubt about the existence of a belief in immortality, or immunity to death, in the Zadokite teachings. There need be no question about beliefs in a particular (rather than universal) resurrection of the flesh to this life, as we will see. The Zadokite Document contains a statement which has suggested to some a pure doctrine of immortality of the soul by itself: "They who hold fast to him are for the life of eternity" (CD v.6). This harmonises with the theology
of the third hymn (IQH 111.19) which is also unique for its doctrine of redemption: "Thou hast redeemed my soul from the pit... Thou hast drawn me up to an eternal height". One is tempted to stop with the mention this passage makes of the soul and a state of immortality and conclude that it is merely the soul which is resurrected and the soul which has immortality. We are prevented from doing so because: a) body and soul cannot be held to be opposing phenomena in this period of Hebrew thought, but two aspects of the flesh as over against the Spirit, as we have already noticed in detail, b) the rest of the resurrection passages will not let us draw such a conclusion, and c) the unique Messianic Banquet of the Covenanters (IQS vi. 3-8 and IQSa) is in itself symbolic of a belief in their bodily participation (perhaps as a present reality) in the Heavenly Council and state of immortality, perhaps as an inaugurated immortal Council in which the temporal is decisively combined with the eternal.

Like the Hasidim the Zadokite Scrolls speak of a particular restoration of the body at a particular time, but in a universal sense: "and to destroy flesh until the appointed times." The "worm" or flesh of man was certainly believed to be capable of such a restoration in the early Church: "where their worm(σκύλων) does not die, and the fire is not quenched" (Mk. 9:48). These words of Jesus disclose a familiarity with the same tradition of teaching as does, perhaps, Isaiah (66: 24) who contrasts the "worm" that shall not die with the "flesh" which shall worship God in the "new heavens and the new earth". Not a few critics have held that these passages in the Qumran hymns imply both a resurrection and a resurrection directly to the presence of God, as one has called it: "Resurrection which would give access to an eternal joy, eternal honour and eternal salvation which would put man into the eternal proximity of God, but the texts themselves do not seem to go so far. They tend to speak of resurrection as a resurrection to this life. As a doctrine of immortality of the soul (by itself) does not appear to have any basis in the Scrolls, so also, a doctrine of resurrect-
ion of the body does not stand by itself. We are cautioned by IQH vi.34 and 111.20 which mention an arising from the "pit" and from the "dust" to "walk about in uprightness", to "raise the ensign" and to execute vengeance(vi.29) in various forms. Resurrection thus does not stand by itself as an instrument of salvation and may even imply resurrection to this life only, for the purposes of God. It is thus an error to separate these teachings and debate whether the Zadokites and Hasidim, in their view of the afterlife of man, believed in resurrection or immortality. It is clear from these earliest sources that they believed in both. The clearest example of resurrection and immortality, inextricably combined in a single doctrine is IQH 111.20ff. This combination of the doctrines is by no means out of harmony with the highly advanced articulation of resurrection- immortality beliefs by the Hasidim martyrs in II Maccabees(7:9,14,23). Therefore these pre-Christian Jews, of the Sons of Zadok tradition, as reflected in the Maccabean and Qumran literature, warrant a simple exposition of their doctrine of the afterlife as a question of whether they believed in resurrection or immortality. The combined form of both these advanced teachings occurs in all levels of their literature.

It may be concluded that the doctrine of resurrection of the body was not, therefore, mutually exclusive of a doctrine of immortality of the soul in Qumran and Maccabean sources. Prof. C. K. Barrett has clearly demonstrated that this was also the case, as far as the New Testament Period is concerned, in his recent comment on Oscar Cullmann's dichotomy: "Immortality or Resurrection". It has not only been attempted to demonstrate here that the body and soul were not considered opposites, in this period of Hebrew thought; nor even contrarieties as they were supposed to be in the Middle Ages, but that they were combined in a distinctive manner in pre-Christian times.
The views of these pre-Christian Jews, examined above will be seen to provide some of the basic presuppositions why the doctrine of resurrection, which has traditionally been attributed to the early Christian Church should not be thought to imply a denial of the immortality of the soul. The suggestion that both resurrection and immortality were irrelevant to the Qumran Covenanters, "because they expected a final Judgment before the end of their generation", will also be seen to be an inadequate solution to the problem of precisely where the early Church stood in these matters. When one generation became more than one generation, among the earliest Christians, the expectation of the eschaton also appears to have become a problem, resulting in a controversy which will be described in the following chapters in the "Kerygmata Controversy". But it would indeed be erroneous to suggest that expectation of an imminent eschaton lessened the importance of resurrection and immortality to the early Christians. We will see that precisely the opposite was to be the case.

However one may choose to classify the Covenanters of the Zadokite and Qumran documents, and we have here placed them among the Sons of Zadok as the levitical wing (if the Essenes may be called that) compared to the Sadducees who were the priestly wing of the normative Judaism of this period; their writings provide a fund of evidence for a firmly established pre-Christian doctrine of resurrection and immortality. On the basis of these documents alone, we have learned a great deal about the advanced state of the pre-Pauline doctrine of immortality. Nonetheless identification of the Zadokites and the Qumranites with the Essenes, which now seems to have won the widest acceptance after many years of debate and to which it is pointless to add further etymological arguments, is useful for the control such an identification permits one to apply to the earliest sources by means of a comparison with what some of the Fathers of the Church have said about the Essenes. But because these writings fall outside the scope of pre-Pauline literature, we have not given them a full examination here.
Ecclesiasticus and the Sadducee Doctrine of Translation

The Greek text of Ecclesiasticus (commonly known as Sirach) as it stands in the LXX Canon, has until comparatively recent times, been the only version accessible to scholarship. Jerome, however, knew of a Hebrew text and one must have been available to the authors of the Talmud. The Greek text seems to have been well known to the later fathers who called it "Liber Ecclesiasticus" (the Church Book) because they believed it had been used in the early Christian Church for moral and catechetical instruction. Extensive knowledge of this book by New Testament writers, seems to lend credibility to this supposition. No Hebrew manuscript of Sirach was known until Solomon Schechter brought to light several extensive fragments of Sirach which consisted of two separate Hebrew versions of the text. These were found in the Cairo Geniza (a depository or refuse heap of very ancient manuscripts) along with the famous Zadokite Document in 1896. One is an original Hebrew version and the other is one which has obviously been interpolated by a Pharisaic hand.

The more recent discovery of several fragments of Sirach among the manuscripts in Cave II at Qumran has both vindicated the champions of the originality of the Geniza texts of Sirach, the belief that this writing is ancient, and that it was known to the men of Qumran and was directly related to the Zadokite literature of the pre-Maccabean Age. These 2Q manuscripts have been in the process of editing for some time by Abbé M. Baillet and have yet to see the light of publication. However, extensive notices about them have appeared both from M. Baillet and J.T. Milik.

The general historical setting presented by the book strongly suggests the society of the aristocratic hellenised Jews of the Seleucid period, as is indicated by its references to the "king with his purple robes" and suggestion of a "school" of hellenised Jews in Jerusalem. This "Zadokite"
document is pre-Sadducean by only one generation and may be taken as a source for original Sadducean teachings because of its later treatment by the Pharisees. The Talmud (B.T. Sanhedrin) has placed Sirach and the "books of the Sadducees" side by side in its list of forbidden writings. The high praise which the author gives to "Simon the High Priest" (50:1,20) has now been generally accepted to be the Zadokite, Simon son of Onias II (219-199 B.C.), and father of Onias III. The Sadducean stamp of this document is clearly manifest in the Hebrew text of 50:12ff, which states, as do the Dead Sea Scrolls: "Give thanks unto Him that gave the Sons of Zadok to be priests, for His mercy endureth forever". This basic point of view is also substantiated by its dating. It is one of the few documents (in the Zadokite collection) which can be dated with a fair degree of certainty and thus is important for the dating of related documents as well. The year given in the prologue for the date of its translation is "the 38th year of Euergetes" (Ptolemy III). It thus is possible to date fairly precisely the beginning of the translation in 132 B.C. and its completion, sometime before 116 B.C. The book suggests that Simon had been dead for some time, thus the original writing was between 180-168 B.C. by a contemporary of Onias III. The Greek text thus may be considered the work of a Sadducee who translated the views of a previous generation (his grandfather) of the Sons of Zadok for the benefit of his contemporaries in Alexandria.

The question of authorship (of the original document) also raises several interesting questions. One of the Hebrew texts of Ecclesiasticus states that it was written by "Jesus (or Jason) the son of Sirach, son of Eleazar, of Jerusalem" (50:27). In the other Hebrew text which contains the Pharisaic redactions he is called: "Simon the son of Jesus the son of Eleazar the son of Sira (סִינָרֵיIOR). This has been considered an outright Pharisaic intrusion by Oesterley and R.H. Box, who defend the original reading as "Jesus ben Eleazar ben Sira". If this reading is correct, it increases the probability of a
strong resemblance between Jesus (or Jason), the brother of Onias III, and the author of this work. This same Jesus (or Jason) who was denounced for founding a school in Jerusalem (II Mac. 4:7) was in all probability the member of the sect to establish an important alliance with Rome, because he also is called "Jason the son (or grandson) of Eleazar" of Jerusalem (II Mac. 8:17) at a time when Demetrius was harassing the Jews. 261 As this Jason was slandered by Menelaüs before King Antiochus and thus removed from office, so the Jesus of Ecclesiasticus states in language remarkably similar to that of the Hadayot: "From an unclean tongue and lying words— the slander of an unrighteous tongue to the King. My soul drew near to death, and my life was very near to Hades beneath" (Eccl. 51:6). When Jason was deposed from his high priesthood, he was forced to flee the country; travelling first to Idumea, then to Alexandria and then to Sparta (II Mac. 5:5ff). So also the Jesus of Ecclesiasticus seems to mention these same events relevant to his betrayal, narrow escape and rescue: "before I went on my travels" (Eccl. 51:13). 4.0. E. Oesterley has not hesitated to cast the Jesus of Ecclesiasticus in the role of a teacher of the Jerusalem school: "He imparted instruction to the young members of the Jerusalem aristocracy who assembled at his school" (אֵלֶ֑זֶר נְדִיכָּה ), Eccl. 51:23. 262 According to II Maccabees, chapter 4, Jason's "School of the Law" (so he does call himself a "teacher of the law" in 23:11, 23) was far more hellenistic in outward forms that the pro-Pharisaic author would have preferred. We will notice presently how this line of Sadducaic tradition, particularly its school of immortality came to have an important bearing on the Urgemeinde, or earliest Christian Church, but suffice it to observe how this Jason discloses his role as a "teacher" in Ecclesiasticus:

"Draw near to me, you who are untaught, and lodge in my school...why are your souls thirsty? I opened my mouth and said, get these things for yourself without money. Put your neck under the yoke, and let your souls receive instruction." Eccl. 51:23.
There are numerous points at which the teachings of Ecclesiasticus harmonise with the positive doctrines of the Sadducees. A few of these may be listed in brief summary:

a) a basic orientation to the written Law (39:1,8) and denunciation of those who expand it by means of oral tradition (32:17),

b) its setting in the Jerusalem Gerousia and exaltation of the Council (38:33,6:36),

c) its orientation to the aristocracy, because of its many reminders to remember the poor (4:1-10, 5:1, 5:8, 11:18, 13:21),

d) its inclusion of Gentiles (36:17),

e) its repudiation of the resurrection of the body (38:23) which it considers vanity (or pride, 10:11-12) as over against the power of God to save (39:18-20) and the immortality that God gives to the Spirits of the children of men (16:17, 41:4), and

f) against the notion of Fate and universal resurrection to Judgment, it teaches "choice" (or freedom of the will) and divine grace: "Before a man are life and death, and whichever he chooses will be given to him" (15:17-18).

The Doctrine of Translation:

Thus in its repudiation of the popular teaching of resurrection and universal Judgment at the end of time (which was to become the theme of the later Pharisees), the book of Ecclesiasticus has sought to preserve an older and more scriptural teaching in its "Doctrine of Translation". In subsequent chapters I will attempt to show that this teaching was an important theme in pre-Sadduceic, Sadduceic and early Jewish-Christian circles. Again, it should be pointed out that the Sadducees' and proto-Sadducees' rejection of universal resurrection does not imply that they had no view of the afterlife, but that they found no grounds for a belief in a universal resurrection at the end of time in scripture. The distinctive doctrine of Translation, on the other hand, was significantly documented in the Pentateuch and thus, to the mind of the Sadducees, was treated as "Torah". The proof text most often quoted by them was Gen.5:24, "Enoch walked with God; and he was not, for God took him".
However, because Ecclesiasticus has rejected the teaching of universal, bodily resurrection at the end of time, it is tempting to infer that its author, as well as the Sadducees, borrowed heavily from the Greeks for their view of immortality. So it would appear from his quotation of the Stoic theory of "dust to dust" (41:10) and the Homeric notion of immortality in the "good name of a man" which "endures forever" (41:13). But these teachings are just as readily rejected as they are transcended by the author and the Sadducees (38:23, cp. IQH 111.21). As with the book of Ecclesiastes, which also repudiates the notion of eschatological resurrection and places its emphasis on the return of the "Spirit" directly to its "Maker" and the moment when man will "see God face to face", seats Ecclesiasticus places its emphasis on ultimately being at one with God, the "eternal Covenant" God makes with man (17:12) and the immortality one has in the memory of God amidst all the Spirits in heaven. However, in putting forth the ancient doctrine of Translation, the book of Ecclesiasticus (and the Sadducees) have not rejected all notions of bodily resurrection. There are several instances of their belief in a "return", or bodily resurrection, "to this life" (48:5), thus the doctrine of Translation should not be thought to be exclusive of resurrection of the body. What it does appear to exclude, at this early stage, is the notion of a future, universal, eschatological resurrection of mankind for Judgement.

What seems to be implied by the doctrine of Translation is the mystery contained in the word (ἀλληλούμενα) "changed", as in a "moment" or "glance of an eye", which the Apostle Paul reflects upon in ICor. 15:51. It is this theme which is important to the author of Ecclesiasticus. In his list of great men of faith he first mentions Enoch, who "pleased the Lord and was translated" (μετετέθη) (44:16). Noah also, here appears to have been Translated, or "taken in exchange" (ἀνταλλαγμα) (44:17). There was indeed more than an immortality of "name" for Samuel who was believed to prophesy after his death (46:20). So also, with
Elijah who was translated like Enoch and Noah: "taken up by a whirlwind of fire" (48:9). The Hebrew (unaltered) text says: "taken up by a whirlwind, and by fiery troops to the heavens". These "mighty ones" are better known in other contexts as the "Holy Ones" or "Saints" of God. The Syriac-Greek MS read: "Elijah was hidden in the heavenly chambers, then was Elijah filled with His Spirit" (48:12). Regarding Elijah's raising of a corpse from death (40:40), there are several other references to this type of resurrection in the Thanksgiving Hymns as a resurrection to this life. We must be careful to notice that the Zadokites do not expand this particular miracle into a general theory regarding the Eschaton and resurrection of all mankind. Nor does it imply a resurrection to heaven for them; it is merely the rescue of the dead to the realm of the living again. We will see that this was also the case regarding the Urgemeinde understanding of resurrection. The doctrine of translation, or ascension, however, is an entirely different matter. That implies a direct transference (not at the end of time) to the Presence of God and the Spirits ("Holy Ones in array") before the Presence of God. A more detailed examination of this translation will be given when we look at the Noah Fragments of the Book of Enoch (65-69) below.

Ecclesiasticus and the Zadokite literature we have examined above, do not provide evidence for the conclusion that the Sadducees taught that all the righteous, or elect, would thus be "translated" together, at one time on a specific day designated by God for Judgment. On the contrary, on the basis of this early pre-Christian evidence, it is possible only to say that their teaching implied translation, as described above, but in a particular rather than a universal sense, involving separate times and occurrences rather than a "universal day of wrath". We will see presently that this universalisation was a tendency of Pharisaic and post-Pauline eschatology. On the basis of Ecclesiasticus, it is possible to confirm regarding the Zadokite and Sadducean view of the afterlife that a) they rejected the doctrine of
universal resurrection but maintained a belief in a particular resurrection of the body to this life, b) they rejected the notion of the immortality of a separated soul, but held to the immortality of the "Spirit" which "returns" to God, without going beyond the teachings of the Torah in this matter, c) they affirmed a doctrine of Translation of the elect to the Presence and company of God in heaven, but in a particular (present), rather than a universal (eschatological) sense.

Enoch and Immortality in the Hasmonaean Era:

The document, or collection of documents, which shed the greatest amount of light on the immortality-resurrection beliefs commonly held throughout the Hasmonaean (or pre-Herodian) period in Jewish history are the books which go by the name of "Enoch". This is not to suggest that Enoch contains only traditions of this period, or that it was written by a single author, or that there has always been agreement about the dating of its component parts.

The discovery of extensive fragments of Enoch among the Dead Sea Scrolls (in caves I and IV) has placed the whole question of Enoch as a pre-Christian source on a completely new footing. In Qumran Cave IV, have been found 5 Aramaic manuscripts, containing chapters 1-26 and 83-90 which together with the last chapters (98-108) probably formed a complete book, and 4 Aramaic manuscripts, containing chapters 83-90, which all provide clearer and more intelligible texts of Enoch than hitherto available. Although these documents are of inestimable value to biblical scholarship, unfortunately none of them have yet been published in more than a descriptive manner. Portions of that earlier part of Enoch, known as the "Book of Noah", have turned up in no less than 4 separate Hebrew manuscripts found in Cave I. J.T. Milik has published just enough of the Enoch fragments to enable scholars to know that the Qumran library had in its possession no less than 10 separate manuscripts of Enoch in Aramaic.
It is significant that these manuscripts have turned up in separate complete "books" or scrolls, or fragments of separate books, which attests their antiquity. Although nothing conclusive has been disclosed to prove the existence of the controversial chapters 37-71, known as the "Similitudes", among the thousands of Scroll fragments, it is common knowledge among those experts who have worked with these materials, that only a small fraction of the contents of Cave IV have been published to date, fifteen years after their discovery. 271

While acknowledging the developmental character of the Book of Enoch, various experts, in years past, have held that its original purpose was to establish the Sadducaic point of view regarding the ancient Solar Calendar. It will be noticed that the calendar question became a fundamental point of issue between the Pharisees and Sadducees; the latter reckoning time by the solar year, and the former by the lunar calendar. Because, like Elijah, Enoch was believed to have been Translated (or ascended) to heaven, he was thought to be an appropriate authority on heavenly luminaries. This Sadducaic orientation, of the books of Enoch, was first noticed by Leszynsky who said: "The Sadducean character of the original work is seen most clearly in the discussion regarding the calendar; chapters lxxii-lxxxii are rightly called the Book of Astronomy". 272 This basic point of view is also reflected in the bitter polemic between the Pharisees and Sadducees (in 102:6-104:13) which has caused Leszynsky to place this section after the schism between the Sadducees and Pharisees in the time of Hyrcanus. 273 Thus other points of controversy, besides the calendar question, are evident in Enoch. The most important one is the question of immortality and resurrection with which we are concerned here.

Along with the other Zadokite and proto-Sadducaic literature we have examined, Enoch, which in many respects appears to be a veritable library of Sadducaic writings, places itself among a large body of writings which are concerned with the pre-maccabean crisis in Jerusalem relevant to the Abomination of
Desolation, persecution of the Hasidim and martyrdom of the Jerusalem Council in 168-164 B.C. It is thus of no small interest that R.H. Charles built as strong a case as he did, for the dating of the contents and historical allusions, contained in that part of Enoch called "The Visions of Enoch" (83-90), as descriptive of the crisis in Jerusalem in the 2nd century B.C. This is particularly evident in the visions about the "Seventy Shepherds", the "Seven Stars" and the "Seven White Ones". 275

Whoever the author was, and it is clear that he was a hellenised Jew of Zadokite and Sadducean bent, he wrote in a time of great political danger and perhaps continued persecutions. Thus the heavily veiled and symbolic language, similar to the apocalyptic style of Daniel. In addition to the "Seventy Shepherds" and "Seven Stars", no less an expert than E. R. Bevan was convinced that such symbols as the "Sheep" and their oppressors the "Ravens", the "Lion" and "Eagle", etc. must be references to the persecutions, under Antiochus Epiphanes, of Israel and the Jerusalem Gerousia. He held that the murder of Onias III was also described in this symbolic manner: "The Ravens, i.e. the Seleucid government, flew upon those lambs and took one of those lambs, and dashed the sheep in pieces and devoured them". 276

When placed alongside other documents which deal with these events which were so important to the history of the Sons of Zadok and later Sadducees, the symbolism of Enoch does not remain as obscure as modern critics might suppose. Ecclesiastical concludes its narrative in a tone of outrage caused by the persecutions of Antiochus Epiphanes and song of praise for Onias III ("Ben Simon"). 277 II Maccabees concludes its history with a vision of the Translated Onias III, with the Prophet Jeremiah and the courage they inspired in the Hasmonean troops who succeeded in avenging his murder. 278 So also the Damascus (Zadokite) Document has placed its historical narrative in the context of the "martyred saints" or Hasidim, as we have noticed in some detail. 279 Points of literary contact between these documents are too numerous to mention here and have been already
listed in extenso by various experts. Hence I will confine
my observations to points of literary similarity and common
historical data which bear on immortality and the question of
immortality beliefs among these Sadducean Jews in the Hasmonaean
Era.

One such point of contact is Enoch's placement of
its narrative in the context of the immortal Hasidim. This is
seen from its many references to the "Holy Ones", which term is
used interchangeably with "angels", as in 89:59. In the Thank-
giving Hymns (I.H) the "Holy Ones" are called "Angels"; in the
Zadokite Document (CD), they are called "Sants". Barthélemy
and Milik, in their interpretation of the Manual of War (I.1362) have
held that (דָּנְיֵא קְדָשִׁים) "Congregation of Gods", is a parallel expres-
sion for (נַחֲלֶת יֵשׁוֹעַ) "Council of Holy Ones" (cf. 89:7, Job 15:8,
Is. 22:19, Is. 6:1ff). A. Noth has maintained that their of-
official designation was "Saints of the Most High". That Enoch
has identified the "Holy Ones" (and angels) with the "Seven
Shepherds" (because of the decisive link this establishes with
the "Council of 70" and the martyred Hasidim, which have been
discussed at length above. Enoch has described the Seventy Shep-
herds as not succeeding in their task. This was indeed the case
with the martyred Council which was cut down by Alcimus (if that
is interpreted as the judgment of God) before they could finish
their objectives. 2 Peter 5:4, suggests that the eschatological
implications of this tradition were important to the Urge
 Gemeinde, as well as Mt. 26:31, Mk. 14:27, Jh. 10:10-11 and Heb. 13:20. The al-
usion to the "Seven" (Hasidim) who grasped Enoch by the hand (in
87:2) is most illuminating for the light it sheds on the "Angels"
and "Council of the Heavenly Hosts" in the Thanksgiving Hymns
and their bearing on the Sadducean-Zadokite view of the immortals
of God as already translated (before the end of time) and acting
as a type of pre-Dante "Beatrice". In 87:2, Enoch identifies,
in a decisive manner, the "Heavenly beings" who were like "White
Men" with the "Seventy Shepherds", which should satisfy any doubt
that the "Holy Ones" of the Hymns are the same martyred Hasidim
and "Angels" (though fallen) of Enoch.
The Judgment Scene (in 90:20-27) is significant in the light of the above argument for its reference to the "Seven Brothers", or first seven Hasidim Martyrs: "And the Lord called those men the seven first White Ones, and commanded that they should bring before Him, beginning with the first Star which led the way, all the Stars..." (90:21). It is significant as a "Judgment" which has already taken place and is not thought of as a future eschatological "Judgment" of mankind. In this passage, it should be noted that: a) "The Seven First White Ones" are men, not originally divine beings. The terminology used to describe them may imply "Angels" as well as "Saints" (as this is presumably a posthumous event), but R.F. Charles, unfortunately has gone to the lengths of calling them "Seven Archangels" for which he finds it necessary to go to Zoroastrianism and Tobit 12 to find comparisons. This is, of course, unnecessary. The number "Seven", indeed, came to have a significant meaning among the "Hellenists" in the New Testament Church (Acts 6), but the "Seven" here have reference to the "First Seven" Hasidim who were called the "Seven", perhaps long before their widespread legend was recorded in the chapter of II Maccabees. We notice that the other Shepherds who lost the sheep do not receive the preferred treatment of the First Seven. However, the judgment begin with the "First Star which led the way" (90:21). This does appear to make a literary connection with the "Star" mentioned in the Zadokite Document (CD ix.8), who is described as the leader and "law-giver"———(הגהה) in CD viii.4, 7, 9. Many have held this figure to be the "founder" of the Community of Covenanters exiled near Damascus. Although he should not be considered a "founder" either of a group of refugees or of the Sons of Zadok, the identification seems to be corroborated by Isnoch (90:21).

The outstanding characteristic of the "Star" is that he was an interpreter of the Law. Not second Moses, but one who (הגהה פליג) studies the Law (CD viii.8). Under him the (הגהה פליג) "New Covenant" was established at Damascus.
Whatever might have been the name of the "Star", and we have offered several suggestions above, he was undoubtedly a helleniser, as is evident from the charge of "uncircumcision" which was levelled against him and the other "Stars" (90:21ff). As a result of this charge of "uncircumcision" the "Seventy Shepherds" were consigned to the fiery pit (21). In 86:1-6, the "Stars" are charged with intermarriage with Gentiles. Charles has perhaps gone too far in calling them "Fallen angels". The text does not go as far in calling them: "From heaven beings who were like white men" (87:2), or immortals. It may be argued that Ezekiel 34, because it refers to "Shepherds" (but not Seventy Shepherds), has provided a type of model for Enoch's "Vision of Seventy Shepherds", this is by no means denied, but the application of this model and the historical allusions is to the same historical events described by I Maccabees, the Zadokite Document and the Thanksgiving Hymns, as well as I Enoch.

"The Book of Enoch's Journeys" (Enoch 1-36) has appeared among several of the fragments found in Qumran Cave IV. As with the "Book of Dream Visions", it has also appeared as a separate book in this collection of documents. It is mainly the "First Journey" (ch.17-19) which has generally borne the brunt of criticism as a "hellenist interpolation" by the Religionsgeschichte and other foreign-influence theorists. This is because of the vivid description of Enoch's journey into the "underworld" contained here. R.H. Charles has gone along with this criticism, but with some reservations. He has maintained that a removal of these chapters from the whole book creates serious difficulties, both for textual and literary reasons. Unlikely the great bulk of writings which touch on the subject of Hades in ancient Greek literature, Enoch as a whole goes far beyond the Greek notion of Sheol (Hades) as an endless but negative and hopeless extension of life after death. Prof. C.K. Barrett has, in a recent publication, called attention to this general tendency among the ancients to depict the afterlife in terms of an eternal extension of life and memory, but a survival so wretched
and poor that it would almost be better that existence should cease altogether. So in Enoch's journey into the "underworld", Sheol is seen as an endless extension, not merely of time, but space as well, both height and depth:

"And beyond these mountains is a region the end of the great earth: there the heavens were completed. And I saw a deep abyss, with columns of heavenly fire, and among them I saw columns of fire fall, which were beyond measure alike towards the height and towards the depth. And beyond that abyss I saw a place which had no firmament of the heaven above, and no firmly founded earth beneath it: there was no water upon it, and no birds, but it was a waste and horrible place.

I saw there seven stars like great burning mountains, and to me, when I inquired regarding them, The angel said: 'This place is the end of heaven and earth: this has become a prison for the stars and the host of heaven.'

(Enoch 18:10-14)

Unlike the classic representations of Sheol, or the Underworld into which Odysseus, Aeneas, Theseus, Perithoos and Herakles were said to "descend", Enoch's is more of a journey to the outermost limits of Heaven: "the places of the luminaries and the treasuries of the stars and of the thunder, and in the uttermost depths, where were a fiery bow and arrows and their quiver, and a fiery sword and all the lightnings...and to the fire of the west, which receives ever setting of the sun. And I came to a river of fire in which the fire flows like water and discharges itself into the great sea toward the west." (17:3-5). It was in this place that Enoch saw the "treasuries of all the winds" and the "four winds which bear the earth and the firmament of heaven" (18:1-2). Thus even in the geography of his vision, Enoch has transcended the classic "descent" into the realm of the shades of the Underworld. Although formally, some of these classic "Journeys" resemble Enoch at various points, none of them proceed to the positive and distinctively Jewish view of immortality and the afterlife which Enoch provides. Instead of an Achilles or a Beatrice, Enoch's guide is the angel Uriel (a fallen angel of the Sons of Aaron): They traverse what is called: "a prison for the stars and the host of heaven" (13.15). The charge against these "Stars"
who by inference are, perhaps, Pharisees, is not blasphemy or
impiety but: "They did not come forth at their appointed times". Or, it may be interpreted, they refused to come forth according to the accepted ancient Solar Calendar, which the Sons of Zadok believed was ordained by God from the beginning of creation.

If the "First Journey" (ch. 17-20) could be separated from the rest of the "Journeys" (ch. 1-36), a dependence on the Greek "Journeys" and their antipathy toward the notion of an endless extension of a shadow-like existence after death, might be attributed to Enoch. But chapters 17-20, do not seem to be detachable from this first book of Enoch. Their removal would disrupt the literary development relevant to the fall of the angels from chapter 6 following. Moreover, fragments of this first book have been found among the Aramaic fragments of Enoch found at Qumran. And, indeed, it almost appears that Enoch, like the Greeks, has denied any positive view of life after death when he says of the hellenised Jews (pro-Syrian and pro-Egyptian) who strive against each other: "Send them one against the other that they may destro, each other in battle... for they hope to live an eternal life and that each one of them will live five hundred years" (10: 9). However, Enoch himself states that this prophecy will be reversed and that he has written out the petition for the fallen ones that they might have "length of days" (13: 6)

One aspect of Enoch's eternity is thus similar to the Greek notion of Sheol as an extension of hopeless existence; the eternity which the unrighteous possess in the afterlife. The other aspect of eternity is that which distinguishes Enoch and the whole development of the Jewish view of the afterlife, reflected in the immortality teachings of the Sons of Zadok; it is the eternity or immortality which is given to the righteous. This is seen even more clearly in other sections, such as the fragment of the "Book of Noah" which refers to the "garden where the elect and the righteous dwell, where my grandfather (Enoch) was taken up, the seventh from Adam" (60: 8). This "garden" is already the abode of the righteous and the elect in Enoch's and Noah's
times (61:12, 60:23), the abode of the earliest fathers in
Enoch's time (70:2-4) and the abode of Enoch and Elijah in
Elijah's time (89:52, cp. 65:2). The Noah fragment is perhaps
the oldest testimony in existence for the Translation of Enoch
into Paradise. In no instances have the Sadducees or Zadokites
generalised the doctrine of translation, as it applied to particu-
lar righteous and elect, into a universal Translation or mass
resurrection of mankind from the dead. Not even in the Early
Christian Church, as we will observe, that was the work of the
Pharisees. Most of chapter 60, which is in the "Book of Noah"
is a description of the "Garden of the Righteous" (60:23) in which
Noah's fathers already dwell as a present reality (cp. 65:2), indeed,
independent of any doctrine of a general resurrection at the end
of time. In another portion of Enoch which comes from a time
more contemporary with the Early Church, we find this same posi-
tive aspect of immortality expressed in reference to the "Holy
Ones" (saints) who dwell (already) in the "Garden of Life":

"Blessed is He, and may the name of the Lord of Spirits
be blessed for ever and ever.
All who sleep not above in heaven shall bless Him:
All the Holy Ones who are in heaven shall bless Him,
and all the elect who dwell in the Garden of Life:
And every Spirit of light who is able to bless, and
glorify, and extol, and hallow Thy blessed name."

(Enoch 61:11-12)

The book, or books, of Enoch may thus be considered
one of the important sources for Jewish beliefs on immortality
and the afterlife in the years just before the advent of Christianty.
Particularly now after the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, it
can be placed in perspective and may be seen to be without rival
as a source for the history of doctrinal development during the
first century B.C. Because of its different levels of composition
and numerous authors, it is not surprising that its teachings
at times appear to be loosely joined. They should not therefore
be thought to be contradictory. Such a "contradiction" which
is not at all a contradiction, has frequently been noticed in
chapters 6-36. Here, the Kingdom of God is described in earthly
terms, seemingly in reference to an earthly Kingdom. Chapters 91-104, however, present conceptions of the Kingdom which are presumed to be heavenly. Also, on one hand, man is said to have been created "like the angels" originally without sin (69:11), but death came as an intruder through sin to destroy him. On the other hand, the fallen angels are denounced as the source of sin in the world (12:1ff). These are not contradictions as much as they are contrarieties which stand side by side in the teachings of Enoch. Thus, in the light of present day, eschatological categories, regarding resurrection and immortality, Enoch's teachings appear to some as contradictions. Enoch's teachings about Judgment, likewise, will vary according to whether the Messianic Kingdom is conceived as an eternal earthly Kingdom, in which case final Judgment preceded it; or only as a temporary earthly Kingdom, in which case final Judgment must come at its close to destroy all.

In the portions of Enoch most likely to be contemporaneous with the Early Church, called the "Similitudes" (37-71), the clear teaching is that the Messianic Kingdom embraces heaven and earth but is initiated by a "Judgment". Likewise, in the oldest portions of Enoch both body and soul, as an inseparable unit, are described as arising again (to this life), once again, to abide in an earthly Messianic Kingdom, but ultimately are translated to a heavenly Kingdom. But even here the righteous are resurrected to bring about "Judgment". Thus the initial phases of the Kingdom are begun (rather than concluded) by Judgment. Thus the "eternal Judgment", described by Enoch, has nothing to do with this "resurrection", if the dead, but is an event which concerns only those angels who are already dwelling in heaven:

"And sinners shall be delivered into the hands of the righteous. (13) And at its close (the 8th week) they shall acquire houses (mansions) because of their righteousness, and a house shall be built for the Great King in glory for evermore, (and all mankind shall look to the path of righteousness). (14) And after that, in the ninth week, the righteous judgment shall be revealed to the whole world, and all the works of the godless shall vanish
from the earth, and the world shall be written down for destruction. (15) And after this, in the tenth week in the seventh part, there shall be the great eternal judgment, in which He will execute vengeance amongst the angels. (16) And the first heaven shall depart and pass away, and a new heaven shall appear, and all the powers of the heavens shall have a sevenfold light. (17) And after that there will be many weeks without number for ever." (Enoch 91:13-17).

In Enoch no distinction is made between the body and the soul. But those who live the life of the body are distinguished from those who live in the "Spirit" and are Translated to a "Spiritual Kingdom". In the latest portion of Enoch it appears that it is only the Spirit that returns to the Lord of Spirits and only the righteous who partake of this immortality. Unlike Enoch 91:10, which speaks of the "righteous" who "shall arise from their sleep to "execute judgment on earth" (7), Enoch 103 indicates that it is the Spirit that will have immortality. 103:7 states: "Know ye that their souls will be made to descend into Sheol." Thus by inference one might expect Enoch to say that the "souls" of the righteous will arise. But the term used is " Spirits", which receive the immortality bestowed by God rather than the Souls:

"That all goodness and joy and joy are prepared for them and written down for the Spirits of those who have died in righteousness, and that manifold good shall be given to you in recompense for your labours, and that your lot is abundantly beyond the lot of the living. And the Spirits of you who have died in righteousness shall live and rejoice, and their Spirits, nor their memorial from before the face of the Great One unto all generations of the world; wherefore no longer fear their contumely." (Enoch 103:3-4).

Verses 7 and 3 are not contradictory if one takes seriously the inseparability of the body and soul, in the Hebrew thought of this period, and distinguishes both from the "Spirit". Thus Enoch has clearly differentiated here between the "immortality of the Soul" and the "immortality of the Spirit"; where the latter is promised, but the former is not. Moreover, Enoch
appears to use the term "Soul" in the restricted sense of "that which is lost" (9:3, 9:10, 22:3), so 16:1 has explicitly stated: "From the souls of whose flesh the Spirits, having gone forth," indicating that the Spirit has departed both the body and soul. There is a clear distinction in Enoch between the body-souls of those who are lost, and the Spirits of the blessed, who appear to acquire new bodies (and presumably souls). In neither case, is there a simple disjunction of "body" as over against "soul", as Prof. Gullmann has argued elsewhere. In both cases "Spirit" and "Soul" are distinguished in this context; one designating the lost, and the other the blessed and the living.

On the basis of these and other portions of Enoch found among the Dead Sea Scrolls, the position of this Zadokite-Sadducean literature regarding resurrection may be summarised as follows: a) They believed in a particular resurrection of the body from the dust of the righteous elect (to this line, 51:1) for the purpose of executing Judgment, b) the destruction of the body, for the wicked who are living, and the consignment of their souls to Sheol, in the hellenistic sense; but for the righteous, a renewal of the Spirit to be united with the Spirits of all those who died in righteousness (103:3-4). Because Judgment will be executed by the particular resurrection of the righteous, Enoch says of those righteous ones who have suffered ill and affliction, that they shall "shine as the lights of heaven" (104:2) "And the eternal Judgment shall be far from you for all the generations of the world", "For you shall be companions of the hosts of heaven" (104:6).

The temporal man who suffers affliction but shall presently become as the lights, or the "stars of heaven eternally bright", discloses the historical context of persecution to which a great deal of Zadokite-Sadducean literature has recourse. "For you shall be companions of the hosts of heaven", not only points to the Hasidim but also the promise of Is 11:21,23, as well as Is 5:2, that the righteous shall be among the "lot of the Holy Ones", "the host of the Holy Ones" in the presence,
and in one fragment "in the Council of the gods" (πῆχυ τῶν θεῶν cp. Is. 89:8, Job 15:3). Although there has been in the past some debate about the temporal or eternal character of the promises in the Scrolls cited here, there is no question about the eternal life promised in Enoch 104:2-6, 103:3-4 and other passages, with which they seem to be directly related. These teachings at least can be known to be representative of the doctrine of "Resurrection and Immortality" as it exists in the portions of Enoch which have been found among the Dead Sea Scrolls. There are, indeed, more explicit statements relevant to resurrection in the Similitudes, such as: "And in those days shall the earth also give back that which it has received" (51:1), but these must be seen as later developments of the original immortality teachings, as no other Jewish literature of an earlier dating contain an unchallenged doctrine of "General Resurrection". The first unquestionable occurrences of this teaching appear in IV Ezra and T. benj. 10:6-8. 294

We must not overlook the eschatological presuppositions, for the doctrine of Translation, behind the fact that the source of revelation, in the Book of Enoch, is said to be from the Prophet Enoch, himself. Contrary to the notion of a General Resurrection at the end of time, Enoch, like Elijah, was singly and immediately "taken up", or Translated, to heaven; not once but twice. "And in those days a whirlwind carried me off from the earth, and set me down at the end of the heavens" (39:2). "And he was raised aloft on the chariots of the Spirit and his name vanished among them" (70:2). In chapter 93 Enoch's own history is recounted in relation to that of Elijah of whom it is said: "A man shall ascend" (93:8, cp. 89:52). A similar experience is designated for all the "Elect Righteous", who are referred to by the same term used for the School of Immortality in the Hadayot, i.e. the "Eternal Plant of Righteousness" (93:10). These are to be Translated to heaven to receive the "sevenfold instruction" that Enoch did concerning creation: "Who is there of all men who could know what is the breadth
and the length of the earth" or who could discern the "length of heaven and how great is its height, and upon what it is founded" (93:12-14). Thus from the beginning throughout all levels of Enoch, runs a thread of what might be called "Translation Theology," in the figure of Enoch and the Righteous Elect, which should be seen as one of the basic presuppositions of this collection of Sadducaic writings.

As late as chapters 1-36, perhaps written in the Sadducaic era, is a doctrine of immortality in direct opposition to the Pharisaic teaching of Resurrection-Judgment: "Nor shall they be judged (11εκρίνομαι) all the days of their life," "And the years of their joy shall be multiplied in eternal gladness and peace (5:9). Not the righteous, but the unrighteous are the disappointed ones: "For they hope to live an eternal life" (10:10, cp. 15:4). In what is commonly agreed to be the oldest portion of the book, Enoch describes his Translation by the "winds of heaven" (Holy Spirit) to the mansion within the mansion before the presence of God (14:10-24). This pre-Christian Sadducaic tradition seems to have a great deal in common with the later cryptic saying of Jesus: "In my Father's house are many mansions" (Jn. 14:2ff). The relationship of this and other Urgeemeinde traditions to the teachings of Enoch will be examined in greater detail below.

It is sufficient to observe, here, that the "mansions" and those who dwell within are held to exist as a present reality rather than as a future hypothesis or hope. Unlike this heavenly Kingdom, and the immortal who dwell therein as a present reality, the dwelling of God and His Son, with the righteous upon the earth, is described as a future possibility. In chapter 105, which J.T. Milik holds to be a part of one of the Aramaic manuscripts found at Qumran, this is disclosed:

"For I (God) and My Son will be united with them (the children of earth) forever in the paths of uprightness in their lives; and ye shall have peace: rejoice, ye children of uprightness." (Enoch 105:2)."
This teaching also appears to have much in common with the later saying of Jesus: "If a man loves me, he will keep my word, and my Father will love him, and we will come to him and make our home with him" (Jn. 14:23). Like Enoch the heavenly Kingdom is described as a present reality in the Uremente (Mt. 6:10, omitted by Lk. 11:2) as over against the earthly Kingdom and its habitation by immortals upon the earth which are described as a future reality. But this does not imply that the heavenly does not already affect and influence the earthly.

Enoch 105 speaks of the earthly habitation of God:

"In those days the Lord raised them to summon and testify to the children of earth concerning their wisdom. Show it unto them, for ye are their guides, and a recompense over the whole earth. For I and my Son will be united with them forever." (Enoch 105:1-2).

In the later Similitudes, which in the past have most frequently been considered a Christian interpolation but may be seen, below, to be more appropriately a Sadduclean-Christian writing, that which is immortal is seen as a heavenly phenomenon: "And all who dwell above in the heavens received command and power and one voice and one light like unto fire. And that One with their first words they blessed...and they were wise in utterance and in the spirit of life" (61:6-7). Although a present reality it is primarily a heavenly reality: "All the Holy Ones who are in heaven shall bless Him, and all the elect who dwell in the garden of life" (61:12). It should be noted that these "elect who dwell in the garden of life" are the Holy Ones who already exist in this state before a judgment of any sort has taken place. However, even in the later Similitudes it is not possible to be certain that the line is sharply drawn between the earthly and heavenly, but there is clearly a doctrine of immortality here: "And the righteous shall be in the light of the sun, and the elect in the light of eternal life: the days of their life shall be unending, and the days of the holy, without number" (58:3).

If the life of the immortal is in a heavenly Kingdom, it is strongly suggested to be one which has its threshold upon the
earth. This is particularly evident in the duties assigned to those, such as the archangel Phanuel: "who is set over repentance" unto hope of those who inherit eternal life" (40:9). So also this same book speaks of the lot of the righteous as being "preserved" in the name of the "Lord of Spirits", "for in His name they are saved" (48:7).

The Similitudes do not, in fact, give one a choice between heaven as the realm of god and earth as the realm of the mort 1 and wicked. Those who "deny the name of the dwelling of the Holy Ones and the Lord of Spirits" (i.e. the City of God as we have seen above) are said to have neither: "And into heaven they shall not ascend, and on earth they shall not come" (45:1-2). This passage reflects the precise relationship of resurrection and immortality in Sadducean and Urgemeinde theology. Resurrection is clearly seen as a resurrection to this life (again) and Translation as an ascension to heaven. This belief is corroborated by 51:1, "And in those days shall the earth also give back that which has been entrusted to it, and Sheol also shall give back that which it has received, and hell shall give back that which it owes". The earthly aspect of these events is also indicated by the "mountains which shall leap and the hills shall skip like lambs", "For in those days the Elect One (here an individual) shall arise, and the earth shall rejoice, and the righteous shall dwell upon it, and the Elect shall walk thereon" (51:5). Although these passages do not refrain from speaking of heaven in spiritual terms, the important point is that they, here, begin to make no distinction between heaven and earth, as the dwelling place of the immortal and the elect. Both are the dwelling place of the "Elect One"; both are transformed by God. This earthly state of immortality is further described in relation to the Son of man and the particular righteous and elect who have returned to bring these things to accomplishment:

"and the Lord of Spirits will abide over them, and with that Son of man they shall eat and lie down and rise up for ever and ever. and the righteous and elect shall
have risen from the earth, and cease to be of
downcast countenance. And they shall have been
clothed with garments of glory, and these shall be the
garments of life from the Lord of Spirits: And your
garments shall not grow old, nor your glory pass away
before the Lord of Spirits."

(Enoch 62:14-16)

This reference to the "garments of glory" and the "garments of
life", which shall "not grow old", is a teaching which is also
reflected in 108:12-14 and found among the Qumran Enoch frag-
ments, as well as the tradition: of the Urgemeinde. The teaching
clearly implies that it is not merely an old garment (or body)
which is renewed, but a completely new garment (or body) which
will not grow old. The Apostle Paul has used the word "tent" with
similar implications: "If the earthly tent we live in is destroyed,
we have a building from God, a house not made with hands,
eternal in the heavens"(II Cor. 5:1). Whereas Paul has mentioned
"further clothing, so that what is mortal may be swallowed up
by life"(II Cor. 5:4), the earlier Urgemeinde seems to have negated
the notion of preserving, or resurrecting, the old body by the
analogy of "attaching a new piece of cloth to the old". So in
the saying of Jesus to Nicodemus: "you must be born again", this
may be reflected, as in his words:

"No one sews a piece of unshrunk cloth on an old garment;
if he does the patch tears away from it, the new from
the old, and a worse tear is made. And no one puts new
wine into old wineskins; if he does, the wine will burst
the skins; but the new wine is for fresh skins."

(Mk. 2:21-22)

In the context of Enoch these sayings of Jesus are suggestive
of a more positive eschatological meaning with regard to the
immortal nature of the "Spirit". They are at least not out of harmony
with the immortality teachings preserved by the Urgemeinde.

In summarising the immortality teachings contained
in the Enoch literature, it has been observed that at the latest
as well as the earliest levels: a) there is no separation of
the body and soul, but an emphasis on the immortality of the
Spirit which is consistent with Sadducean eschatology as a whole,
b) the "Translation Theology" of Enoch has shown itself to be consistent both in its application to Enoch himself and its view of the afterlife in reference to the immortal "righteous elect" who will share in the Kingdom of the Son of Man on earth (future) as they already do in heaven, as a present reality, c) it may therefore be concluded that Enoch, along with the earlier Zadoniite writings contains clear evidence of both resurrection and immortality in its teachings, but the resurrection described is a particular resurrection to this life (rather than a future universal or general resurrection) and the immortality it describes is a present immortality of the righteous elect, independent of the "Judgments" which will befall the wicked.
A Cross-Section of the Jewish Immortality Beliefs in the Time of Christ:

Up to this point we have been engaged in a genetic analysis of immortality teachings throughout various layers of Sadducaic thought. We have traced their development from the earliest sons of Zadok, the Hasidim and the Zadokites up to the time of Herod the Great. We have found that there is a central line of development within the Sadducaic tradition, in the broader sense of that term, which has unmistakably emerged as a clear doctrine of immortality and a positive view of the afterlife within those circles of pre-Christian Jews who were to become an important and constitutive part of the earliest Christian community. The relationship of these teachings to the earliest stratum of Christian belief will be the subject of enquiry in the following chapters.

However, it is well to pause here and draw attention to some of the secondary developments in the central immortality tradition which began in the 1st century B.C. and were already on the scene by the time of Christ. Reflection on the multiplicity of these developments will serve to demonstrate that immortality in Jewish thought was not simply a case of one tradition superseding or eliminating another, or even one group of adherents supplanting another, so that by the time of Christ only the last link of an inevitable evolutionary chain of teaching on immortality was visible. On the contrary, traditions which have survived from this period disclose that by the year 30 A.D. there were a variety of Jewish teachings on resurrection, immortality and the afterlife which existed side by side whose cumulative effect was brought to bear on the early Christian Church as a whole. It may thus be useful to detach ourselves from this genetic analysis, for a brief moment, and view the subject under investigation from an entirely different perspective. We have attempted, at some length in the
previous chapters, to look down the longest strands of immortality tradition which reach back into the dark past of pre-Christian Jewish thought. We have now stopped at the point where these strands converge, so to speak, at the shuttle of the loom to rapidly glance at the cross-section of traditions before us, with their variety of teachings on immortality, resurrection and the afterlife. This should enable us to become more sensitive to the distinct shades of teaching which have gone into the fabric from which the proclamation of early Christianity was woven.

Apart from the first Christians, themselves, one of the most important bodies which was on the scene and literally dominated Jewish religious life in the year 30 A.D. was the Pharisaic Party. They were the powerful lay-movement and majority party of this time. Josephus has contrasted the Sadducees with the Pharisees of this time: "There are but few men to whom this (Sadduceic) doctrine has been made known, but these are men of the highest standing. They accomplish practically nothing, however. For whenever they assume some office, though they submit unwillingly and perforce, yet submit they do to the formulas of the Pharisees, since otherwise the masses would not tolerate them". 298 It is more than likely that the Christians, of this time, were also scarcely noticeable alongside the Pharisaic movement. There are two reasons, however, why the Pharisees have not been treated on the same scale as the Sadducees in this investigation, apart from the fact that a great deal has already been written on the Pharisees by others. First, they were a secondary and later development, as far as resurrection and immortality teachings were concerned, and secondly, their greater influence was on the eschatology of the Christians after the time of the Apostle Paul, rather than the Urgemeinde which often found itself in conflict with them.

It is now generally agreed that the Pharisaic schism, by which means they separated themselves from the central traditions of the Sadduceic priesthood, took place during
the reign of Alexander Jannaeus as high priest (103-76 B.C.)

In that they once stood on the same ground with the Sadducees before their well-known break, it might be expected that their eschatology and view of the afterlife would have much in common with the traditions of the Sadducees. So we have found that they are similar in many respects, but with several important differences. Both held to a certain view of resurrection and immortality, but with these differences: a) The Sadducees believed in the particular resurrection of certain elect ones whom God had chosen to bring about His judgment in the form of vengeance, thus a resurrection to this life; on the other hand, the Pharisees transformed this into a general resurrection, as a future phenomenon, at the end of time and thus it was an eschatological event which would accompany the destruction of the present world; its purpose was to provide reward for the righteous and punishment for the wicked. b) Like the Sadducean teaching, which is unparalleled in Greek philosophy or literature, for its unwillingness to separate the body and soul which it distinguishes from an imperishable Spirit, the Pharisees also appear to have considered the body and soul an inseparable unit. Whereas the Sadducees believed that the body-soul is a corruptible death-ridden phenomenon from which the immortal Spirit eventually departs, the Pharisees held that these (i.e. the flesh-soul) must be preserved and resurrected for purposes of Judgment. Thus it is likely that the Pharisees did not deny the immortality of the soul in their belief in the immortality (resurrection) of the body. c) If the Sadducees believed in an immortality, in which the elect participate, as a present reality, the Pharisees believed in a future immortality of both the body and the soul. Like the Hasidim and the Sons of Zadok in the Sadducean tradition, the Pharisees also believed in an eternal state of blessedness, but one which must follow a future general resurrection to Judgment. Rather than resurrection and judgment, the Sadducees tended to speak
of the Translation of the elect of God as a particular phenomenon. Thus the crucial question which divided Sadducaic and Pharisaic thought at this time was not merely the means by which these things would take place, but also the time and extent. When do these things happen; in the present or in the future? How widely do they occur; are they particular or universal events?

We next turn to the Essenes. To what extent were they in the Jewish religious scene during the time of Christ? There is an abundance of evidence to prove that their numbers were not small during this time. If they houses or societies throughout every village in Palestine, T.W. Manson has probably given a very conservative estimate when he suggested that they numbered about 4,000 at this time.305 Josephus indicates that they were barred from the Temple and the existence of a special "Gate of the Essenes", in the southwest corner of the city which dates from this period, suggests that they may have been banned from the holy city as well.306 This does not contradict the tentative suggestion offered here that the Essenes represented the levitical wing of the large Sadducaic priesthood, forced into seclusion originally in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes and again when the Pharisees came into power. Their view of immortality and the afterlife was thus similar to that of the Sadducees, as we have seen in the examination of their literature. Philo seems to reflect the tension which existed between these pro-Sadducaic Jews and the Pharisees when he states: "No one was able to lay charge against the society known as the Essaeans(Ἐσσαίοι), or Saints(Ἰάιοι); on the contrary, they were all defeated by the virtue of these men".307 Their exclusion from the holy city is explicable in terms of their pro-Egyptian leanings which would not find much favour with the pro-Syrian Pharisees. Philo says of their name(Ἐσσαίοι): "I think it may be related to the word 'holy ones' (Ἱαῖοι) indeed they are men utterly dedicated to the service of God".308 The levitical nature of their order is also corroborated by Josephus' long description of their manner of
living. Regarding their beliefs, it is not impossible that their teachings may have undergone some slight modifications by the year 30 A.D., but it is more likely that Josephus has misrepresented them when he stated: "the Essenes believed that the body is corruptible but that the soul is immortal and imperishable". Such a delineation does not seem appropriate to any of the Jewish teachings, and the Essene documents, which have now come to light, disclose that they did believe in resurrection in a limited sense, as we have qualified it above. However, one can agree with his statement of their aim in the year 30 A.D.: "Their aim was first to establish the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, and secondly to promote virtue and deter from vice", if one recognises the artificial distinction which he has introduced. It is perhaps correct that their primary teaching was the doctrine of immortality. As we have examined their views in some detail already, it is sufficient here to call attention to the fact that they were very much on the scene in the year 30 A.D. and perhaps had some relationship to the earliest Christian communities, whom they strongly resemble.

What had become of the original Sadducees, or legitimate Sons of Zadok who originally constituted a major part of the priesthood, by the time of Christ? It is clear that many of their leaders were either killed or put out of the way in the time of Queen Alexandra, when the Pharisees first came to power (76-67 B.C.). From Josephus and the Talmud it is clear that in Herodian times the priests whom Herod imported and appointed to office (the so-called "Sadducees", who were in fact Boethusians) appropriated, even by violence, more than their share of the priestly perquisites. Large numbers of the displaced (Sadducaic) priests died of hunger during this period because Herod's appointees seized the tithes upon which they depended for their sustenance. Josephus lists 20 high priests who held office before the fall of Jerusalem (in 70 A.D.), each of whom was ill-fitted for his office and resorted to either gross office seeking nepotism or cruelty. Pečachim is full of woes
against these false priests. Thus the high priests whom Herod appointed, although Jews from Alexandria who claimed priestly connections, were by no means of the same character or bearing as the Sadducees who preceded them. In spite of Herod's success in appointing the weakest individuals possible, in order that he might retain his grip on religious affairs, the Sadducees managed to maintain a certain amount of control in the Gerousia and the Temple. We have seen that many of his appointments were arbitrary from Alexandria and thus a particular outrage to the legitimate Sons of Zadok. The first was his father-in-law, the second his brother-in-law, who by chance happened to be of the noble Sadducees (rather than a Boethusian). When this proved too popular with the Jerusalem priestly aristocracy, he had the latter (a boy of 18) drowned and continued to appoint Boethusians. The true Sadducees had mainly abandoned the city of Jerusalem by the year 30 A.D. and were probably widely distributed throughout the villages and communities of Palestine. An example of such a priest was Zacharias, the father of John the Baptist who was a direct descendent of Eleazar (and thus a Son of Zadok). It is more than likely that large numbers of these priests were absorbed into the early Christian Church, as is indicated by Acts 6:7. This question will be discussed in greater detail below, but suffice it to note here that they would not have been Pharisees, who were essentially a lay-movement, nor would they have been Essenes, who were not essentially priests even though they were Zadokites and strongly pro-priestly in nature. It is also likely that many other Sadducees were absorbed by various Essene communities.

There were other parties in existence at this time such as the Herodians (which may have been another name for the Boethusians), The Circumcision Party (a Christian nickname for the Pharisees) Galileans and Sicarii (who were Zealots and had an eschatology similar to that of the Pharisees) and several others. Because they have left no distinctive teachings on immortality, resurrection or the afterlife, we call attention to them here.
The most important group, from the point of view of this investigation, was that of the early Christian believers in Jerusalem, namely, the Urgemeinde, a term which will be more fully defined in the following pages.
1. Here denotes a doctrine of "last things" based on a linear concept of time which thus views the Kingdom of God only as a future phenomenon.

1a. The International Rabbinical Conference held at Philadelphia, Pa., concluded: "Resurrection of the body has no foundation in Judaism" and that "belief in the immortality of the soul should take its place". Resolution 6, adopted by this assembly states: "The belief in the bodily resurrection has no religious foundation and the doctrine of immortality refers to the after existence of the soul only". Proceedings have been printed in the Jewish Ency. Vol.IV, p.214.


6. In Anti.xviii. 11, Josephus asserts that the Jews have had "three philosophies" from the most ancient times, but in xviii.23, he refers to a "fourth philosophy" of the Zealots. The Pharisees are compared with the Stoics in Vita 12 and the Essenes with the Pythagoreans in Anti.xv.371.

7. Occurs in the Mishna, Jadajim iv.6-7, Erubin vi.2, Makkoth i.6, Para iii.7, Nidda iv.2, the singular is pointed (פֵיתִ) in a codex of Erubin vi.2.


11. Josephus, Anti. xii.138-146; II Mac.3:2ff; cp.IMac.1:29ff.


18. Zaddok, Zadduk, Zaddouk, and Zaddoukh, are common transliterations of the name Zadok, throughout the ages. The letter "u" rather than "o", or even the doubling of the "d"(dagesh forte) presented no real difficulty to the fathers; G.R. Driver has taken the line that this difference implies a different group of people for each spelling, see the chapter entitled "Sadducees, Sadducaaeans and Zadokites" in his, "The Judaean Scrolls" oxford 1965, p.259ff; his distinction between the late post-Christian "Sadduceans"(Zealots and post-Christian Gnostics) and "Sadducees"is inappropriately applied to the pre-Christian Sadducees, Zadokites and Essenes.

19. Manson, Sadducee and Pharisee, op cit, pp.144-159.

20. LXX(Σάδουκη)in Ezek.40:46, 43:19, 44:15, 48:11, Ezra 7:2, Neh. 3:4, 3:29, 10:21, 11:11, 13:13; (Σαδουκειοκτος)in Ant. xviii.1.1, B.J. ii.17.109, ii.21.7; On two occasion Josephus uses the name(Σαδουκη)to designate not a Sadducee but a Zealot, B.J. ii.17.10(449-56), ii.21.7,(623-31)and the name(Αγανακτις Σαδουκη) Whackeray translates,"Son of Sadok", who by no means could be called a Sadducee; in the Vita xxxix.197, Josephus clearly distinguishes between(Σαδουκατος)a member of the aristocratic high priestly party and (Σαδουκη)denoting a follower of Judah and Sadok; this point seems to have been confused by pro-Pharisaic Rabbinic writers.

21. Manson, op cit, p.147.


23. Maintained by Edwyn Bevan,Jerusalem Under the High Priests, London 1904, p.100ff; See Josephus Ant.xii.140,141,142; op. E. Biorkermmann, La charte sélécucide de Jérusalem, art. in Rev. des Études Juives 100(1935)4-35.
24. Ant. xii. 414-419, xiii. 163, 259, 260-265, etc.


26. Hieronymus, Comm. on Matt. xxii. 23 (Vallars, ed. vii. 1. 177), he states: "Sadducei autem qui interpretantur justi"; Epiphanius, Haer. 14 says that (Σαδδουκαίοις) is the equivalent of (Δικαιούς).


30. Mishna, Shabbath, xvi. 1.


32. Bab. Talmud, Sanhedrin, 100b.


34. Bab. Talmud, Shabbath, 115a.

35. Mishna, Sanhedrin, x. 1.


38. Pal. Talmud, Pe'ah, 1. 1; Bab. Talmud, Gittin 45b, Sanhedrin 100a (where "mînim" occurs as a variant of "Saddūqîm").

39. Bab. Talmud, Sanhedrin 100b; also see Megillah 24b; G.R. Driver has supposed that "Sadduceans" implies another party as distinguished from the "Sadducees" because the Sadducees did not leave an, literature or doctrines behind them to be condemned, op cit, p.388.
40. Ant. xv.320, xvii.78, 339, xviii.3, it is possible that Boethos was himself the high priest and the father of Herod's third wife, Miriamne.


42. Billerbeck, Ibid, p. 34; but see Aboth de R. Nathan, v.

43. J. Wellhausen, Pharisäer und Sadduceäer. Hanover—1924, p. 46, dismisses the saying of Antigonus of Socho on the grounds that it does not contain an original writing, but a combination of learned sayings dependent on Aboth 1.3; but see the evaluation of Aboth in Taylor, Sayings of the Jewish Fathers, Cambridge 1877; also Jewish Ency. ix, p. 176, Frankel 188-189; Bacher, Tannaiten II, p. 437-453.

44. Ant. xii.43.

45. Rabbinic sources tend to date this whole tradition in the time of Simon II (who was not called the "Just") and consequently Marcus (Loeb, Josephus, III, p. 732-6) believes that Josephus has made a mistake. But at the latest the schism between the Boethusians and the Sadducees would have to be placed between 70-40 BC.


47. Baneth's translation is quoted by E. Schürer, Hist. op cit, II, ii, p. 32, n. 80, the original saying is from the Aboth (Jewish) or "Fathers", which is found in section ix, of the Nezikin (fourth part) of the Mishna; quoted also by Geiger, Urschrift, p. 105; Wellhausen, op cit, p. 46; Taylor, op cit, p. 126.

48. Josephus, B. J. iv. 9.11, v. 13.1, vi. 2.2, the first Boethos was appointed between 24 and 25 BC, by Herod the Great, Ant. xv.9.3, xvii.4.2, cp. xvii.5.1, xix.6.2, originally an Alexandrine family who achieved the following order of succession in Herod's appointments: 4, 7, 8, 17, 18, 26 as high priest; cf. Schürer's list, Hist. op cit, II, i, p. 197ff; the first Boethos was probably Herod's father in law.

49. Mentioned by Josephus as contemporary, "Matthias Son of Boethos (μαθαιος άφειτος), BJ iv. 9.11, v. 13.1, vi. 2.2.

50. Schürer, op cit, I, p. 33.

51. Baneth, Magazin für die Wissenschaft des Judenth. ix (1882) 1-37; See also, Taylor, op cit, p. 126.
52. See, Pirke Aboth, I; Herford, in the R.H. Charise, ed. Apoc. and Pseud. II, p.691, considers the saying among the oldest in the collection, p.687, "Be not like slaves who serve the master with a view to receiving a present; but be like slaves who serve the master not with a view to receiving a present and let the fear of Heaven be upon you".

53. Wellhausen, op cit, p.47-50; and his, Gescht.Israels, Vol.1, p.127-130, 230 ff; This origin has been held by Kuenen, Zadox en de Zadokleten, in Theol. Tydschr.(1869), pp.463-509.

54. In the Hebrew text of I Chron. 5:30-41.

55. Pirke Aboth i.3.


57. B.J. ii.165(Loeb) H.Thackeray, ed.

58. J.A.T.Robinson, The Body.London (1952)1963, p.11-16ff; cf H.Wheeler Robinson, The People and the Book(ed. A.S.Peake, 1925), p.362; Pedersen has said,"He (man) is a flesh-animated by-the-soul, the whole conceived as a psycho-physical unity", and "The body is the soul in its outward form", J.Pedersen, Israel, I-II(E.T.1926), p.171; Tresmontant, writes, "Indeed we should not say that man has a soul, but that he is a soul; nor consequently, that he has a body, but that he is a body", Claude Tresmontant, A Study of Hebrew Thought(tr.Michael Gibson)New York 1960, p.94; See also, Torlief Boman, Hebrew Thought Compared with Greek(tr.J.L.Moreau)London 1960.

59. Hippolytus, Ref. ix.29; on Hippolytus' sources see, M. Black, art. in Essays in honour of C.H.Dodd(Cambridge 1956).

60. Mishna, Jadajim, iv.6.


59b. Augustine, Confessions, Bk.x-xiii.

60. Mishna, Jadajim, iv.6.

62. The poem written by Tyrtaeus entitled πολτεία, frag. 6-7, praises the virtue of dying for one's country and ends by urging young men to valour.


65. Phaedo, 82.

66. If Mt. 25:14-30, is held in relation to 25:31-46.


68. Josephus, Contra Apion. i.164.

69. This direct quotation is recorded by Josephus in Contra Apion, i.164 and is corroborated by Eusebius, Praep. Evang. xiii.12, 664 A and several others.

70. As quoted by Eusebius, Praeparatorio Evangelica, xiii.12, 664 A; Supported by Thackeray, footnote (e) in Loeb, Josephus I, p.229

71. Contra Apion. i.164.

72. Contra Cels. i.15.


74. W. Jaeger, Jour. of Rel. xviii (1938) p.131.


76. Eusebius, Praep. Evang. ix.5.
77. Josephus, Contra Apion. 1.180-182; See also, Clearchus, On Education, which contains similar references to the Jews; Substantiated by Diogenes Laertius, Proem ix; And supported by Clem. Strom. i.15, as cited by Th. Reinach, followed by Thackeray, Loeb Josephus I, p.235.

78. Contra Apion. 1.178.

79. Ibid. 1.175.


83. Menekles (customs officer at Tyre), Alexis (chief of police at Jaffa), Oinas and Alexandros (office of hyparchy; cf. PCZ 59018, 59077, 59093), Diódorus (who is in charge of increasing trade in Gaza), PSJ 628; cf. The registration of property in every hyparchy (or villages which were not yet recognised as Poleis) and tax exempt property, SB 8008, 17; to be carried out annually, Ibid, 23; the declaration of slaves on acquisition, Ibid, 33ff; and the fines imposed on those not declaring, Ibid, 39; These agents of the finance minister sometimes profited themselves, PCZ 59093; Mizrāim, 68 and Tarbitz, 4, 244; PSI 616 contains a description of the group of agents, Mizrāim, 30; also cf. Rostovtzeff, op cit, p.34.

84. PCZ 59003.

85. This term is essentially a military term designating both the style of training and fighting of a certain type of soldier in the Hellenistic Period and need not imply either ethnic or racial origins.

86. Ovid, Met. iii.236, iv.610, vii.294; Pliny, N.H. v.13.69, Demosthenes, Hist. lxx.20; Polyb. Hist. v.705, xvi.18.2; Herodotus, Hist. 1.105.

87. Article by Six, Observations sur les monnaies phéniciennes, in Numismatic Chronicle (new series) xvii (1877) 177-271, Six presents evidence that Athenian coins came in trade to Gaza as early as 500 B.C., p.230ff.
89. Ps. 138:1, and 86:8; cp. 95:3, 96:4, etc.
91. Cited by Schürer, op cit. II.1.28; Four Stoic philosophers, Antiochus (teacher of Cicero), Sosus, Antibius, and Eubius; two famous grammarians Ptolemaeus, and Dorotheas; two historians were Apollonius and Artemidorus (Stephanus of Byzantium, loc.cit: Askalduny, cited by Fabricius, Biblioth. graeca, ed. Harles 1.521, vi.156ff suggests that Ptolemaeus was from the 2nd century B.C.; The Epicurean Philodemus was from Gadera, and the Cynic Menippus (1st Cent.B.C.); See, Hamburger, Realencyclop. für Bibel and Talmud, Part II, art. "Griechenthum", most of these, however, are from the 1st Century B.C., during a Renaissance of Greek culture after its rejection following Seleucid enforcement.
92. See the edict of Claudius, Ant. xix.279ff, written to settle a dispute between the Alexandrine hellenised Jews and later Hellenist settlers in Alexandria. The edict urges Jews not to seek the office of "Gymnasialarch". There is some question whether the rescript of this edict in a letter to Alexandria is authentic, but the letter makes this point even sharper; cf. Claudius' Letter to the Alexandrines, British Museum, 921; prim. ed. in H.I.Bell, Jews and Christians in Egypt, 1924, p.lff; also cf. F.F.Bruce, Christianity under Claudius, BJRL 44(1961-62)pp.309-326.
94. Elias Bickerman, From Ezra to the Last of the Maccabees, tr. Moses Hadas (Foundations of Post Biblical Judaism), N.Y. 1947, p.53; See also Jeanne Louis Robert, Inscriptions grecques de Lydie, p.129.
97. Ibid.
98. Ant. xii.241.
99. See above footnote 93.
100. Mt. 27:47, par. Mk.15:35, Lk.9:54 "and consume them even as Elijah did?", Mt.16:14, 17:3, par. Mk.9:5 for Enoch, Jude14.
101. See also Ezek. 40:46, 43:19, 44:15-16, 48:11-12; E. Schürer (II.479ff)II.11.223, I.1.188; Regarding Onias IV, see Ant. xii.388, xiii.62,64 (see note in Loeb ed.)xx.236, D.J.vii. 422-3,432, on the basis of the temple built by an Oniad and served by Zadokites at On in Egypt, G.R. Driver and E. Bammel link the high priest Onias III with the history of the Zadokites, see Driver, The Judean Scrolls, op cit, p.226; Fr. A. Michel, in his, Le Maître de justice d'après les documents de la Mer Morte, la Littérature apocryphe et rabbinique (Avignon 1954) p.321, has stated that Onias III was not the leader of a Hasidaean party but the acclaimed leader of the "Sons of Zadok and Rightful Teacher"; One later Rabbinic source would place Onias III among the Pharisees, B.T. Ta'anith 234, but that is anachronistic, because the Pharisees had not yet come into existence, and unlikely, because a famous hellenised high priest would not associate, necessarily, with an essentially lay anti-hellenistic movement.


103. II Mac. 4:32, indicates that it was by stealth that he murdered Onias III and he is plainly referred to as "Menelaus" rather than "Onias IV"; According to II Mac. 4:23, Menelaus was the brother of Simon the Benjamite (cf. II Mac. 3:4) and not Onias III as Josephus has wrongly suggested in Ant. xii.238.

104. Ant. xii.384.

104a Ant. xii.139-144, 145-146.

105. The elementary studies of the Ephebol consisted of reading, simple arithmetical and music: the whole being called (μουσική). Some of the Greeks at Iconium (Acts 14:1) may well have been the type of teachers (γραμματιστής) Josephus noticed elsewhere. Parallel to this were the later catechetical schools in Alexandria which designed its curriculum to progress toward Judeo-Christian doctrine by way of the Greek classics, arithmetical, music and the "liberal arts". It need not be assumed that the Levites, who were in charge of "music" among these pre-Christian Jews, concerned themselves only with instrumental accompaniment for public worship. The canonical psalms indicate that their rhetoric included a poetry of a type of Jewish immortality cult in a class by itself. Philo, Legit. ad Cajum. 20, has described the multitude of Synagogues in Alexandria which bear the marks of Hellenism. Evidence of similar pan-hellenist Synagogues occur in Acts 6:9, cp 9:20; Tosefta Megilla iii; Jer. Megilla 73d. Attention should also be called to the fact that Herod the Great offered prizes for the performance of "music" (μουσική) in the Greek sense of the term at the feasts at Jerusalem. The recitation of poetry, declamation and philosophical discourse were as standard a part of ancient feasts as vocal "music" is today, (Ant. xv.276-277) xv.8.1; cf. Herod's new Gymnasia, Ant. xvi.5.3.
106. IIMac. 4:12.

107. IIMac. 4:14.


109. These Antiochean Decretals are similar to the Aramaic decrees of Ezra, which now have been shown to be genuine, as originally suggested by Eduard Meyer and now substantiated by such Iranian specialists as H.H. Schaeder, E. Meyer, Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums (1925) Vol. II, p. 126-7. Most classical critics agree that in matters of imperial organisation, the Seleucids did as a matter of policy, follow the procedures of their Persian ancestors, Rostovzeff, Camb. Ancient Hist. vii. p. 180; cf. Bevan, The House of Seleucus, op cit, II, p. 296-297. This Antiochean "Charter of Jerusalem" as quoted by Josephus has now been authenticated by the discovery of several Seleucid inscriptions, which are clearly dated and identified, Supplementum epigraphicum Graecum, op cit, II, p. 663; and W. Dittenberger, Orientis Graecis Inscriptiones Selectae; Josephus Ant. xv. 417; cp. C. Bradford Wells, Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period, 1934, Nr. 40, p. xxxvii, 1; The Amyzon inscr. which verifies the Josephus version of the decreals has been linked to Antiochus III by Wells, who takes it to be the work of a Royal official of the king before the Syrian campaign of 201 B.C., which later destroyed all that the decreals accomplished.

110. Lk. 2:46, Jh. 7:15, Lk. 6:40, Jh. 3:4, etc.

111. Ant. xii. 240; The fact that Jason's request to establish (or receive endorsement for) his Gymnasium and Menelaus' request to build a separate Gymnasium, indicates the author's awareness of two distinctly separate institutions. The former presumably did not have a separate building (apart from the Temple) which is the essence of the latter request. The attempt to abolish circumcision is mentioned for the first time in connection with Menelaus.

112. Ant. xii. 241.

113. Ant. xii. 239.


115. IIMac. 4:25.

116. IIMac. 4:32.
117. IIMac.4:35.

118. IIMac.6:1ff, Menelaus blamed his crimes on Lysimachus, an officer of Antiochus whom he promptly executed. He was indicted by the King, but exonerated. Later, the three members of the "Council of Elders" who bore witness against him were executed in his place, IIMac.4:41ff.

119. IIMac.6:1.

120. IIMac.6:2, here called the "Temple of Zeus the Friend of Strangers".

121. Ant.xii.261.

122. Ant.xii.251.

123. Ant.xii.240.

124. Ant.xii.241.

125. IMac.1:15; IIMac.4:9, refers to a founding of a Gymnasium but makes no mention of the removal of circumcision.

126. His countenance was depicted as emitting rays of the sun, G.H. Box, Judaism in the Greek Period (Oxford 1932) p.33.

127. The mysteries of Mithras could be repeated only once in 20 years to refresh the soul, purify it of sin, renew the spiritual youth of the devotee and make him a new person; So, F.C. Grant, Roman Hellenism (Edinburgh 1962) p.18; The Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum, VI.510 (in the, H.Dessau, Inscriptiones latinae selectae, 4152, Vol.II, Part I, p.146) says: "Taurobolio criobolique in asterum renatus", or "Reborn unto eternity by the bloodbath of the bull and the ram". Almost a Christian statement apart from the reference to the bull and the ram. It is dated Aug. 13, 376 A.D. from the altar of the Emperor Valens; See also, H.S. Jones, "Mithraism", Ency.of Rel. and Ethics, ed. J.Hastings (1915) VII, pp.752-9; E.Wust, art. "Mithras", Real-Encyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft, ed. A Pauly, G. Wissowa (1932-ff) XV, Part II, col.2131-55; However, the main collection of sources on this subject is found in F. Cumont, Texts et monuments figures relatifs aux mysteres de Mithra, (2 vol.)1903 (tr.3rd ed. Chicago 1913); M.J. Vermaseren, Corpus Inscr. Relig. mithriacae (Hague 1956).

128. IIMac.11:23.
129. Tertullian found the similarities to Christianity so striking that he dismissed them as a deliberate parody the Devil had inspired on the Christian sacraments, Tertullian, De Bapt. 5; See also De praescr. haeret. 40 and De corona 15; See A. D. Nock, "Mithras", Jour. of Roman Studies, xxviii, pp. 103-113; Clement of Alexandria, Protr. II. 118 and I. 83ff speaks at length of Christianity in terms of a Dionysiac analogy; Justin, Apol. (I. 66. 4, 52. 2, cp. I. 59. 6, 62. 2) mentions this curious analogy to the cult of Mithras, and its use of bread and cup of water in its mysteries as an "imitation in advance", by "daimones" of the Eucharist; G. Textes et monuments, II, p. 20.

130. Tertullian, De Bapt. 5; De praescr. haeret. 40; De corona 15; On the triad of Zeus, Aphrodite and Dionysus, some have held that the triad should include the virgin goddess Athena in Jerusalem rather than Aphrodite because she was more war-like; So the Byzantine writer John Malalas in his Chronography (W. Weber, Studien zur Chronik des Malalas, in Festgabe fur A. Deissmann (1927) pp. 20-66, and also, Bickermann, Der Gott, op cit, p. 112 discuss this historical fragment) associated Athena with Jerusalem, but he also associated Athena with the Arab goddess Allat and the Phoenician goddess Anat, but this does not seem probable in view of the existence of both internal and external evidence for a Dionysiac cult at Jerusalem during time of Menelaus; The association of Mithras with Dionysus and their relation to Eleusis, as seen from Demosthenes, "De Corona" has been noticed by J. Steinbeck, Kultische Waschungen und Bader im Heidentum und Judentum und ihr Verhaltnis zur christlichen Taufe, in Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift 21 (1910) 778ff; Also, Kittel, TWNT, I. pp. 528-33; H. Rahner, Greek Myths and Christian Mystery, p. 70.

131. Dionysus was one of the gods of the Mithras cult at Antioch and is mentioned by name in connection with the cult imposed by Menelaus on Jerusalem (IIMac. 6: 7). Its teachings regarding the underworld (Nether world) or even intermediate state, thus would have been particularly abhorred by proper Jews.


133. Segal, JBL lxx (1951) 132; cp. IQS vi. 2, 9 and CD iv. 3-4, v. 2-5 (C. Rabin ed.) and lines 3-4 (p. 4) and lines 4-5 (p. 5) Schechter ed.

134. CD vi. 2 (P) 17, 11 R. H. Charles ed.

135. Ezek. 40: 46, 44: 15, 46: 11; IChr. 29: 22, gives highest praise to the Zadokite priests as does Sirach (Ecclesiasticus).
136. IChr. 29:22.

137. CD v.6 (RHC ed.).

138. CD ii.10 (B)ff, they believed in both a Messianic Priest and a Messianic King, both designated as "anointed"—the priest having precedence over the king his "co-messiah", IQH vii.20-21; So the "Benedictions"(IQSb iii.22ff) contain a blessing of the priests "Zadok's Sons"(following iii.22,iv.1ff), and give an exalted and immortal place to a Messianic High Priest(IQSb iv.22-28); So also Zechariah(4:14) mentions two "anointed ones"(4Q i.3-4) contains a patriarchal blessing for the Messianic King and (IQSa ii.11-12,14,20) and the anointed one as begotten by God; CD ii.12 and vi.1 speak of "anointed ones" in a plural sense as in IQM xi.7-8, which "anointed ones" make known the epochs or ages; Fragment IQ.30 mentions a "holy messiah", CD vi.1 says "holy anointed ones". Clearest reference to two specific Messiahs is in CD xix.10-11,"there shall come the anointed ones of Aaron and Israel, cp. CD xx.1, xii.23 "there shall arise the anointed one of Aaron and Israel", also mentioned by the fragment of xiv.19.

139. CD vii.12-20.

140. CD ix.7.


142. J.T.Milik, op cit, p.80.

143. CD v.6-8, defiling the sanctuary etc., an allusion to the abomination of desolation by Antiochus IV and the false priest Menelaus. IIMac. 6:11, refers to those observing the Sabbath in secret in caves who were burned by Philip because their piety kept them from defending themselves on the Sabbath.

144. JBL lxxv(1956)91ff, in his discussion of 4Q Nahum, line 7, Allegro holds the Pharisees to be the enemies of the "Lion of Wrath"; T.H. Gaster, The Dead Sea Scriptures (London 1957) p.243, holds that the "young lion" wrought vengence on behalf of the Covenanters; H.H.Rowley, in V.T. ix(1954)389ff, holds to the earliest dating of the documents and does not deny the association of the "Lion of Wrath" with Judas, but would take the reference to Demetrius to be a reference to Demetrius I and not III, thereby acknowledging the contemporaneity of this document to early Maccabean times.
145. 2QpHab. 11.5–6 (Gaster ed.) op cit, p.239.

146. J.T. Milik, Ten Years Discovery (London 1954) p.66–7, considers this an unmistakable reference to the Wicked Priest. It is significant that the Covenanters considered Jerusalem "their city" and the Temple, "their Temple" in spite of their banishment, CD ix.19, IQS ix.3, IQM ii.5–6, vii.11. This last passage gives instruction as to how the sacrifices are to be executed until the usurpers are removed from Jerusalem.

147. IMac.2:42, II Mac.14:16.

148. pNah. 11.11, cp. IQH ii.15, 32, refers to the seekers of smooth things that put the man of truth into the pit.


155. Polybius Hist. xxix. 27–28, also describes the manner in which the Roman ambassadors snatched Egypt from Antiochus Epiphanes at the moment of his victory over the Ptolemies.


157. Mainly because the Kittim are said to have sacrificed to their military standards, which G.R. Driver has assumed only Romans were capable of doing in this period, JQR xlv(1953–54) p.3–11.

158. The only passage which comes close to this is the simple reference in the Qumran Manual of War (IQM 1.4), "the Kittim of Ashur" and the "Kittians in Egypt", by no means suggests that the Ptolemies were ever called "Kittians" or "Kittim".


160. T.H. Gaster, Scriptures of the Dead Sea Sect, op cit, p.248, has interpreted this Demetrius to be Demetrius Eucerus (88 BC),
but he does not explain how the rest of the document can be placed in the historical context of Antiochus IV (175-163 B.C.); F. Cross and J. Allegro, say Demetrius III, cf. The Ancient Library, op cit, p.92-4; also G.R. Driver, Hebrew Scrolls from the Neighborhood of Jericho and the Dead Sea (Oxford 1951), and Hebrew Scrolls IQ1a, JTS11(1951) p.17-30; also G. Roth, Commentary, Oct. (1957) p.317, and Evidences, June-July (1957) p.37, March (1958) p.13, and in the PEQ xc (1958) p.104; but see Dupont-Sommer, Evidences, December (1957) p.27. On the other hand J.T. Milik, holds this to be a reference to the time of Antiochus III, Ten Years, op cit, p.72; The calculations of H.H. Rowley in V.T. ix (1959) p.388, have not been shaken by these conjectures. In a careful examination of all the data available, Rowley, JBL lxxv (1956) 188-93, has maintained that this is Demetrius I; Op. also his Historical Background, op cit, p.42.


162. H.H. Rowley has built a strong case for such an association in the Zadokites' outspoken denunciation of marriage with a niece; a particular and flagrant offence committed by Joseph the son of Tobias; see, H.H. Rowley, The Internal Dating of the Dead Sea Scrolls, in Analecta Lovaniensia Biblica et Orientalia, Ser. II, Fasc. 30, p.265ff; Prof. M. Black has associated the Teacher of Righteousness with the Hasidim as well as the Sons of Zadok, whom he considers to have been an organisation (i.e. the Hasidim) which came into existence during the time of Onias III, see, M. Black, The Scrolls and Christian Origins (New York 1961) p.20ff.

163. 11Mac. 4:35.

164. 11Mac. 4:36.

165. 11Mac. 4:37.

166. 11Mac. 4:38.

167. 11Mac. 13:4-8.

169. IQH xiv.17-19, brackets in the translation represent re-
constructed portion or lacuna in the manuscript. I have
here followed closely the Mansoor-E.J. Brill edition of
the Hymns.

170. IQH 11.13, par. to IQS viii.6 and IQH Hab.x.13; also CD 1.8;
That their school was known as a "House of the Law" is seen
in CD ix.35, 37.

171. IQH 11.13, H. Bardtke, *Die Loblieder von Qumran* TLZ 82(1957)
col. 339-348, loc cit, translates, "Dolmetscharder Erkenntnis
durch wunderbare Geheimnisse", an interpreter of knowledge
through wondrous mysteries. The writer is thus suggested to
be unique in Hebrew literature for his unusual teachings
which were hitherto undisclosed mysteries. Nötcher
has held, "It is probably a man in an eminent leading posi-
tion, possibly the Teacher of Righteousness himself...but it
is incumbent upon him to influence the community through his
teaching. Only such a man could say about himself something
as bold as this passage." Nötcher, *Zur Terminologie der
Qumran-Texte* (Bonn 1956), 73; M. Mansoor, op cit, suggests
"interpreter of knowledge by wondrous secrets" at IQH 11.13;
See also IQH xiv.8 and Brownlee, op cit, p.13.

172. IQH vi.3,11 (Mansoor ed.); cp. p Hab. 11.2-3 which also sug-
gests his function as a head of a school or teacher.

173. IQH vi.12.

demonstrates that (יָפֵּה )"denotes some official intermediary
or go between"; Mansoor, op cit, p.143, cites Is.43:27 where
(יָפֵּה )is generally rendered "spokesmen", "mediators" rather
than "interpreters" of the Word of God. So also, K. Marti,
*Das Buch Jesaia*, p.274, holds that the term is a reference
to the prophets who were basically "mediators" and "speakers"
and not necessarily "interpreters"; Cq. II Chr. 32:31,(יָפֵּה );
and Job 33:23,(יָפֵּה )and (יָפֵּה )are "angel" and "mediator",
However, the present passage clearly repudiates any mediator,
"There is no mediator". Most have assumed on the basis of
this passage an elaborate angelology at *Qumran* (despite the
fact that none has been brought to light); So, R. de Vaux,
*Le travail d'édition des fragments manuscrits de Qumran*, in
*RB* 63(1956)49-67, suggests an elaborate angelology as in
later Rabbinic and Ebionitic literature, but there is no
basis, as yet, for this supposition on the strength of
what has actually 'come' to light among the *Qumran* documents.

175. I have here used the text of the J. Licht edition and have
followed closely the translations of M. Wallenstein, in the
Nezer and the Submission in Suffering (Leiden 1957); also his,
Hymns from the Judean Scrolls, Manchester 1950; as well as


177. Cf. Gen 2:9,17, "the tree of knowledge of good and evil"; So "under the tree" (or wood), particularly the fig tree, the Jew received moral instruction (Jn.1:48-50, cp. Mt.7:17-18 and Lk.6:43); Perhaps more in the sense of a place of family instruction (Lk.4:25, Mich.4:4, Zech.3:10), but it is significant that the learned scholars and rabbis, who met at Jamnia, met "under the vines", for which the school became known.

178. IQH v11.6.


180. ( פָּנַי הַנַּעַר ) or ( פָּנַי הַנִּיאֶר ) as it occurs in plate VIII, is generally translated "a mighty warrior", as in Jud.6:12, 11:1, Isam.9:1; The plural form, as it occurs in the Hodayot, ( פָּנַי הַנַּעַר ) also occurs in IlMz.15:20, and ( פָּנַי הַנִּיאֶר ) in IChr.7:5, 11:40; The same term is used of God in Ps.24:8, Deut.10:17, Jer.32:18, Neh.9:32.

181. Jh.4:14.


183. Cp. IQH v11.4-6, ix.28.

184. IQH iv.27-28, Mansoor has called attention to the manner in which the term "many" is frequently used in the Manual (IQS) in relation to the term "few". Rather than a designation for the "sect", it seems likely that this may have been a simple reference to the majority following of the hellenised Jews as over against the "few" who went along with Menelaus. This passage refers to the "mysteries" which only God can make known, IQH 1.21, 11.13, 11.10, xiii.2,13, IQM xiv.14, IQS ix.18, x.1.5, etc. also refer to these mysteries; Cf. "asured understanding and the knowledge of God's mystery, of Christ, in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge" (Col.2:2); also, "Servants of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God" (Cor.4:1); Rom.11:25 speculates that the mystery is that "The full number of the Gentiles will come into Israel; On the subject of "mystery" see, R.E. Brown, Semitic Background of the New Testament Mysterion (II), Biblica 40(1959)p.73.

185. IQH iv.31, Used in a generic sense.
186. E. Dhorme, Comptes Rendus de l'Academie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres (Paris 1951), 192ff; A. Vincent, Les Manuscrits, in Espirit et Vie (Abbaye de Maredsous, Belgium) 4 (1951) 434-457, esp. 456ff; J. Klausner, Jesus of Nazareth (London 1929) p. 202, says these were the "first Hasidim" as the Talmud regards them the forerunners of the other parties; Mishnah Aboth, 1.2,3, refers to the defenders of the Torah who were repressed under Syrian rule as the "Sopherim", but they have no other name than "first Hasidim" in the Talmud; R.T. Herford, The Pharisees (Boston 1962) p. 27, esp. 33, says they should be the forerunners of the Pharisees, but establishes no line of connection between the Hasidim and the Pharisees; cp. E. Schürer, Hist. II. 11. p. 26.

187. J. Klausner, Ibid. p. 202, simply refers to the original Hasidim as the martyrs for the Torah from this period without any other designations.

188. Other occurrences of the term (ת Şiון) in a similar historical setting are: Ps. 12:1, 16:10, 30:4, 31:13-23, 37:28ff, 50:5, 18, 116:15. That the Psalm is designated a "Psalm of David" by those who placed it in the canon, by no means indicates that it was written by David or that it reflects the time of David any more than the "Book of Daniel" does the time of Nebuchadnezzar. It is not impossible that its authors were from among the Sons of Zadok (who was anointed at the same time as David, but as high priest) and thus dedicated their Psalms to David.


190. Ant. xiii. 171 (xiii. 5. 9).

191. W. O. E. Oesterley, The Psalms (London 1939) chapter 7, shows that most critical scholars have dated the composition of Psalm 110 in the 2nd century B.C. Bickell, has held that the initial four verses contain an acrostic to the great high priest Simon. This has been disputed by Briggs, I. C. C., loc. cit., who holds that nevertheless many of the Psalms, Test XII, Ecclesiasticus, Jubilees and several others should be assigned to the 2nd century B.C.

192. pNah. 11. 11, "Demetrius, the king of Yawan, who at the instance of them that sought smooth things, sought to enter Jerusalem".
193. I Mack. 7:13, 7:16, "He slew them", the subject is Bacchides not Alcimus who became high priest after Menelaus; I Mack. 7:17, "Flesh of the Saints"; cp. the "Council of 70" which is used interchangeably with the Hasidim in the Hagiga, 18,b.

194. (Χηων’) here, is occasionally translated, "foundation" but the term may designate 'Council', 'assembly', 'foundation' or 'counsel', see Mowinckel, JBL 75(1956)272. 'Council' is the meaning taken by Vermees, cp cit, p.158. Its use in IQS x.25, seems to be dependent on Is.26:1-3, which refers to a "strong city" protected by walls and bulwarks; see, L. Köhler, Der hebräische Mensch (Tübingen 1953) and his discussion of (υκνην) on page 89ff.

195. In note 2 of the Mansoor edition of the Hymns(v.23-27, ad loc) it is stated that this passage refers to a rebellion of the "sect" who turned against the author(compare 2.1 used with υκνην line 23), "the author refers to the unfaithfulness and rebellion of the members of the sect who had turned against him". But this argument seems weak because: a) we do not have evidence for a serious schism within the community itself, and b) the editor does not here define "sect" or the nature of the Covenant Community, which he separates from the Jerusalem scene.


197. In Ant.xi.364, Josephus mentions the (συνεδριον) of 500 members at Gaza; cp. the recently discovered inscription from Gerasa; B.J. 11.639, refers to the "eminent men of the Council of Tiberias" which consisted of 600 men.

198. Herbert Danby, The Tractate Sanhedrin: The Mishna (London 1919) 1.5, states: "The Great Sanhedrin is composed of 71 members and the little Sanhedrin of 33... How can you tell that the Great Sanhedrin should have 71 members? It is written: 'Gather unto me seventy men of the elders of Israel', and these with Moses makes 71. Rabbi Jehuda is of the opinion that there should be only 70 (including Moses), Num.11:16". Sanhedrin, iv.4, describes the aristocratic character of the Sanhedrin and states that it gave membership for life. Sanhedrin iv.2 delimits its power: "In cases where there is no question of a death sentence..."
(---- --), any (member) may give judgment, but in the trial of capital offences only priests, levites and those Israelites who are qualified to ally themselves with a priestly family by marriage shall do so."

199. Ant. xii.138-144.

200. Ibid.

201. In addition to those mentioned above passages which describe events relevant to this martyred Council and the betrayal of the high priest(Teacher) may be found in the following Zadokite Scrolls: CD xiv.8ff, 14ff, CD iv.2(RHC,ed.)viii.6(cp 15), ix.23,37,46, xv.1-3; IQH v.23-25 and pHab.x.10-11,etc.

202. II Mac. 7:9.

203. II Mac.7:11.

204. II Mac.7:14.

205. I Cor. 15:51-52.


208. II Mac.14:38ff, by no means suggests that Razis was a new member of a new subversive Gerousia, he obviously was so completely hellenised that he was taken for a Greek or pro-Syrian until he was accused of "Judaism" by the agents of Menelaus.

209. II Mac. 14:42.

210. II Mac. 15:15.


213. R.B. Laurin, The Question of Immortality in the Qumran Hodayot, JSS 3(1958)344-355; cp. C.Rabin, on the other hand believes that certain passages must be taken for references to either resurrection or immortality; Rabin, Qumran Studies, (London 1957)73-74; J. van der Ploeg, The Excavations at
Qumran (London 1958) p.108, holds that these particular passages can be interpreted in more than one way. He does not suggest that resurrection or immortality are ruled out, by any means.

214. Laurin, op cit, ad loc.

215. IQH iii.20-23, "An eternal foundation"; cp. (א"ל תורפ יא"ל) as in Prov. 10:25, the above expression is also used in IQS x.25 and IQH ii.10.


218. CD vii.18-21.

219. This position is suggested by E. Schweizer, Gegenwart des Geistes und eschatologische Offnung, in Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology (C.R. Dodd) op cit, p.493; also the position which seems to be taken by W.D.Davies, Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls; and his, Flesh and Spirit, in Scrolls and the New Testament, op cit, p.117; see also his, "Knowledge", In the Dead Sea Scrolls and Matthew 11:25-30, HTR 46(1953)113-39.

220. Laurin, op cit, p.354, claims that the author is speaking "hyperbolically" and cites IQH vi.7, with which he dismisses IQH vi.13, and concludes that the writer was using poetic license. He has summarised: "The Hodayot do not conceive of immortality for the righteous, either in the body or in the soul. As we would expect they use the timeless expressions of the Biblical Psalms, but this is implicit in any real fellowship with God", op cit, p.355.

221. As with those who have held that the Covenanters were "Zealots" such as G.F.Driver, in Hib.Jour.xlix(50-51)11ff; JTS ii (1951) 17-30; cp. his, The Hebrew Scrolls from the Neighbourhood of Jericho and the Dead Sea (Oxford 1951); W.R.Farmer, Maccabees, Zealots, and Josephus (New York 1956) p.160; But especially R.B.Laurin, The Question of Immortality in the Qumran 'Hodayot', JTS 3(1958)p.355.

222. B.J. ii.154, Josephus identifies their teachings with the Greeks directly, without qualification, and attributes to them a hellenistic eschatology, e.g. "the soul is immortal and imperishable".
227. J. Allegro, Further Light on the History of the Qumran Literature, JBL 75(1956)95; his argument that 'the Wicked Priest will be judged' is convincing enough, but there is no evidence that he is to be raised up from the dead for this purpose.
230. I Cor. 15:51. There are good reasons for holding that this teaching was not original with Paul, because of its nature as a quotation, but this will be discussed in greater detail below.
233. So Nötscher has translated [כֶּנֶּגֶד תַּעֲשֶׂה וְיָשָׁר] "at the time of judgment all the Sons of Truth will awake", instead of placing this in relation to the preceding verb: "The sword of God will hasten the time of judgment, and all his true Sons shall be awakened". Prof. Mansoor has translated this same passage: "His true children shall be roused to (destroy the sons) of wickedness; and all the sons of guilt shall no longer be".
234. C. Rabin, The Zadokite Documents (Oxford 1956), ad loc; also see Qumran Studies, op cit, ibid.
235. M. Mansoor, op cit, n. 146, note 11(דועה מ"ז instead of [דועה ו]).
236. IQH x1.11-14, the parenthesis represent Mansoor's reconstruction of the lacuna in the Licht text.
237. As in Vermes translation, The Dead Sea Scrolls, op cit, p.186.
238. IQH x1.12(דועה) is restored here, cf. IQH iii.20, IQS x.25, IQH ii.10; see also L.Köhler, Der hebräische Mensch (Tübingen 1953) 3.8ff.
Portions of the Zadokite Document (CD) found among the Dead Sea Scrolls.

The number of those who are convinced that the Essenes originated earlier than Hasmonean times is ever increasing. J.T. Milik places the actual writing of the Damascus Document (Zadokite Document, CD) later than the Rule of the Community, but nevertheless is convinced that the group it describes existed before the Maccabean Revolution in 167 B.C., op cit, p.59. Others who take this position include: F.M. Cross, Ancient Lib., op cit, p.82; Segal, Habakkuk Commentary and the Damascus Fragment, JBL lxxx(1951)131; J. Allegro, Further Light on the History of the Qumran Sect, JBL lxxv(1956)89; also Liver, HTR 52(1959)149-185, esp.181.

His very brief discussion in, The Essene Writings, op cit, p.43

242. See above p. 106 ff and note 215 and 194; especially Mowinckel, JBL 75(1956)272; Gesenius, Hebrew and Chaldee Lex. (1954)p.580 gives as the primary meaning of (יהוה): "an assembly" or "sitting together" as "judges consulting together and the primary meaning of (יהוה), its root: "to found" in the sense of ordain and appoint (as in IIChr. 31:17 and Ps.8:3). But it does have the connotation of the "anointed" who "meet together in council" as a priestly council. Thus the term (יהוה) "couch" or "sitting together" is used interchangeably with (יהוה) hence "a council". It is precisely this term used of David and Samuel when they "ordained" Zadok, high priest and 1,760 of his household "for the service of the house of God" (IChr. 9:22) Thus its implication is not only a Council but an "ordained" or an established Council.

243. In IQH v.23-27, "assembly" (יהוה) is used synonymously with "Men of my Council" (נני וני) in reference to the Gerousia of Jerusalem; pHab. v.10-11, has "Men of their Council" (נני וני). There are good historical grounds for holding that this implies the existence of a rival Council to that of the Zadokites, perhaps the one which usurped power in Jerusalem.

244. Some translate, "angels", in the Gnostic sense rather than "Holy Ones", but this is not consistent with the use of the term throughout the Qumran texts; cp. CD vi.1-4, where the "Penitents of Israel" are described as the "First Saints" or "Holy Ones", and among those who "will hold office in the end of days". "Behold the statement of their names according to their generations and the period of their offices, and the number of their afflictions". Those who believe these are references to "angels", also usually refer to IQS viii. 17, 20, ix.8 and the above, but again the Covenanters, themselves are here called "the Men of Holiness" and not "angels".

246. IQR viii. 31, which Rabin holds to be conclusive evidence for resurrection. See above, also, Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, ed. J. van der Ploeg, Vol. III, p. 169, note 1; but see also, E. L. Sukenik, ed., The Dead Sea Scrolls of Hebrew University (Jerusalem 1955) ad loc.

247. C. Rabin, Ibid.

248. C. K. Barrett has demonstrated that both conceptions are so formulated that they are not mutually exclusive. Clear proof of this may be seen in Ps. Sol. 3:16: "They that fear the Lord shall rise to life eternal and that life shall be in the light of the Lord and shall come to an end no more"; his excellent discussion of this teaching may be seen in, "Immortality and Resurrection", (The 1964 Drew Lecture on Immortality delivered at New College, London), also in The London Quarterly and Holborn Review, April 1965, p. 95; See also Billerbeck who states: "Of no less significance for the earliest conceptions of Sheol was the doctrine of Immortality, which, from hellenistic Judaism, gradually passed into Palestinian circles." (in H. L. Strack and P. Billerbeck, Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch, Munich 1928), Vol. IV, p. 1017; also, E. Schweizer's extensive discussion of the problem in Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament—ed. G. Kittel, Vol. VI, p. 377, section 46ff.


251. Also called "The Wisdom of Jesus the Son of Sirach" or, simply, "Ben-Sira".


253. Especially James; cp. (Ac 1:26) and James 1:5, (55:11-13) and 1:13-14, (5:11) and 1:9, (8:35-36) and 1:27 and many other passages; also the Gospels, cp. (Eccl. 26:2) and Mt. 6:14, (48:10) and Lk. 1:17 and many others which disclose that Ecclesiasticus was a well-known scripture in the early Christian Church.

254. These two versions correspond to the two distinct versions of the Greek text in the Textus Receptus along with the one other recension represented in various other manuscripts; see S. Soeder, Documents of Jewish Sectaries. Cambridge 1310, Vol. I; R. K. Charles, A. P. C. and Pseud., introduction; C. H. K. The Zudemkite Documents (Oxford 1954), introduction.

255. M. Balat, Rev. Lib., (Jan.) lxiii (1950) 54 and 572; also M. A. Lehmann, Ben Sira and the Qumran Literature, Rev. de Qumran 111 (1961) 103-116, esp. 103, 104; J. I. Malik holds that Ben Sira (50:3) is the source of the terminology on the Copper Scroll (plate v. 8), Rev. Bib. lxvi (1959) 338; also Bo Reicke, The Jewish 'Damascus Documents' and the New Testament, in Symbolae Biblicae Upsalienses. Supplementa, in Svensk Exegetiska Årsbok, 1946.

256. B. J. Sanhedrin 100b; see also C. Taylor, Pirke Aboth (London 1900) 115.

257. see note 255, above.

258. Euergetes I (Ptolemy II) reigned only 25 years, thus it must be placed in the reign of Euergetes II (175-116 B.C.) whose 30th year was 132 B.C. The translator and compiler states that his source is his (παντός) "grandfather", in the usual sense. Thus the setting of its narrative would be 200-175 B.C. The grandfather would have been a contemporary of Onias III and would have remembered the last years of the high priest Simon II. The tone of the book suggests that this famous Simon had been dead for some time, placing its narrative at a time between 180 and 160 B.C. Josephus probably errs in calling Simon I, "The Just" (Ant. xii. 43). He refers to Simon II in the same manner in Ant. xii. 224ff.

Hezfeld has identified "Simon the Just" of Pirke Aboth iii. 1, with Simon II (226-196 B.C.), L'varenbourg, argues strongly
in favour of Simon II as "The Just", whose memory is also preserved in Rabbinic tradition, Lerenbourg, Essai sur l'histoire et la topographie de la Palestine, p. 46ff.

253. The prologue states that it is a translation into Greek from a Hebrew document by the author's grandson when he came to Egypt. This "Jason" son of "Eleazar" seems to be mentioned in Iac. 3:17. On the dating of this work see Box and Oesterley, in Apoc, and Iseud., ed. Charles, Vol. I, p. 293. The book makes no reference to the Maccabean Revolt and thus must have been written before 166 B.C.

260. W.O.E. Oesterley and G.H. Box, op cit, I, p. 231-292. In the prologue of this document Jesus is called ( Πρωτόκολλο ) which already implied "Scribe" at this time, a name which was later to become the popular designation for the Pharisees. As this designation occurs only in the altered manuscript it is in all probability a later Pharisaic distortion because Ecclesiastical as a whole denounces most of the Pharisaic teachings, or what was to become Pharisaic doctrine, in favour of the general Sadducaic point of view. It conspicuously excludes Ezra, the patriarch of the Pharisees, from its list of great heroes of faith (Eccl. 44:1-50:24).

261. Cp. Nah. 11:11 and Iac. 3:31ff. in I Chr. 24:3, Zadok is listed among the sons of Eleazar.

262. Oesterley and Box, op cit, I, p. 291ff.

263. Ecclesiastes 3:22, 12:5, 6, "and the Spirit returns to God who gave it".

264. Ecclesiastico 16:17, "Say not: I am hidden from God, and in the height who will remember me? I shall not be noticed among so illustrious a people, and what is my soul among the mass of Spirits of all the children of men", Oesterley and Box translation, op cit, ad loc.

265. Cp. II Es. 2:11.

266. The author of the separation of the body and soul has not been discussed in detail, but his position, but may be seen by a comparison of 51:26, 16:17 and 51:23, in which the term for "soul" is repeatedly used in the sense of "mind" or "intelligence" and thus contrasted with what the author says regarding "Spirit".

267. Its oldest title is "The Books of Enoch", but it is commonly known as "I Enoch" or just "Enoch", as in the Epistle of Jude (verse 14) in its quotation of it along with The Epistle of Barnabas (9:3). This title was used when the early church
fathers quoted this document; Clement of Alexandria, Eclog. Proph. (Dindorf ed. i.ii.456, i.ii.474); Origen, In Ioannem vi.25, Contra Celsum v.54; Tertullian, De Cultu fem. i.20, De Idol. iv, "Enoch praedicens", xv "Spiritus praececinit per...Enoch"; the original title was probably "The Books of Enoch", in En. 82:1, Enoch says: "All these things I am recounting to thee... and (have) given these books concerning all these: so preserve ... the books from thy father's hands"; and in 14:1 "The book of the words of righteousness"; cp. Origen, Contra Celsum v.54; also in Num. Homil. xxviii.2; Test. Levi x.5; Origen, De Princ. i.3.3; Jerome, De Viris illustr. iv (De libro Enoch); these citations indicate that in the 1st and 2nd centuries A.D. Enoch was regarded as authoritative and inspired. In the 1st century it was recognised as scripture by Jude, the author of Hebrews and is quoted extensively by the Apocalypse. It was not until the 3rd century A.D. that it was dismissed from use by the Church.

268. R.H. Charles has held that the book as a whole belongs to a period before 64 BC. W.O.E. Oesterley has considered R.H. Charles's datings to be "approximately correct" and along with Charles divides its writing as follows: a) the oldest pre-Maccabean portions of "Apocalypse of Weeks" (12-36; 93; 91:12-17), b) the latest pre-Maccabean portions or "Fragments of the Book of Noah" (6-11; 54:7-55:2; 60; 65-69:25; 106-107), c) that written before 110 BC called the "Book of the Heavenly Luminaries" (72-83), and between 165-161 BC, "The Dream Visions" (83-90) and, d) that written between 105-64 BC called the "Similitudes" (37-71, 91:1-11, 18-104). Both Rowley and Torrey reject R.H. Charles's theory that Ch.6-39 and 93:1-10, 91:12-17 are pre-Maccabean; H.H. Rowley, The Relevance of Apocalyptic (London 1947) 75-80 and C. Torrey, The Apocryphal Lit. (New Haven 1945) 111-114. But see E. Sjöberg, Der Menschensohn im äthiopischen Henochbuch (Lund 1946) pp.1-38 and Robert H. Pfeiffer, History of New Testament Times (London 1949) pp.75ff, who holds that Enoch is a library written between 165-63 BC. He has dated the "Parables" or "Similitudes" (37-71) between 100 and 80 BC, Ch.6-36 at about 100 BC, the "First Dream Vision" (83-84) between 163-130 BC, and the "Apocalypse of the Seventy Shepherds" (85-90) between 163-130 BC.

269. J.T. Milik, art. Rev. Bib. lxv(1958)71ff, 76ff; also, Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judea, tr. J. Strugnell (London 1959) p.33, Milik admits that this list is incomplete and that other Enoch fragments are yet to be identified or made public. Only 5 of the 22 documents of the so-called "Genesis Apocryphon" which directly presupposes knowledge of the Enoch, "Book of Noah", have been permitted to see the light of publication by those who now have possession of them. This manuscript was found more than 15 years ago in Cave I; cp. Vermes, The Dead Sea Scrolls in English (1962) p.216.

271. Dupont-Sommer has openly admitted: "May we not suppose that in time to come, remains will be found among the still unidentified fragments of an eleventh manuscript corresponding to the "Similitudes", A. Dupont-Sommer, The Essene Writings From Qumran, o.y cit, p.299.

272. He concluded: "That it is not merely a scientific interest which impels the writer to give expression to his astronomical theories, may be seen from the words at the conclusion of the section: 'Blessed are all of the righteous, and sin not as the sinners in the reckoning of their days, in which the sun traverses the heavens, entering into and departing from the portals for thirty days (1xxxii.4-7). Her in one can discern quite clearly the tendency of the writer. He desires the adoption of the Solar Year, while his contemporaries wrongly followed a different reckoning and therefore celebrated the feasts at the wrong time. The 'sinners' who sin in the 'reckoning of the year' are the Pharisees, and the righteous ones who are the 'blessed' are the 'Zadukim' who walk upon the paths of righteousness (Zedek) as the name was made to imply, were the Sadducees", Leszynsky, Die Sassudizer (1912) pp.253-266, esp.p.253ff; so also Oesterley takes this interpretation of "Zadukim", as a play on the word for "righteous", designating the Sons of Zadok or "Sadducees", O. O. E. Oesterley, o.y cit, p.204, n.2.

273. Cp. 91-104, 83-90; ner: Enoch champions the Hasidim in league with the Sadducees. Some have held 102:6ff to refer to the oppression of the Sadducees, but as the Sadducaic aristocracy was divested of its wealth by the Seleucids, the description cannot easily be applied to them.


275. 89:59, 90:17,25, 18:13-16, 21:1-6; see the above account of the "Gerousia of 70"(p.98) including the "Martyred Council of Jerusalem" and the above account of the 7 martyred brothers of the Hasidim.

277. Eccl. 50:20; the unaltered Hebrew text has "Ben-Simon" rather than "Simon", or "he" (as in the Greek text). 50:1 praises the father of Onias III with the words: "The leader of his brethren and the pride of his people was Simon the high priest, son of Onias. This does not refer to Simon I, but Simon II (see note 258), the father of Onias III. The praise in 50:20 refers to the son of "the high priest Simon", thus Onias III.

278. II. Macc. 15 to end.

279. See above page 105ff.

280. Sernberg Høller, in his critical edition of the Manual of Discipline (I:S) in the Dead Sea Scrolls collection, cites no less than 64 quotations and allusions to Shnoch, with several which he believes to be from the missing chapters (37-71) of the "Similitudes". cf. M. Mansoor, in his critical edition of the Thanksgiving Hymns (106), cites approx. 24 quotations and allusions to Shnoch, including the missing section. C. Rabin, in his critical edition of the Zadokite Document (30), cites no less than 50 quotations and allusions to Shnoch. See also the comparisons R.H. Charles has made between Shnoch, Ecclesiasticus and II Maccabees in Apoc and Pseud. op. cit.


287. E.g. Homer's, Odyssey, (bk. 11) in which Odysseus journeys into the underworld; cp. Virgil's Aeneid (bk. 6), in which Aeneas makes a similar trip; see J.R.J. Guthrie, Orpheus and Greek Religion (London 1935, 2nd ed. 1952) p. 52; also, Hesiod's description of Theseus' and Herakles' descent into the underworld as well as the epic poem called Minyas, with its descent into Hades.
as well as the fable of Herakles' descent into Hades, are all commented on by A.R. Kohle, Psyche: Seelkult und Untersuchungen der Griechen (Düningen 1925), tr. W.B. Hillis (London 1925) p. 236; also T.F. Glinson, who comments on this latter work in his, Greek Influence in Jewish Eschatology (London 1961) p. 3-11; I. Levy, Légende de Pythagore de Grèce en Palestine (Paris 1927) as with Glaston has held that these chapters of Enoch were influenced by Greek literature.


290. See I Chr. 15:5, cp. 11, perhaps by inference a Pharisee.

291. cp. 10:9 (אַלּוֹת) may denote any period, but xii. 6: "They (the fathers) shall lament and make supplication unto eternity; xiii. 7, here the fathers pray: "that they should have forgiveness and length" (i.e. length of days); cp. 10:10.

292. 61 is from the portion of Enoch called the "Similitudes", which many believe to have been written in Christian times because of the many "Christian" views it seems to share. We have no reason to doubt that it is from the same strata of Sadducean Judaism (as this term has been qualified above) in which the Urgemeinde had its roots.


294. Cp. 4 Ezra 7:32, 7:37. The specific resurrection mentioned in Daniel 12:2 for the first time is not only limited to Israelites, but "many of those who sleep in the dust of the earth", which is by no means even all the Israelites who sleep in the dust of the earth. Charles has said that Daniel's teaching did not become a prevailing belief in its own time or for a long time to come, R.H. Charles, The Book of Enoch, p. 99; also Is. 25:8, 26:19, etc. suggest a rising, but one which is limited to righteous Israelites.


297. Cp. with the Annex of the Manual of Discipline (IQSa) which contains a description of the Messianic Banquet; see also K.G. Kuhn, The Lord's Supper and the Communal Meal at Qumran, SNT, pp. 65-93; also, Van der Ploeg, The Meals of the Essenes, JJS 2 (1957) 163-175.
298. Ant. xviii.17; The Babylonian Talmud also reflects this state of affairs (Yoma 19b): "My son, although we are Saducees, we are afraid of the Pharisees".

299. It is agreed that Josephus has misplaced the first occurrence of the name "Pharisees" in the setting of the Hasmonaens Jonathan and Judah. Without relevance to this context he has interrupted his narrative to discuss the notion of Fate, as held by the three parties, including the Pharisees (Ant. xiii. 171). He next mentions them in the time of John Hyrcanus (xiii. 288) involved in a controversy which is better suited to the state of affairs during the reign of Alexander Jannaeus, who persecuted so many of the Pharisees. This is the place where the Talmud (b.Yidd.66a) has rightly placed the schism.

300. In ancient Greek literature Plato, e.g. in Phaedrus 247c, distinguished between "body", "soul" and "spirit" but considered the soul to be the "harmony" of the others; cp. Phaedo 93b-d and Rep. vi. 508d. Aristotle developed this triad as "mind", "soul" and "body" but criticised the notion that the soul is the sum of the body's elements: "Harmony has a contrary, namely disharmony. But the soul has no contrary. Therefore the soul is not a harmony" (Eudemus, in Arist. frg. 45). However, he did hold that the soul is the product of the right arrangement of these parts and called it "the entelechy of a natural body potentially possessing life" (De An. II 1.412a, 19ff). E. Schweizer has held that there is no Greek parallel to the Jewish notion of the superiority of the (πνεῦμα) over (ψυχή) which is not influenced by Judaism or Christianity, op cit, p. 22, note 11.

301. According to E. Schweizer, art in TWNT, VI, pp. 377ff., esp. his section on "Paul" (see A. E. Harvey, tr., Spirit of God, London 1960).

302. The earliest Christian fathers held that man is perfected only when Spirit is added to body and soul; see Irenaeus, Haer. V. vi.1; Clem. Alex., Strom. V. lxxxvii.4ff; Tatian, Or. Graec. xv.2.

303. A curious recognition of this teaching is found in Irenaeus and Polycarp who interpret the Spirit of God to be that power which resurrects the body and soul; see Epid. xlii, Mart. Polycarpi, xiv.2; cp. Euseb. H. E., IV. xv.34, cp. Epiph. Haer. xxxiii.13; Ignat. Eph. vii.2, x.3, Sm. xii.2, xiii.2, Mag. xiii.2, Pol. i.e, ii.2.


307. Philo, Every Good Man is Free, xci.

308. Ibid. lxxv. As early as 1846, the Orientalist Frankel pointed out that "Essenes" is derived from (זירוג) "pious", "godly" or "holy". Although there is still little agreement on the etymological origins of this term, no better explanation has yet been put forth.

309. B.J. ii.119-161.

310. B.J. ii. 154.

311. B.J. ii. 156.

312. Ant. i.110-114; cp. B.T. Sukkah 48b.

313. Ant. xx.179; also Pesachim 57a.
II.

A. Pre-Christian Immortality Traditions and the Jerusalem Urgemeinde.

Urgemeinde Traditions and the Pharisaic Censorship of both Sadducean and Early Christian Sources:

The fragmentary accounts of the Sadducees which have managed to survive and retain a semblance of currency today are the deprecatory comments from the hand of Josephus or Rabbinic sources, mainly post-70 AD in origin. Mark only mentions them once and there are scarcely a handful of references to them in later Christian writings. Thus it is largely the deprecating accounts from Pharisaic sources which have given rise to what is a popular view of the Sadducees today. The same may have been true in New Testament times as the Synoptic Gospels seem to have followed the Pharisaic lead in their brief criticisms of the Sadducees and describe only the Herodian Sadducees (or Boethusians) who alone held the high-priestly offices in their day. Although a few New Testament accounts disclose that the Sadducees rejected the Pharisaic resurrection eschatology, none of them states that they denied the immortality of the Soul or the imperishability of the Spirit in the afterlife. A positive view of the uniquely advanced theology of the Sadducees may be gained from the books of Maccabees, the Zadokite Documents and other Dead Sea Scrolls, Ecclesiasticus, the Books of Enoch and
the other writings which have been examined above at some length.

We have already called attention to the fact that most of the literature, legal pronouncements and data relevant to the Sadducees were intentionally obliterated during and after the Council of Jamnia by the Pharisees, which was the main purpose for their gathering at Jamnia. We have also observed that the Pharisees had gained complete control of the Council of Jerusalem by the time of the Urgemeinde. It thus should not be surprising that the letters and data relevant to the leaders of the original Jerusalem Church have also been found to be strangely missing from the Synoptic Gospels and Acts. Although a large collection of Pauline writings has survived in New Testament literature, there remain only a few minor letters from the leaders of the original Urgemeinde, and even these (the Epistles of Peter, James, Jude and John) are not unchallenged regarding their authorship. S.G.F. Brandon has asked: "What has caused the apparent loss of all literary documents representing the mind of the Church of Jerusalem, the font of authority and the source of tradition for the Christian faith when the writings of Paul, who had been deeply involved in controversy with its leaders have survived, howbeit in fragmentary form, in the sacred canon of scripture of the Universal Church". Brandon, along with several others, has placed the historical narratives of Luke and Acts at a distance of some forty years after Paul's letters
and believed them to be orientated mainly to the growth of the Church in Antioch. On the face of it, chapters 1-12 of Acts appear to give an uninterrupted account of the Christians in Jerusalem after the Ascension, and unquestionably, a great many of the original Urgemeinde traditions have survived in the Synoptic Gospels, but here too, as with the pre-Jamnia Sadducaic traditions, the work of a type of censorship of an intentionally Pharisaic bent is also evident. The Synoptic Gospels and Acts tell us next to nothing about the Urgemeinde. We shall examine this phenomenon in the light of what is now known about the rise of Pharisaic influence and the relative dominance of certain Pharisaic points of view within the Early Church, for what may be learned about the Urgemeinde and its teachings regarding immortality and resurrection. We shall next examine critically some of the traditions regarding the afterlife which have survived in New Testament literature for the light they shed on the Urgemeinde and its teachings.

After the death of Hyrcanus II (Antigonus), the Sadducees occasionally held high priestly offices, but their influence became almost negligible in the face of the masses who supported the powerful Pharisaic lay movement. These latter transferred most of the legal authority to their own Scribes and interpreters of the Law (Mk.3:6). One indication of the attitude of the Urgemeinde toward this popular lay movement is the parable of the Pharisee and the Tax Collector who went up to the Temple to pray. From the days of Onias III, the gathering of
taxes and tithes was a priestly rather than civil office because of the important function of the Temple treasury as the financial centre of the state. The term (τελωνης), apart from the later abuse of this office by the Boethusians, had the general connotation of a member of the Temple priesthood, or a Sadducee. Because of the unpopularity of the Boethusians in his own time, Luke probably refrained from calling them Sadducees. It is likely that Luke would have omitted this tradition altogether, but for the fact that it was an original saying of Jesus. The same may be true of the narrative about Zaccheus the chief tax collector, or of Matthew himself, and Jesus' other embarrassing (to the Pharisees) friendships with "publicans" and "sinners", or non-Pharisees, as the case may be. On the other hand, there appears to be some evidence of a general Pharisaic outlook on the part of some of Paul's later followers as is seen in Luke's inclusion of Paul's apologetic in Acts: "Brethren, I am a Pharisee, a son of Pharisees". This question will be dealt with when we examine the historical context to which Luke has addressed his narratives.

One of the difficulties created by the somewhat artificial delineation of early Christianity into two categories consisting of a) Pauline "hellenisation" and b) Jerusalem "anti-hellenism", is that the character of the Pauline "mission to the Gentiles" must then be made to look completely anti-Jewish which does not seem to be the case. The Jerusalem Church, however, can be argued to have consisted largely of hellenised Jews as we
shall see, but its members nevertheless considered themselves to be firm at the centre of Jewish orthodoxy. Like the Sadducees, the Urgemeinde, or early Jerusalem Christians were priestly, pro-Temple and had a firm view of the afterlife and a profound reverence for the written Law. Thus both because of their nature and because of the destruction of the Temple (in 68-70 A.D.) many Urgemeinde traditions were either abandoned or suppressed by those who preferred the lay worship and the popular eschatology of the Pharisaic synagogues. Despite this significant turn of events fragments of Urgemeinde traditions have survived which disclose important earlier Christian teachings on Immortality, Translation and the exalted Son of Man, all in sharp contrast to the Pharisaic notion of Resurrection to Judgment at the end of time. Thus by the time of Paul there appear to have been two main points of view regarding the afterlife which resulted in two differing proclamations within the early Church, the "Sadducaic" and "Pharisaic" Kerygmata. Alongside recent "Parousia Delay" discussions must thus be placed a new and serious look at the Kerygmata Controversy. While the "Parousia Delay" theories, put forth by others recently, seem to apply to the Pauline wing of early Christianity they are most inappropriately applied to the Urgemeinde, which at many points was contemporary with Paul and his followers. We will examine these "Sadducaic" and "Pharisaic" developments within early Christianity in greater detail below.

Because of the Josephan and Pharisaic polemic against the Sadducees, some have gone one step beyond the suggestion that
they had no theology, to assert they were the "Skeptics" par excellence of Jewish thought. Indeed, their doctrine of Immortality does not coincide with the Homeric, Platonic or Polis concept of Immortality, familiar to the Greek philosophers or Josephus, who has made the unfortunate comparison. It is generally held by historians of Greek thought that during the Macedonian or Hellenistic era, Greek philosophy, in its various forms, had progressively degenerated from dogmatism to skepticism. Sextus Empiricus (2nd cent. AD) wrote: "Some men say that they have found truth; some say that it is impossible for truth to be apprehended; some still search for it. The first class consists of those who are specially designated Dogmaticians, the followers of Aristotle and Epicurus, the Stoics and some others: the second class consists of the followers of Clitomachus and Carneades, and other Academics: the third class consists of the Skeptics". Hatch has defined these terms, (δογματική, σκέπτική, ἀκαδημαϊκή) as "philosophy of assertion, the philosophy of denial, and the philosophy of research." Because the Sadducees occurred at this later stage of "Hellenism" and philosophical devolution, they are therefore generally relegated to the third category of Jewish "Agnostics" or "Skeptics".

However, it is theologically impossible to place the Sadducees within the schema of "Skeptics" or "Agnostics" primarily because of their unique and positive theological position, as we have noted above and also as seen in the book of Job, with its
radically Jewish understanding of a Creator and "knowing" God, who comprehends or "knows" man, rather than man who has special (esoteric or otherwise) knowledge of God and immortality, etc. Such a view of God, the afterlife or immortality cannot be called "Gnostic". Nor would it have been possible for them to have won so vast a following in the hellenistic world if they were merely an imitation of one of the common schools of Philosophy; either the Skeptics or the Gnostics.

S. Liebermann has maintained that it is possible to distinguish at least seven distinct levels or types of Pharisee within what he calls the rise of the Pharisaic movement. Although there were not nearly as many different types of Christians, we have already found nearly as many different kinds of Sadducees in the Sons of Zadok, Zadokites, Hasidim, the Qumran Sadducees, the Sadducees of Ecclesiasticus, the varieties of Sadducees in the various Books of Enoch and the altogether different Sadducaic distortion in the Boethusians of Herodian times. We shall now consider the possibility of a last development of the true Sadducees; the Christian Sadducees. All these groups with the exception of the Boethusians, have in common their loyalty to the dynastic priesthood springing from the Sons of Zadok anointed in days of David. Other characteristics, such as their allegiance to the written Law of Moses, as over against the oral traditions of the Pharisees, are well known and need not be elaborated at this point.
As for Josephus' charge that the Sadducees deny the immortality of the soul: we have seen this to be part of a convenient comparison Josephus has made between three philosophies of his time. Without mentioning resurrection of the body, Josephus said that the Pharisees taught the "incorruptibility of the soul", but the Sadducees did not "believe in the immortal duration of the soul, and the rewards and punishments of Hades" and held that "the souls die with the bodies". We have already noticed that this assertion judiciously avoids all mention of the Sadducees' positive doctrine regarding the Spirit. Both Oesterley and Leszynsky have called attention to Josephus' colouration of the narrative at this point for the benefit of his Hellenist readers. He has also judiciously neglected to mention that the Pharisees also believed in resurrection of the body. He has corrected this intentional error slightly in the Antiquities without actually suggesting a doctrine of resurrection: "the former shall have power to revive and live again". It is quite possible that this error led to another, particularly in his description of the three "philosophies". Here Josephus attributed to the Essenes a belief in immortality, as such, to the Pharisees, incorruptibility of the soul so that there remained nothing for the Sadducees, but to say that they denied the future life altogether. However, in view of the popular designations for the various schools of philosophy or "Gnosis" in his day, it seems more likely that Josephus has employed these convenient
categories for the sake of an analogy, particularly in that he calls the Jewish teachings "philosophies". The first is immortality of the soul, the second, revival of the body (in addition to immortality of the soul), and the third, scepticism. Moreover Josephus has put resurrection and immortality on the same plane. Thus, in his limited view of the matter, to deny the resurrection of the body, as did the Sadducees, was to deny immortality of the soul as such.

In our somewhat extensive examination of Zadokite and Qumran literature, now generally attributed to the Essenes, we saw evidence of teachings indicative of both immortality and resurrection. This inclines one to take an even dimmer view of Josephus' categories. From both Talmudic and New Testament sources one derives quite a different story. One learns that the Sadducees denied only the notion of a general resurrection as an eschatological event, because they found no proof of it in the Torah. If we had only these two sources, which both are far more reliable than Josephus, it would be possible to conclude that the Sadducaic teachings were in complete accordance with the most ancient written traditions regarding the afterlife and that in rejecting the notion of general resurrection, they did not deny the immortality of the soul, Spirit or afterlife, as such.

Many have felt dissatisfaction with the old distinction between the Pharisees and Sadducees, as a "religious party" which opposed a "secularist political party". Kohler
has chosen to describe the Sadducees as a party which protected the views and practices of the Law, Temple and Priesthood, as opposed to those of the Pharisees. Cowley differentiates between the parties as "progressive" and "conservative".

J. Z. Lauterbach has stated that their differences were those which lay between priests and laymen; but nonetheless, the issue was a religious one involving the Messianic hope.

The Urgemeinde and the Sadducaic Christians:

It is commonly agreed that the Christians of the original Jerusalem Church considered themselves to be by no means less than orthodox Jews and rightful heirs to the promises of Israel. What are some of the reasons for this supposition? First of all, it should be observed that the name (κριστιανός) does not occur as a designation for Christians until after Paul and Barnabas had begun their work in Antioch. Even at that late date, the name is said to have been used only of the disciples in the Antioch church. Luke's narrative in Acts discloses that the Antiochian church was already in existence for some time before Barnabas and Paul arrived to work there. Acts (11:20) says that the congregation was started not by Paul, but some of the hellenised Jews, "Cypriots and Cyrenians", in all likelihood coming from Jerusalem, who preached to the Greeks (τινες ἐκ αὐτῶν ἄνδρες Κύπριοι καὶ Κυρηναῖοι, ὁτινὲς ἐλθόντες εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν ἐλάλουν καὶ πρὸς τοὺς Ἐλλήνας. Eventually, Barnabas came and laboured for a season, whereupon he travelled to Tarsus to enlist the help of
Paul. The two returned to Antioch and it was at this stage that large crowds assembled together and the disciples were called "Christians" for the first time (χρηματίσαι τε πρώτας ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ τοὺς μαθητὰς Χριστιανοὺς.) 11:26. Two things which might be observed here are, a) the (ἐκκλησία) had already been in existence for some time, both in Jerusalem and elsewhere, before it was called Christianity by this name, b) the church in Antioch was founded by hellenised Jews and Greeks, who preached (τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ) long before Paul and Barnabas arrived on the scene.

What then, may be known about the (ἐκκλησία) in Jerusalem? Is there any real evidence to show that its members although believing in Jesus of Nazareth were at the same time officially Jews, or while being Jews, that they were not hellenised Jews? While it is not necessary to demonstrate, at this point, why the Sadducees must be considered hellenised Jews, can this same designation be applied to the first Christians? Again, is there any real evidence that the Jerusalem Urgemeinde did not consider itself in every respect to be representative of orthodox or normative priestly Judaism?

Given that the historical narrative of Acts is accurate, as far as its details can be verified, it perhaps has yet to be appreciated that the leanings of this Lucan writing are predominantly pro-Pauline and somewhat slighting toward the leaders of the Jerusalem church. The actual composition of Acts has generally been placed somewhere between 40 and 50 years, after
the last of the events which it describes. The work would thus be contemporaneous with the Council of Jamnia and Josephus' writing of the Jewish War. Its apologetical colouring in favour of the congregations in the North and Asia Minor, to the exclusion of the Church's activities in the South, has often been recognised as well as its preoccupation with a surprisingly small number of leaders, such as Stephen, Philip, Peter, Barnabas and Paul.

Despite Acts' historiographical biases, fragments of Urgemeinde traditions do occasionally emerge, such as those about Apollos. Apollos was in all likelihood a man of considerable prestige, well educated, and is said to have been "mighty in the scriptures", "instructed in the way of the Lord" and "full of the (burning in) spirit" (δυνατός ὃς ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς. οὗτος ἦν κατηχημένος τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ κυρίου, καὶ ἦσον τῷ πνεύματι 18:24-25. Although Acts (18:24-26) states that Apollos was originally a citizen of Alexandria by birth, there is no reason to assume that he had been there recently. There is more reason to suppose that he had spent some time with the Urgemeinde in Jerusalem and came directly from Jerusalem to Ephesus. His Urgemeinde orientation is indicated by: a) the fact that he was "powerful in the (written) scriptures", b) that he seems to have had accurate first-hand knowledge of the earliest Jesus traditions c) that his Kerygma was in accordance with the Urgemeinde view that Jesus was the eschatological Christ, d) and that he presumably understood the eschatological nature of John's Baptism by which Jesus himself had been baptized. Apollos' acceptance and prestige is also commensurate with the reception given to the
disciples and members of the original Jerusalem Urgemeinde.

Even though it included a large number of hellenised Jews, the weight of evidence seems to point to the conclusion that the Urgemeinde did consider itself to be "officially Jewish" in every respect. Rather than an anti-Temple point of view, the facts indicate that they were more faithful in their worship at the Temple than the Pharisees. Luke says they were continually (ἡσαν διὰ πάντος ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ εὐλογοῦντες τὸν Θεόν) "in the Temple blessing God" (Lk.24:53). They continued "daily with one accord in the Temple" (καθ' ἡμέραν τε προσκαρτεροῦντες ὀμοθυμαδὸν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ) Acts 2:46. It is known that Peter and John followed the hours of prayer in the Temple (Πέτρος δὲ καὶ Ἰωάννης ἀνέβαινον εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν ἐπὶ τὴν ὑπαν τῆς προσευχῆς τῆς ἐνάτην) Acts 3:1. The accustomed meeting place of the leaders of the Urgemeinde was Solomon's Porch of the Temple. Moreover, they taught daily in the Temple (πᾶσαν τε ἡμέραν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ) Acts 5:42. Four men of the Urgemeinde took upon themselves the strictest Nazarite vows of ritual purification, which Paul himself was ordered by James to observe (21:23).

The fastidiousness with which the Jerusalem Christians observed ritual purity, shows that the Temple was by no means a coincidental place of meeting. Peter himself makes the astonishing claim never to have broken the dietary laws (οὐδέποτε ἔφαγον πᾶν κοινὸν καὶ ἀκάθαρτον) in 10:14. However, the point of that passage is to show that by the command of God he finally did so. It is nevertheless impossible to align
Peter's ways with those of the Pharisees because of the disfavour created by Peter, on coming back from a visit to Joppa, "because he had entered (their dwelling) and eaten with the uncircumcised" (ὁι ἐσῆλθες πρὸς ἄνδρας ἀκροβυστίαν ἐχοντας καὶ συνέφαγες αὐτοῖς) Acts 11:3. This was one of the many points of Pharisaic tradition which gave rise to frequent disputes, initiated by the Pauline Christians toward the Urgemeinde, because of the broadmindedness of the latter. In Rabbinical literature, paradoxically enough, it is the Pharisees who are purported to be liberal and broad-minded rather than the Sadducees. When the question of whether or not Gentile converts must be circumcised was brought before the Jerusalem Church, the controversy clearly originated in the hinterland and was brought down to Jerusalem (reluctantly) by Paul from the outside. Luke's presentation suggests that the Pharisaic avant garde was let down by the leaders of the Urgemeinde who did not support them in this matter of circumcision. Luke has thus disclosed that the growing church soon included "Pharisees who believed" (Φαρισαίων πεπιστευκότες), Acts 15:5, who claimed that it was needful for Gentiles (converted to Judaism?) to be circumcised in order to obtain salvation. A general conference at Jerusalem ensued, the results of which are significant because they show the Sadducaic character of the leaders of the Jerusalem Urgemeinde, who also "believed". What was the outcome? Peter answered first that "neither our fathers nor we have been able to bear (the yoke of circumcision). But we believe that we shall be saved through the grace of the Lord Jesus, just as
they will" (i.e. the Gentiles, 15:10-11). Peter in so many words has confessed, in his answer to Paul, that both he and his fathers were uncircumcised, and thus Hellenists. It is possible that the "we" may include the whole Urgemeinde. James, who had the final word in the matter, did not in his decision defend the Pharisaic position, but the traditional Sadducaic view in every respect namely, that circumcision was not necessary for salvation, that they follow the purification laws (ritual), and that they follow the Law of Moses, and no more (Μωσῆς γὰρ ἐκ γενεῶν ἀρχαίων κατὰ πόλιν τοὺς κηρύσσοντας αὐτὸν ἔχει ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς κατὰ πάν τάν σάββατον ἁναγινωσκόμενος) Acts 15:21. It is significant that this problem originated outside of the Jerusalem Church and first became an issue in a dispute involving Paul and Barnabas. Paul, the former Hillelite now turned Christian, did not insist on circumcision but did consider the gift of the Holy Spirit a type of "spiritual circumcision". Circumcision (in the spiritual sense) not only became a requirement for new Christians, to Paul's mind, but was to play an important part in his Kerygma, as we will see (below pp.381-385). Curiously, the Jerusalem council did not leave it to Paul and Barnabas to set things right, but sent along with them two "chosen men of their own", named Judas, called Barsabbas and Silas. These were called leading men among the "Drotheis" (δροθεῖς), a name frequently used of Urgemeinde Christians and of James himself (Acts 15:22) and was perhaps, the original name for the Urgemeinde.343

It is generally agreed that the Pharisaic movement was essentially a lay movement344 although this may not have been strictly true, to the extent that there were occasionally priests among their numbers. Nonetheless, it must be held that the
aristocratic priests were mainly Sadducees, apart from the Boethusians, and supporters of the Sadducaic point of view. The tradition in Acts (6:7) which states that large numbers of the priestly party, "a great crowd of the priests obeyed the Faith" (πολύς ὁ ἀγάλματος τῶν ἱερέων ὑπῆκοον τῇ πίστει) is of particular interest for its implication that large numbers of Sadducees were absorbed into the Urgemeinde, en masse. It is not unreasonable that this should have happened, now that the Messiah was crucified and his resurrection appearances had already occurred, in addition to the preaching of Peter. And in view of the willingness of Gamaliel, the leader of the Pharisees, who now held most of the power in the council, to show leniency toward the teachings of Peter, (Acts 5:34). At this decisive stage in the growth of the Urgemeinde, it can be assumed that: a) their Kerygma came into being, b) their numbers increased vastly (not necessarily converts from Judaism, but those within Judaism who became obedient to the Faith, c) large numbers of priests including the priestly aristocracy became obedient to the Faith. It is unlikely that these priests considered themselves to be abandoning Judaism or "converted". But by becoming "obedient to the Faith", they became better Jews, as we have seen with the early Christians, in Spirit and in Truth. They would not be required to become less attentive to the worship of the Temple, or forsake the Laws of Moses or the Levitical Laws of purification in any respect. It is in this connection that an early tradition which states that James the "brother" of our Lord, did, himself, eventually serve
as the officiating high priest for a short duration, has come to light. The mere survival of this tradition suggests that there was in fact one segment of Early Christianity which was both priestly, Jewish and Sadducaic in character. But we shall deal with that tradition related by Hegesippus, Epiphanius, Eusebius, and Josephus, presently. Perhaps we come closer to the original spirit of the Urgemeinde in Jesus' words to Nicodemus, "a ruler of the Jews" and "teacher of Israel"; Nicodemus was not told to renounce his Judaism or be converted, in the manner of John's preaching, but, he must be "born anew", or totally changed and renewed from within by means of "water and Spirit" to a higher sonship and obedience to God and thereby become a better Jew at the same time. By contrast, the Pauline Christians or later controversialists within the church who prompted the Council of Jerusalem seem to have required that Gentiles must become Jews in order to be saved.

It is reasonable to say that in the early days of the Urgemeinde, Christianity was not known under that name in Jerusalem, at least if Acts (chapter 11) is taken seriously. It may be suggested here, that this is what prompted Luke the historian to limit his narrative in Acts to the missions spreading forth from Antioch. Consequently he has concerned himself with the Pauline activities in the North, because here were Christians, known as such, for the first time, who thus formed a contrast to those in Jerusalem who were still tied to a less acceptable type of Judaism, i.e. of a hellenistic or Sadducaic strain. James'
warning to Paul in Jerusalem was, "You see brother how many thousands (ten thousands μυριάδες ) there are among the Jews of those who have believed; they are all zealous for the Law" (Acts 21:20). Either Luke is guilty of gross exaggeration, or the character of the Urgemeinde must be re-evaluated in terms of a spiritual revolution among hellenised Jews within the context of normative priestly Judaism.

The composite character of the Jerusalem Urgemeinde is spelled out in no uncertain terms in the Pentecost incident, which marks the beginning of the Church for those who recognise its origin in the Urgemeinde. Who were those first three thousand who received the Holy Spirit through the preaching of Peter at Pentecost? Acts (2:5) states that they were Jews, but specifically hellenised Jews living in Jerusalem, (Ἦσαν δὲ εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ κατοικούντες Ἰουδαίοι, ἀνδρεὶς εὐλαβεῖς ἀπὸ πάντων ἐθνῶν τῶν ὑπὸ τῶν θανόν ) It is clear that through the gift of the Holy Spirit, some of the Urgemeinde not only spoke tongues, but many of the languages of the hellenised world (συνήθεν τὸ πλῆθος καὶ συνεχυθή, ὅτι ἡκούον εἰς ἑκάστος τῇ ἰδίᾳ διάλεκτῳ ἱερούντων αὐτῶν ) Acts 2:6. Luke's list of those who first heard the disciples speaking in their own languages and later became members of the Jerusalem Urgemeinde includes: Parthians, Medes, Elamites, those from Mesopotamia, Judea, Cappadocia, Pontus, Asia, Phrygia, Pamphylia, Egypt, parts of Libya about Cyrene, Romans both Jews and Proselytes, Cretes and Arabians (Acts 2:9-11). Thus from the very first the Urgemeinde included a variety of hellenised Jews in that all of these three
thousand are said to have been baptised into the Faith. We may thus conclude in a preliminary manner, a) that they consisted of Jews and Gentiles from a variety of backgrounds, b) that Greek was a common language among them as well as Hebrew, c) that they remained and considered themselves Jews in every sense of the word. Far from abolishing Judaism, they became better Jews for it, with a righteousness which exceeded that of the Pharisees and Scribes by "fulfilling" the Law rather than destroying it. Acts 2:47 says the Urgemeinde "found favour with all (ἐξοντες κάριν πρὸς ἅλων τὸν λαόν) the people. And the Lord added to their number day by day those who were being saved".

James the High Priest:

Wellhausen and Schürer, along with many others, have characterised the Sadducees as a priestly class of high social standing. A measure of their vast influence is the haste with which Pompey executed most of their leaders, in 63 BC, in order to secure his power. The remainder were put to death during the reign of Herod the Great in 37 BC. There was little hope for the future of this aristocratic ruling class when Alexandra, wife of Alexander Jannaeus, gave the upper hand to the Pharisees upon the death of her husband in 76 BC. Josephus said of the few Sadducees who survived or remained in Jerusalem in his day, that they influenced "none but the rich, and have not the populace on their side", "their views are received only by a few, but those are of the highest rank". He nonetheless, gives
every indication that to be of the priestly family during his
day was still a mark of distinction and social standing.
Since their anointing in the days of Solomon, the sons of Zadok
served as priests in the Temple. Up until the purge of Pompey
and Herod, they alone were responsible for the sacrifices and
the highest priestly functions. It was commonly understood
that the office of high priest should traditionally fall to
someone of Zadokite lineage.

If prestige and status were associated with the name
of Sadducee, so it was with the first Christians and leaders of
the Urgemeinde. Perhaps there was something behind Paul's
slightly edged words, upon his return to Jerusalem after
fourteen years, when he said he came to preach the Gospel,
"privately before those of repute" (καίδιάν δὲ τῶν δοκοῦντων)
Gal. 2:2. He added: "from those who repute to be something (ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν δοκοῦντων
—εἰναι τι), what they were makes no difference to me; God shows no
partiality (ὅτι οἱ λέον εὑρεν μοι διάφερει πρὸς ὑμᾶς ὁ θεὸς ἀνθρώπου οὐ
λαμβάνει) — those, I say, who were of repute added nothing to
me" (εὑρεν γὰρ οἱ δοκοῦντες εὑρεν πρὸς ὑμᾶς) 2:6. In addition to
the well known "pillars", of the Urgemeinde, James, Cephas and
John, whose prestige the Galatian Epistle admits (1:19, 2:9.11.12),
there were undoubtedly many others like Stephen, Philip,
Prochorus, Nicanor, Timon, Parmenas, Nicolaus and Apollos who
were well instructed in the way of the Lord, mighty in
scriptures and at the same time men of education and social
standing. W. Schmithals has considered the seven deacons or
"Hellenists" to be evangelists and leaders of considerable standing within the early church on the basis of Acts (6:8ff, 8:5ff, 21:8), but it is clear that their authority extended to more than just the Hellenist "section" of the Church. It is perhaps not coincidental that the "Seven Brothers" or martyred Hasidim, mentioned in II Maccabees 7, were hellenised Jews, as well as Stephen and his "Seven" who are now called by some, "Hellenists". We have here simply referred to them as Urgemeinde.

Regarding the office of high priest, one might well ask what indication there is that the relationship of the early Christians toward the high priests was anything other than antipathy or subjection? It must be pointed out that the evidence at this point derives from secondary sources compared with the evidence we have already seen for the close and responsible relationship of the Urgemeinde to the Temple. There are nevertheless sources of early authority which lead us to believe that James, the brother of our Lord, did exercise some functions and privileges as a high priest. The succession of high priests in Jerusalem was not on the basis of hard and fast principles, particularly during the period of Herods' appointments. Josephus states that the situation was chaotic in his day. Various lists of Pharisaic Patriarchs have survived from the Christian period but the office of high priest was held by many in quick succession. We will here examine the traditions which have placed the Apostle James in this priestly context.

The early account of James in the writings of
Hegesippus (2nd Cent. AD) known as his "Ὑπομνήματα" (in five volumes) is quoted with full authority by two witnesses, Eusebius and Epiphanius, both of whom accept the high-priesthood of James. One has suggested that the invasion of Jerusalem by Vespasian was God's punishment for the martyrdom of James. It is possible that Epiphanius had seen Hegesippus' account, but the narratives do not require that such a conclusion be drawn. It is indeed significant that two independent ancient authorities have borne out Hegesippus' account. Hegesippus, implies that James, brother of the Lord, held the status of high priest by stating that he alone was permitted to go into the Holy of Holies of the Temple, (Διὸ καὶ ἐφεξῆς αὐτῷ ἄπαξ τῷ ἑνιαυτῷ εἰς τὰ Ἅγια τῶν ἁγίων εἰσιναί ως τοῖς ἄρχειρευτῖν ἐκέλευσεν ὁ νόμος, κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον), Epiphanius, Haereses, xxix, 3-4. Eusebius, on the other hand, has not hesitated to state that he has received the tradition from Hegesippus whom he quotes verbatim, to the effect that James alone went into the Holy of Holies: "μόνῳ ἐξῆν εἰς τὰ Ἅγια εἰσιναί ", Eusebius, H.E,II. xxiii.6. The priestly ruling harks back to Ezekiel (40:45): "The sons of Zadok, who alone among the sons of Levi may come near the Lord and minister to Him". If James did fulfill high-priestly functions, as these ancient traditions suggest, it indeed increases the likelihood that he was a Sadducee to an almost certainty.

These passages have been called "palpably false" by some, including Lightfoot and Klausner. They are rejected
mainly because they appear to be contradicted by Josephus who states: "James the brother of Jesus called the Christ (ὁ ἀδελφὸς Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ) was put to death at the instigation of Ananus". As Ananus is supposed by them to be responsible for the death of Christ, he therefore could not be responsible for the death of James at this later date. However, there are several flaws in that argument. First, Caiaphas has been traditionally considered responsible for Christ's death. Secondly, even this high priest is not unchallenged. Neither Mark nor Luke mention the name of the high priest at all, Jesus was simply brought to the "house of the high priest" (Mk.14:53, Lk.22:54). Matthew alone says that Jesus was led to Caiaphas the high priest (Mt.26:57). John, on the other hand, gives every indication of having conflated the James tradition with the Christ tradition, and says that Jesus was first brought to Annas, (Ἀνάνας) "because he was the father-in-law of Caiaphas" who was high priest that year (Jh.18:12-13). Josephus seems to support the likelihood that James's death in 62 A.D. was at the hand of Ananus by his description of the events of this time. Between the death of Festus in 62 A.D. and the arrival of his successor, a situation of hopeless anarchy prevailed in Jerusalem. Josephus says that Ananus (Ἀνανιᾷς) the high priest grasped the opportunity to condemn his enemies and have them stoned. His arbitrary government did not last long, however, because King Agrippa deposed him, after he held office for only three months, even before the arrival of a new Procurator. James the brother
of Jesus can therefore be concluded to be among those executed by this Ananus. Josephus states that rivalries between high priests were common in this period. During the time of Agrippa, a high priest by the name of Jesus (a son of Damnaeos) engaged in a pitched battle in the streets of Jerusalem with his successor, Jesus (son of Gamaliel) because he refused to give up the sacred office.

Eusebius has preserved what he says is a literal transcript of the account given by Hegesippus: "James was cast down from the pinnacle of the Temple, then stoned, and at last beaten to death by a fuller with a fuller's club" (H.E. ii. 23.11-18).

Both Clement of Alexandria (in H.E. i. 1.4) and Epiphanius (Haer. 78.14) base their comments on Hegesippus. In his own interpretation of these events Eusebius underscores the close relation between the execution of James and the destruction of Jerusalem, (H.E., iii. 11.1). Because the high priest's name is said to be Ananus and because Josephus states that James was sentenced to death through the orderly jurisdiction of the Sanhedrin presided over by the high priest, the accounts of the early Christian Fathers have also on occasion been needlessly rejected. There is as little ground for the first objection as for the second. Mishna Sanhedrin (vi. 4) shows that casting down from a height before stoning was a regular injunction of Jewish law and that what both Josephus and Hegesippus have said could certainly have taken place without contradiction. One
can imagine the Sanhedrin meeting in the outer court of the Temple and, as in the case of Stephen, an angry and emotion-filled trial ending in a pitiless death. It should perhaps be remembered at this point that like Paul, Josephus has stated himself to be a Pharisee (Vita.11.) and writes from a Pharisaic point of view, at least politically. Thus, at a time when the Pharisees were in absolute power, it was an easy matter to attribute the downfall of Jerusalem to the Sadducees who no longer had any real influence. A curious glimpse of these chaotic times is provided by the author of Luke-Acts in reference to Paul. In Acts (23:5), Paul states that he did not even know that the earlier Ananias (47-59 A.D.) was a high priest (οὐκ ἤδειξα, ἀδελφός, ὁ ἐστὶν ἀρχιερεύς), which gives credence to the pretensions of the Pharisees.

A third witness to the James tradition is Origen, who obviously was aware of Josephus' account (in Ant.xx) and says of Josephus: "while acknowledging the righteousness of James he did not believe Jesus was the Christ" (Ad.Matt.x.17 and Contr.Celsum i.47). Origen, the careful scholar, has gone to some length in the above statements and in his writing against Celsus (ii.13), to assert that Josephus himself has explained the overthrow of the Jewish nation by the Romans as God's vengeance for the murder of the righteous James. Thackeney has called attention to the fact that this statement is not made by Josephus, but by Hegesippus. He thus attributes to the great Alexandrine scholar an incredible blunder, committed not once, but twice.
Brandon has offered the interesting suggestion that Origen may have had access to an older version of Josephus: "The Antiquities must have originally contained an account of Jesus which was offensive to Christian feeling", also, "It would seem that there were in circulation in the time of Origen manuscripts of Josephus which differed seriously in the tenor of their accounts of Jesus and James, and that some of the manuscripts preserved the genuine text of the Jewish Historian". Like others who have attempted to reconstruct the force of Josephus' statement, Brandon has assumed that the original "text" was offensive to "Christians", rather than Pharisees, and therefore was censored heavily by undesignated Christians.

As we have already observed, the Pharisees in a most decisive manner at their Council of Jamnia, conducted a massive effort to denounce and obliterate all Sadducaic decisions and documents. We have also observed that the traditions of a pro-Pharisaic character were of greater interest to later writers such as the author of Luke-Acts than those relevant to the Sadducees and the Urgemeinde. It is thus more likely that the censorship which took place after the year 70 A.D. was not by Christians, but Pharisees or at least those of a Pharisaic point of view. A better suggestion might thus be that Origen did not have an older version of Josephus, but being aware of the Pharisees' rise to power in the face of what he knew to be the crucifixion of the legitimate Messiah, and the overthrow of the
righteous high priest James, he saw through Josephus' effort to place the Pharisees in a better light, as well as its tragic implications. The destruction of Jerusalem as the vengeance of God was more easily explicable and better justified, to Josephus, as that caused by the capricious execution of a righteous high priest, by a few usurping "Sadducees", than the crucifixion of Christ which could of necessity fall to the responsibility of the Pharisaic masses. Josephus has said that the masses were not with the Sadducees who represented only a small part of the spectrum of Jerusalem religious life. But they were wholeheartedly behind the thriving lay movement of the Pharisees, which seems to have been the audience for whom Josephus has made most of the adjustments in his second history.

Whether or not Origen has directly quoted Hegesippus, another text of Josephus, on his own interpretation of the facts as he knew them, it is sufficient for our purposes here to note that Origen accepted the high-priestly position of James and considered his death a causative factor in the destruction of Jerusalem. It may be inferred from this that he was aware of a tradition from either Hegesippus or Josephus which placed James in the role of the Messianic High Priest alongside Jesus as the Messianic King, or Christ.

The policy of Herod the Great, as we have noted, was to appoint his own high priests. This was often done in an arbitrary manner, choosing men of little significance whose
political interests could be controlled; with the result that
the so-called "Sadducees" of Herod's time won for themselves
the notorious reputation which is now attributed to Sadducees
of all levels and periods. Apart from the absorption of
large numbers of the Sadducees into Christianity itself, the
leadership of the authentic Sadducean party must be said to
have come to its conclusion with the execution of its leaders
in 37 BC. The weak and secular high priests appointed by Herod
are properly called Boethusians because these Sadducees were
almost all related in one way or another to the high priest
Simon the son of Boethos who won the office on the merit of
being either the grandfather or father of Herod's third wife. 365
Holscher's exhaustive examination of the evidence led him
to conclude that seven occupants of the office were actually
Pharisees. 366 Schürer has stated in a more general manner
regarding these Boethusian high priests: "They were at
the head of the Sanhedrin and of the native government
generally, and although the majority of them were men of
Sadducean tendencies, yet in the actual conduct of affairs they
bowed, however reluctantly, to the wishes of the Pharisees. 367
Despite the common designation which continued to be used for
these priests, it cannot be surmised, on the basis of the
evidence we have examined, that the customary occupancy of the
priesthood, as a whole, was Sadducean after 37 BC.
Urgemeinde and the Written Law:

The Sadducees are generally acknowledged to have been the conservatives who held to the Torah (written Laws of Moses); the Pharisees as progressives who embroidered the Law with "Tradition" (oral and written). Lauterbach, not unlike Gerhardsson, has already pointed to the dangers of oversimplification here by underscoring the seeming contradiction of these categories: "The Sadducees who were the old and conservative elements of their faith, were yet, strangely enough, determinedly opposed to the authority of Tradition; whereas the Pharisees, who were the younger, broader, more liberal and progressive school, relied for the most part on the dead hand of the past". If the customary categories are not adequate, Lauterbach does not find it possible to provide a solution of his own, but perhaps the problem is not as paradoxical as it first appears.

As hellenised Jews, the Sadducees were most assuredly conservative in liturgical matters and their attitude toward the written Law. But they were far from conservative in their general outlook on life. They indeed maintained the status quo with regard to the Temple, Torah and priesthood, but that status quo had already been for three hundred years a type of hellenised Judaism as we have seen. It has already been noticed in detail how Judaism became the official "cult" of the Jerusalem Polis; the Torah its constitution and its priest-kings
the administrators of the Jerusalem city-state during the Antiochian and Hasmonean periods. The Pharisees, by contrast, were progressive to the extent that they were against the status quo for which purpose they employed numerous traditions outside the pale of the Written Law. But they should be considered reactionary, culturally, in their radical reversion to pre-Hellenistic separatism and purification from Gentile ways. Josephus says of them:

"I wish merely to explain that the Pharisees had passed on to the people certain regulations handed down by former generations and not recorded in the Laws of Moses, for which reason they are rejected by the Sadducean group, who hold that only those regulations should be considered valid which were written down (in Scripture) and that those which had been handed by former generations need not be observed."

Ant. xiii.297.

Is it possible to ascertain the position of the Christian Urgemeinde regarding the Law? Fortunately, the earliest traditions, contained in the Synoptic Gospels, are clear on this matter. They are also numerous because of the impossibility of separating them from the traditions relevant to Jesus. A definitive situation has been described in Mark 7, in which the disciples of Jesus were challenged because they did not wash before eating, after coming from the market, or purify cups and pots, etc., as did the Pharisees. The Pharisees here asked Jesus directly: "Why do your disciples not live according to the tradition of the elders?" (διὰ τι ὁ περιπατοῦσιν ὁ μαθητὰς κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων; 7:5. Jesus answered them with the words
of Isaian: "In vain do they worship me, teaching as doctrines the precepts of men" (διδάσκοντες διδασκαλίας ἐντάξειν ἀνθρώπων) 7:7. The attitude of Jesus, or the Urgemeinde for that matter, may be assumed to be strongly antipathetic toward the Pharisaic reaction in general, but specifically toward their misuse of the Law and dependence on oral tradition. This view is expressed in even stronger terms in Matthew (23:4-26).

The strength and sharpness of Jesus', and the Urgemeinde's, attack on Pharisaic misuse of the Law was known well enough to ensure its inclusion even in the Matthean Gospel. However, the later predominance of Pharisaic influence in the historical setting of its author or authors, is evident from their attempt to soften the blows of Jesus' attack on the Pharisees by extending them to the Sadducees as well. Their addition becomes evident in a comparison with Mark (8:15) which reads: "Take heed, beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and the leaven of Herod". Also with Luke (12:1): "Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees which is hypocrisy". The spirit of Jamnia which sought to transfer guilt for the destruction of Jerusalem to the Sadducees, who were practically non-existent as "Sadducees" by the post 70 AD date of its composition, is reflected in the Matthean version: "Take heed and beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees" (ορατε καὶ προσέξετε ἀπὸ τῆς γόμης τῶν Φαρισαίων καὶ Σαδδουκαίων),
Matt.16:6. This comparison shows that the Urgemeinde was not hostile to the Sadducees who are not mentioned in the early versions, but by the time of Matthew's writing it became important to distract attention away from the Pharisees to the Sadducees. It is by no means necessary to hold that Matthew therefore had access to another documentary source, as we will see in more detail below.

Another indication that the pro-Pharisaic interest in oral tradition was a later, rather than earlier, tendency in the Church may be seen in Paul's apologetic to the Galatians: "I advanced in Judaism beyond many of my own age among my people, so extremely zealous was I for the traditions of my fathers" (σημεῖα ὑπάρχων τῶν πατρίκων μου παράδοσεων) Gal.1:14. So also with Paul's warning to the Christians at Colossae that they should not be made the prey of "empty deceit according to human tradition" (κενής ἀπαραδόσιος κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων) Col. 2:8.

It may be taken for granted that the attitude of the Urgemeinde toward the written Law was similar to that of the Sadducees and hellenised Jews who had already for several centuries established the Law of Moses as the constitution of the Jerusalem Polis. This supposition is not contradicted by the various Urgemeinde traditions which have come to us through the hand of the Synoptic writers. The Urgemeinde's stand on the written Law, in particular, is
demonstrated by Jesus' words: "Think not that I have come
to abolish the Law or the prophets (τὸν νόμον ἡ τῶν προφήτων); I
have not come to abolish them but to fulfil (πληρῶσαι) them. For truly, I say to you, till heaven and earth pass
away not an iots, not a dot (ἰῶν ἡ μία κεραία , i.e. of
that written), will pass from the Law until all is accom-
plished" (Matt.5:17-18). By this choice of words the Jesus
saying makes it abundantly clear that the reference is not
to the numerous oral traditions of the Pharisees, but the
written Law of Moses. That Jesus, in fact, spoke on the
side of the Sadducees, in this matter, is borne out by
Matthew (5:20): "Unless your righteousness exceeds (ἐκεῖνη) that of the Scribes and the Pharisees (γραμματίων
καὶ Ἰαχαίων), you will never enter the kingdom of heaven.
" Acknowledging the absolute political control which
the Pharisees had, Jesus said: "The Scribes and Pharisees
sit on Moses seat; so practise and observe whatever they
tell you, but not what they do; for they preach but do not
practise. They bind heavy burdens, hard to bear, and lay
them on men's shoulders; but they themselves will not move
them with their finger" (Matt.23:2-5). Some of the bitter-
est words in the New Testament are directed against the
Pharisees and their proselytes in these sayings, Matt.23:

While the Pharisees expended the Law, by means
of interpretation and tradition, to the point where it was no longer within grasp and often could not be kept; Jesus and the Urgemeinde did the opposite by reducing it to its simplest basic elements: "On these two commandments depend all the Law and the prophets" (Matt.22:40). "So whatever you wish that men would do to you, do so to them, for this is the Law and the prophets" (Mat.7:12). A good test of the Urgemeinde's attitude toward the written Law was the situation in which a Pharisaic lawyer tested Jesus with his questions; Jesus answered: "What is written in the Law? How do you read? (ἐν τῷ νόμῳ τί γεγραμμένος ἐστιν ἀναγνωσθέντα). And he answered: "You should love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your strength, and with all your mind; and your neighbour as yourself". And He said to him: "You have answered right; do this and you will live" (Lk.10:25-28).

Although often stated with radically un-Pharisaic simplicity and pointedness, the authority of the written Law, as in Jesus' words above, is a consistently characteristic mark of the Urgemeinde. "Have you not read in the Law" (Mat.12:5), "you tithe mint and dill and cummin, and have neglected the weightier ( βαρύτερα) matters of the Law" (Mat. 23:23), "as it is written in the Law of the Lord" (Lk.2:23), are examples of this. Jesus also said: "Everything written about me in the Law of Moses and the prophets and the psalms
must be fulfilled" (Lk.24:44), and "Did not Moses give you the Law? Yet none of you keeps the Law" (John 7:19). Interestingly enough in one early tradition Jesus has placed the written Law, i.e. Moses and the prophets on a higher plane than resurrection from the dead. In the parable of the Rich man and Lazarus, He is quoted in the words of Abraham: "They have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them" and "If they do not hear Moses and the prophets, neither will they be convinced if someone should rise from the dead" (Lk. 16:29-31). Indeed, a remarkable indictment against the effectiveness of the Pharisaic doctrine of resurrection to change lives.

The Apocalyptist attitude toward the Law harmonises with that of the Urgemeinde and the pre-37 BC, Sadducaic hellenised Jews. In this respect they represent a level of development of the Sadducaic point of view along with the Covenanters of Qumran and the Urgemeinde. This does not imply that they were alike in many other respects. Oesterley said of the Apocalyptists: "They were loyal to the law, though not in the Pharisaic sense, laying stress rather on the spirit of its observance than on carrying it out literally". In distinguishing them, and the early Christians, from the Pharisees, it should not be suggested that they were antinomian; far from it. Their most stringent imprecations are against those who turn away from
the eternal Law, as in the Sibylline Oracles (iii.176ff) and for those who keep the Law, as in II Esdras (ix.7-12), Baruch (Syriac, xix.3, lix.2).

The Qumran discoveries have shed light on a similar view of the Law which can properly be called Sadducaic in character. The Rule of the Community says of one who enters into the "council" of the community: "He shall undertake by a binding oath to return to the Torah of Moses, according to everything which he has commanded, with all heart and soul, according to everything which has been revealed from it to the Sons of Zadok, the priests who keep the covenant and seek His pleasure" (IQS v.8-9). The definitive authority, as with the Urgemeinde, was the Torah, but not only the Torah, it was the Torah as interpreted by the official priesthood (as over against Scribes in general). These interpreters were designated specifically as the "Sons of Zadok". In view of Jesus' imprecations against the Pharisees, above, what the Covenanters say about themselves and their stand on the Torah is significant: "They (the Covenanters) shall separate themselves from the assembly (?

They shall be a community, with Torah study and property, (submitting response) according to the Sons of Zadok, the priests who keep the covenant" (IQS v.1-2). The term, "men of deceit" need not imply Pharisees, although the same term is used in Job. (22:16) and
Ps.of Sol. (2:38). Their assertion that they are going to found a community based on the Torah "according to the Sons of Zadok" gives the best answer regarding the nature of their loyalties. Without any mention of the "traditions of the fathers", or the "customs of the fathers", the Damascus Document (CD) has centred its teachings and rules on the "Law of Moses". Ignoring oral tradition, it repeats this loyalty to the Law several times (CD xv.12, xvi.1,4) as does the Manual of Discipline, (IQS v.8). There can be no doubt that this reference is to a written Law, because of the regulations for its recitation from "the book" (IQS vi.7-8).

Also the interpreter of the Law is to inform the community according to what he has found in scripture by study and not according to "custom" or "tradition" (IQS viii.11-12, ix.12-14). It is therefore strongly suggested that Qumran provided little opportunity for the development or use of oral tradition.

Jesus' strong injunctions to fulfil the Law "in spirit and truth" in his imprecation against the hypocrisy and evasions of the Pharisees, seem to have a parallel in the Habakkuk Commentary which describes the Covenanters as, "men of truth who live according to the Law and serve the truth" (pHab.vii.10) and the "false preacher", who establishes "a congregation in falsehood", in order that many will, "weary themselves in the service of vanity" (pHab.x.9-11).
Both assertions, although from differing levels of spirituality, reflect a strong and indisputable Sadducaic orientation.

Thus, it must be concluded that the Urgemeinde traditions which touch on matters of the Law, when examined in the light of the Law and oral tradition controversy between the Pharisees and Sadducees, disclose that the Urgemeinde, despite its rejection of several aspects of contemporary Sadducaism, do bear a noticeable resemblance to some levels of original Sadducaism and little resemblance to any level of Pharisaism. However, it must also be borne in mind that the Urgemeinde represented only one part (nonetheless a central and important part) in the formation and development of the early Christian Church, as we will see.

**Urgemeinde and the Resurrection-Immortality Controversy:**

In our examination of the recension of the tradition in Mishna tractate Aboth attributed to Rabbi Nathan, we saw demonstrated a Sadducaic criticism of those who were righteous for the sake of the rewards of salvation, turned by a later Pharisaic hand into an assertion that the Sadducees denied the afterlife altogether. Although it is clear that this distortion while in transit from a Sadducaic tradition into a Pharisaic Tosephta was in the interest of the Pharisaic eschatology, the same process occurs (although
not as obviously) in Luke's presentation of the Sadducaic point of view regarding the afterlife.

In the early chapters of Acts, at which stage Peter and the sons of Zebedee are depicted as the pillars of the Urgemeinde, the Sadducaic priests are not presented as denying life after death or even the resurrection of the dead, but what they considered an ill-founded interpretation of it (4:1-22). In the later chapters of Acts, at which stage James the brother of Jesus is depicted as the head of the Urgemeinde rather than Peter, the Sadducees' opposition to Paul is interpreted as a denial of the resurrection altogether (23:8).

In the fourth chapter of Acts, a scene is described in which Peter and John are preaching to a large crowd gathered at Solomon's Porch in the temple (3:11). Those annoyed by the teaching are said to be the priests, captain of the Temple and Sadducees (ιερέας, στρατηγὸς, οἱ Σαδδουκαῖοι 4:1. The cause of the annoyance is stated to be (διὰ τὸ διδάσκειν αὐτοὺς τὸν λαὸν καὶ καταγγέλλειν ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ τὴν ἀνάστασιν τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν) that they announced the resurrection of the dead to have already taken place in the case of Jesus (4:2). Now, no Pharisee is recorded to have ever been arrested for preaching "resurrection on the Last Day". We have observed that a final resurrection to Judgment was an accepted teaching among the Pharisees long before Peter. That which caused annoyance was
the announcement (καταγγέλλειν) of a specific resurrection to have occurred, in the case of Jesus (ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ).
That was indeed a revolutionary teaching. Instead of a future general resurrection; a particular resurrection which had already occurred. Instead of a resurrection at the end time; a resurrection which had already taken place and was making itself manifest in miracles (4:7). The following morning a curious assembly gathered to hear Peter out, they included (ἀρχοντας, πρεσβυτέρους, γραμματές, Ἄνως ὁ ἀρχιερεύς, καὶ Λαφάς, Ἰωάννης, Ἀλέξανδρος) and all who were (ἐκ γενός ἀρχιερατικοῦ) or relatives of the High Priest, i.e. the Boethusians appointed by Herod, etc., and all those in power in addition to that particular family, many of whom cannot be considered Sadducees in any sense of that term, or should at least be distinguished from genuine Sadducees.

Unlike the author of Acts' later (perhaps second-hand) assertion that the "Sadducees say" (Σαδδουκαῖοι γὰρ ἡγομένοι) the resurrection "is not" (μὴ εἶναι) 23:8, this earlier tradition does not imply that this particular gathering, which may have included Sadducees, rejected the possibility of a resurrection or the immortality of the Soul or the possibility of an after-life, but that they objected to Peter's announcement that it had already occurred. Luke 20:27 also appears to reflect this later interpretation of the Sadducaic point of view: (τινὲς τῶν Σαδδουκαίων, οἱ ἀντιλέγοντες
Why are they not simply designated as Sadducees? Rather, Luke says, "some" (τίνες) of the Sadducees which agrees with (οἱ ἀντιόγοντες) "those who say" in opposition "that there is no (i.e. general) resurrection" (20:27). This seems to demonstrate Luke's knowledge of the differences between the various types of Sadducees and points of view. It is more likely that the learned scholars, here gathered, found no basis in written scripture for Peter's announcement and the Pharisees among them deplored his suggestion that the Resurrection had already occurred. The fact that Peter and John were let off without punishment or imprisonment strongly suggests that they decided to reserve judgment neither agreeing nor disagreeing with the Apostles. This certainly provides no grounds for holding that they denied resurrection or immortality as such. The factors which seems to have been in favour of Peter and John, as far as the Pharisees in the assembly were concerned, were: a) that they (ἄνεργῳς ἀγράμματος) were illiterate (thus not "written Traditionalists"), b) and laymen (ἰδωταί) and thus not Sadducaic priests, c) that they had been with Jesus (οἱ κοίνων τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ητοιμαν), d) and that miraculous things were being done by them (Acts 4:13ff).

Like Apollos, who was "mighty in scriptures", knew the baptism of John and taught accurately the way of the Lord, perhaps because he had heard Jesus himself, these things
also may have been true of some of those interrogators of Peter, whose questioning bears several points of resemblance with the interrogation of Paul by the Urgemeinde. The grounds on which they rejected Peter's teaching was not that they were against Jesus; one might draw the opposite conclusion from the fact that Peter and John were released because "they (the Sadducees among them) recognised that they had been with Jesus" (4:13). Their charge to them: "not to speak or teach in the name of Jesus" (4:18), might with some justifiability be interpreted to spring from an annoyance with Peter's misrepresentation of Jesus. Whatever view one takes, Luke has not attempted to hide the priestly council's disapproval and annoyance with Peter. It is thus not impossible that those Sadducaic priests among them, mighty in the scriptures, like Apollos, found the teaching of the unlettered Peter simply to be without apparent foundation in the books of Moses or the prophets and the Pharisees among them found his teaching to be repugnant to their highly developed general eschatology.

A cautious evaluation of the religious context of the Urgemeinde, thus, must take seriously the Pharisaic rise to power, even to some extent, within later Christian circles and the infiltration of Pharisaic views including the Pharisaic doctrine of a general resurrection to judgment at the end of time. Because the Pharisaic emphasis on
resurrection and judgment succeeded in overshadowing, and nearly obliterating, Sadducaic eschatology and theology from pre-Christian Jewish literature, it must be asked with utmost seriousness, to what extent has this also happened in Christian literature? A contrary view seems to have been taken by Oscar Cullmann who has held that the resurrection of the body was first and foremost the original Christian point of view and one which is irreconcilable with the notion of immortality; "The concept of death and Resurrection is anchored in the Christ-event, and hence is incompatible with the Greek belief in Immortality". He also states, regarding the early Christian expectation: "Hence not only in the Greek faith in the Immortality of the Soul, but also the opinion that the bodily Resurrection of each man occurs immediately after his death, is foreign to this expectation".

It is not difficult to see why Cullmann and many others, relying heavily on later Pauline apologetics, have concluded that resurrection is the sum and substance of the Christian Kerygma. Can that view be substantiated? To the contrary, the revolutionary element in Peter's teaching was that the resurrection had already occurred, in the case of Jesus, moreover in three days time rather than at the end of the world as we know it. The outrageous element in Stephen's pronouncements, as far as the Pharisees were concerned, was not that he had seen the resurrection of Christ, but that he had
seen Him already standing at the right hand of the Father. We will deal with this latter tradition in greater detail below.

Prof. Cullmann's position thus appears to be incomplete and one-sided in view of the irremovable fragments of tradition from the Urgemeinde which have been preserved in the Synoptic accounts because they cannot be separated from the words of Jesus. It also appears to be incomplete because it does not take into consideration the longstanding doctrine of the resurrection to judgment which was both a pre-Christian and Pharisaic doctrine by origin. We have also seen a variety of reasons why Prof. Cullmann's delineation of resurrection of the body apart from immortality of the soul as the original teaching of the Urgemeinde, is untenable.

The uniqueness of the Urgemeinde teaching appears to lie in the very things to which he objects the most strongly: a) immediate resurrection or Translation of the particular dead, b) the compatibility of resurrection and immortality beliefs and c) the proximity of the Urgemeinde to the views of the pre-Christian hellenised Jews. Let us examine further an alternative to the Cullmann and Religionsgeschichte view in this matter.

The closeness of the Urgemeinde to the views of the Sadducees in a large proportion of instances regarding the Law, the Temple and the priesthood, is easier to document
than their proximity in matters concerning immortality or resurrection. This is because of the heavy censorship of Urgemeinde traditions as well as Sadducaic traditions by pro-Pharisaic interests.

One strong indication of the Sadducaic orientation of pre-Pauline theology which prevailed in the early Church, is seen in Paul's words to those believers who accepted Christ, but not the popular doctrine of a general resurrection. According to Cullmann's analysis, such a phenomenon could not exist in the early Church, but they indeed did at one of the very prominent churches which had early and close associations with Apollos. Paul argued with the Corinthians: "how can some of you say there is no resurrection of the dead? But if there is no resurrection of the dead, then Christ has not been raised; if Christ has not been raised, then our preaching is in vain and your faith is in vain" (I Cor.15:12). Clearly these were not outsiders, but early Christians who are said to have had a firm "faith in Christ".

One strong reason for believing that Corinth was not as isolated as one might suppose, are Paul's next words which reflect in form the same kind of opposition Peter met from the Council in Jerusalem: "We are even found to be misrepresenting God, because we testified of God that He raised Christ, whom He did not raise if it is true that the dead are not raised" (I Cor.15:15). Evidently, we are here dealing with
two strata of Christianity, Pauline and Urgemeinde, if these categories can be considered adequate. They are, perhaps, suitable if both categories are understood to have existed side by side at various stages within the pre-70 Church. Nonetheless, Paul, in his own time was questioned just as Peter was before the Jerusalem Council. From this latter interrogation came his famous words: "Brethren, I am a Pharisee, a son of Pharisees; with respect to the hope and the resurrection of the dead I am on trial" (Acts 23:6). Like Peter, Paul was the centre of a controversy in which no grounds were found to prosecute him. In Paul's case, it was the Pharisees who finally defended him: "some of the scribes of the Pharisee's party stood up and contended, 'We find nothing wrong in this man' "(Acts 23:9). With such support from the Pharisees, as had Peter from Gamaliel (Acts 5:34) it is not surprising that the Sadducaic Christians should at various points come into conflict with the Pharisaic Christians, as they did at Corinth. Paul sought to ameliorate what, in effect, had become a sizeable controversy: "each one of you says, 'I belong to Paul', or 'I belong to Apollos', or 'I belong to Cephas', or 'I belong to Christ' " (1 Cor.1:12). It is probable that Paul has here distinguished between two rather than four basic groups at Corinth, the Pharisaic Christians who rallied to the teaching of Paul and Peter (before his conversion in Acts 10) and the Sadducaic
Christians, who rallied to the teaching of Apollos and the original teachings of Jesus. It is also clear in these same sources that the issue causing division at Corinth was the question of eschatology.

One of the notoriously difficult passages which provides a formidable obstacle for a Pharisaic interpretation of Christian eschatology, mainly because this view cannot be interpolated into the last words of Jesus on the cross, is Jesus' answer to the faith of the dying thief next to him (αμήν σοι λέγω, σήμερον μετέμοι ἐστίν ἐν νῷ παραδείσου) Lk. 23:43. These words are an embarrassment to the Pharisaic notion of a general resurrection first, because the man is not encouraged to wait until the "end times" or any "Day of resurrection", and secondly because the "today" to which Christ refers, is already two days prior to the day in which Christ himself was said to have arisen according to the announcement of Peter and Paul to their Pharisaic audience. Acknowledging the awkwardness of this passage, Cullmann has only suggested that it is "not impossible", "to understand (σήμερον) as modifying (λέγωσα)". He thus would rephrase this well known saying to read: "Truly, I say to you today, you will be with me in Paradise". Such a translation has not only been rejected by most critics but appears unnecessarily strained and artificial. There is no need, however, to change the meaning of this passage because this saying of
Jesus has by no means contradicted His earliest teachings regarding the afterlife, as we will observe.

One recognised source for reliable Jesus traditions in which the sayings of Jesus are kept in a remarkable state of preservation is: his parables. The Kingdom parables are particularly illuminating in reference to the earliest Urgemeinde teachings on the after-life because of the recurring theme of "suddenness" which Jesus attributes to the coming of the Kingdom of God. The parable about the rich man and Lazarus has a particular bearing on this question. It is tempting to suggest that Jesus' reference to Lazarus's death and immediate Translation to the bosom of Abraham (ἀπενεκθηναί αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τῶν ἀγγέλων εἰς τὸν κάλπον Ἀβραάμ) Lk.16:22, is in itself a complete repudiation of the Pharisaic doctrine of resurrection. More convincing, however, is the manner in which Jesus has concluded the parable, so as to leave no doubt regarding the unsatisfactory efficaciousness of the popular belief in resurrection by itself. When the rich man asked for a sign in the form of a resurrection of someone from the dead, Jesus repudiated the whole notion in the words of Abraham: "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead (οὐδὲ ἐὰν τις ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῇ πείσθῃσονται) 16:31. Scripture, i.e. Moses and the prophets, are set forth here, at least in this early Jesus tradition, above any resurrection as of far
greater importance and authority than a mere resurrection from the dead. Whether or not one calls this a pro-
Sadducaic point of view, it certainly is a repudiation of
the popular Pharisaic teaching.

Stephen and the Translated Christ:

An Early Controversy: Luke's handling of the old Urgemeinde tradition relevant to Stephen's death and vision in Acts 7 and 8, is remarkable both for its unique (for Acts) use of the term (ὁ νεκρὸς τοῦ ἄνθρωπο) and the manner in which it sets forth the cause of the controversy which divided the Pharisees against the Christians and gave rise to a great persecution against many Christians in Jerusalem. The force of this persecution was felt by the Apostle Paul in particularly But mysteriously excluded the leaders of the Urgemeinde and is generally thought to have resulted in the distribution of many Christians throughout Samaria and Judea. Did the controversy occur in Luke's own time and thus represent the state of the church at the time of writing his second volume? Or is this merely Luke's explanation of a controversy which has its roots in pre-Christian times, wherein the real cause of division between the first Christians may be found? What was the controversy about? These questions are not easily answered and it shall not be presumed here to do more than point to some of their serious and important implications
and indicate the directions in which new answers to these questions can be found. Starting with the last question first let it here be stated that all indications seem to point to this controversy as being considerably earlier than the interrogation of Peter and the Sons of Zebedee, who were called before the Jerusalem Council for preaching the Resurrection of Jesus, but not punished. This becomes particularly noticeable in view of Luke's conspicuous omission of any explanation for the fact that after Stephen's death the Urgemeinde apostles were permitted to remain in Jerusalem when the Pauline Christians were driven out. Indeed, the apostles were interrogated before the same Council, but their immortality Kerygma gave no offence (at least punishable) to the Pharisaic Council or, in Luke's view, to the later Christian Church. Luke attempts to ameliorate this distinction between Christians and explain their apparently separate kerygmatic traditions by reference to a controversy between Stephen and the Pharisees which took place before Paul presumably was converted, but nevertheless one which he must have witnessed first-hand. Although this question touches deeply on Paul's relation to the leaders of the Urgemeinde, or mother church in Jerusalem, we might well ask whether this "cause" of the controversy, tactfully presented by Luke, was not in fact one of the many "effects" of a longstanding controversy which extends even back to pre-
Christian times. It is with the pre-Christian nature of this controversy that we have been concerned in the previous chapters and in the following chapters we shall examine its nature as the Kerygmata Controversy as seen within the early Christian Church.

The Heavenly Vision:

Because of its obviousness, the fact of Stephen's heavenly vision as such, might easily be overlooked for its relationship to the great immortality-resurrection controversy and the events which Luke suggests were the cause of the existing division in the Church. Among the Sadducaic characteristics trenchantly repudiated by the anti-apocalyp
tical emphasis of Jamnia were heavenly visions, theophanies and appearances, particularly the appearance of the eschatological Son of Man. They went so far as to deny the existence of the Shekinah traditionally held sacred by the Sadducaic high priests in the Holy of Holies of the Temple. The Pharisees thus required that the incense, burned by the Sadducaic priests in preparation for the appearance within the Holy of Holies, should not be burned outside, "because they denied such visions altogether". If it were not for the fact that Luke has written a great deal of his own theology into the speeches which occur in the first part of Acts, it...
might be possible to make a literal comparison of the speeches of Peter (for which he was not banished from Jerusalem) and the speech of Stephen (for which he was stoned). These would disclose not only the point at issue between the Pharisees and Sadducaic Christians, but the distinguishing differences between the two traditions, the Kerygma of the Urgemeinde and the Kerygma of the later church. Because Luke considered it his purpose to reconcile both these factions of Christianity as well as their differing Kerygmata to a greater or lesser degree both in his Gospel and the Acts, we can only compare the speeches to see what fragments of tradition have survived Luke's reconstructions.

### Stephen

7:52, "the Righteous One, whom you have now betrayed and murdered."

3:14, "you denied the Holy and Righteous One, and asked for a murderer to be granted to you, and killed the author of life."

7:37, "Moses said...'God will raise up for you a prophet from your brethren as he raised me up'."

3:22, "Moses said, 'The Lord God will raise up for you a prophet from your brethren as he raised me up'."

7:52, "Which of the prophets did not your fathers persecute? And they killed those who announced beforehand the coming of the Righteous One".

3:24, "And all the prophets who have spoken, from Samuel and those who came afterwards, also proclaimed these days. You are the sons of the prophets".
7:55, "But he, full of the Holy Spirit, gazed into heaven and saw the glory of God; and he said, 'Behold I see the heavens opened and the Son of Man standing at the right hand of God'."

3:15, "whom God raised from the dead. To this we are witnesses."

2:32, "This Jesus God raised up, and of that we are all witnesses. Being therefore exalted at the right hand of God."

In the above passages, both Stephen and Peter accuse the Boethusians and Pharisaic Council for the outright murder of Jesus the "Righteous One", thus it was not simply for antagonizing the guilty (whom Luke names) that Stephen was punished and Peter was not. Both Stephen and Peter quote the well known prophecy of Moses (προφήτην ὑμῖν ἀναστήσει κυρίος ὁ Θεός) with the significant difference that Peter's speech applies this prophecy to Jesus himself (3:20, "The Christ appointed for you, Jesus") who is thus placed in the role of the Messianic Prophet. The speech which Luke has attributed to Stephen appears to apply to the Prophets as a whole. However, the fact that Luke writes as he does shows that he has John the Baptist in mind. Stephen's reference, in 7:52, to the killing of those "who announced beforehand the coming of the Righteous One" contains an allusion to John the Baptist, without which the reference to the killing of the Prophets seems like an exaggerated account, as there were few Prophets killed before John. Thus in Peter's speech Jesus' function is that of the Messianic Prophet, in Stephen's it belongs to John the Baptist.

Although the differences between the two Kerygmata is scarcely visible in Luke's handling of the traditions,
We shall see that the Urgemeinde Kerygma laid great stress on John the Baptist as the forerunner of the Parousia event, which they believed to have taken place in the Passion of Christ. The opposing Kerygma, however, was to minimise John so that Jesus himself might be proclaimed as the Messianic forerunner of a Parousia event which was yet to come. This is the fundamental difference, among the many differences, between the Kerygmata, as seen even at this stage in Stephen's and Peter's speeches—hence the significance of Stephen's term, "Son of Man", with its connotations of imminent judgment and the new heaven and earth already at hand. It is fairly certain that Luke has not arbitrarily created these two Kerygmata, but that they reflect two traditions of an early controversy which he alone sought to reconcile. These differing Kerygmata may also be seen in Herod's question and the dispute which followed about Jesus' identification as Prophet or Christ (Mk. 6:14-16, Mt. 14:1-2, Lk. 9:7-8). It appears that a majority of Jesus' contemporaries and later followers wished to see him as the Messianic Prophet or forerunner (Mt. 21:46, Lk. 4:24, Lk. 7:16-17): "and this report concerning him spread through the whole of Judea". It is evident in Jesus' own question: "Who do men say that I am?" (Mk. 8:27-30, Mt. 16:13-17, Lk. 9:18-21), and "Who do the multitudes say that I am?". The fundamental issue thus was whether Jesus was the Messianic forerunner, or whether it
was John the Baptist? This would have been the same as asking, Is the Parousia at hand, or is it yet to come as a future event of which Jesus is the forerunner? If John was the Messianic Prophet, then was not the coming of Christ himself the Parousia event? If so, the resurrection has already taken place in him, and not, as the Pharisees say, a future event at the end of the ages yet to come. It was in this manner that the Urgemeinde Kerygma differed from the views of the Pharisees.

Another major difference between the Peter and Stephen speeches, and consequently the Kerygmata they reflect, is the particular manifestations of Jesus which they reveal. Peter's claim is that he has seen a resurrection appearance: "This Jesus God raised up, and of that we are all witnesses" (2:32), and, "whom God raised from the dead. To this we are witnesses" (3:15). An earthly, flesh and blood reappearance of Jesus back from the dead to this life would not cause the Pharisaic Council to "grind their teeth", as they did at Stephen's vision of Christ exalted at the right hand of God. They were nevertheless answered by Peter and John's teaching that in Jesus was the hope of the resurrection (4:2). Nonetheless, the resurrection may have implied to them what the multitudes already believed, namely, that Jesus was a Messianic Prophet. The nature of the Pharisaic teaching on the resurrection may be seen in the Babylonian
Talmud. Although, obviously, of late composition, it nonetheless contains a tradition which purports to go back to Gamaliel II; one which early Christian fathers held to be a reference to Jewish Christians,

"Sectarians (Minim) asked Rabban Gamaliel: Whence do we know that the Holy One, blessed be He, will resurrect the dead? He answered them from the Torah, the Prophets, and the Hagiographa, yet they did not accept it (as conclusive proof) from the Torah: for it is written: 'And the Lord said unto Moses, Behold, thou shalt sleep with thy fathers and rise up (again) Deut.31:16.' But perhaps, they said to him, (the verse reads) and thy people will rise up. From the Prophets, as it is written, 'Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise. Wake and sing, ye that dwell in the dust: for thy dew is as the dew of the herbs, and the earth shall cast out its dead.' Isaiah 26:19. But perhaps this refers to the dead whom Ezekiel resurrected Ezek.27(37:12)."

The above apology, which ultimately became the accepted Pharisaic teaching on resurrection, will be observed to be surprisingly close to the later Kerygma of the Pauline Christians where it is attributed by Luke to the speeches of Peter as well. Thus the Pharisees' views can be said to be closer to the later Pauline general resurrection Kerygma than they were to the teachings of the (pre-Boethusian) Sadducees who were martyred before Stephen. It is significant that Gamaliel II has quoted the LXX version of Isaiah which refers to those "in the earth" who shall "rejoice" and those "in the tombs" (Ἀναστήσονται οἱ νεκροὶ, καὶ ἐγερθοῦνται ὁι ἐν τοῖς μνημείοις), Is.26:19. The masoretic text says: "Thy dead shall live,
their bodies (SyrATg. say "my body") shall rise" and refers to the "land of the shades" rather than the "land of the ungodly" as in the LXX. Jesus' manifestation to Stephen was not simply a resurrection appearance of flesh and blood, rather, "the heavens were opened" and Stephen saw the "Son of Man" standing in readiness. This came in the category of a Parousia event, to the mind of the Pharisees and would be reason enough to cause these non-Christian elders to grind their teeth. To those who believed in the general resurrection at the end of time to the "next world", the appearance of the heavenly Son of Man already standing in readiness at the right hand of God was an anti-resurrection teaching. It not only implied an imminent Parousia (of one form or another) as over against a future post-general Resurrection Parousia, it also implied a particular breaking of God's Kingdom into "this world" rather than a general resurrection to the "next". It is in this sense that the Pharisees could say of the Sadducees, that they did not believe that "there is a resurrection" at the end of time. The same may be said of Stephen's Kerygma and that of the Urgemeinde, which held that Jesus the Son of Man was Translated (ascended) to heaven and was now standing at the right hand of the Father ready to return (as the early Christians and the disciples of John the Baptist prayed) with the Kingdom and power of God to, "this age" (ἡν ἡμέραν). Action taken by the Pharisees against this
view is also evident in that part of the Mishna dealing with "prayers" (חַיָּיוֹת Berakoth 9.5),

"At the close of every Benediction in the Temple they used to say, 'From everlasting (מְדָרוֹת מְדוֹדָה'); but after the heretics (Minim) had taught corruptly and said that there is but one world (מְדָרוֹת מְדוֹדָה), it was ordained that they should say, 'From everlasting to everlasting' (מְדָרוֹת מְדוֹדָה)."

A well known later tendency in Rabbinic Judaism was to distinguish between "this age" and the "age to come" in an exact manner. Prof. Barrett has called attention to a Rabbinic formula, where (מְדָרוֹת מְדוֹדָה) is often contrasted with (romosome). "Not as This Age will be the Age to Come" (romosome גָּזֶה מְדָרוֹת מְדוֹדָה). He has noticed that the term (romosome) is often ambiguous, as it can mean both "world", in a spatial sense, and "age", as a division of time. The former conforms as well as the latter to the Pharisaic doctrine of a future Resurrection-Judgment. The nature of the difference between Stephen's Kerygma and that of the later church, is thrown into sharper focus by the Jewish Fathers' teaching on the "next world": "Rabbi Jacob said: 'This world (romosome) is like a vestibule before the world to come (romosome): prepare thyself in the vestibule that thou mayest enter into the banqueting hall." Stephen's Kerygma of the exalted Son of Man, Jesus, at the right hand of the Father, ready to enter in upon "This World", stands in sharp contrast to the Pharisaic teaching on a
general resurrection to judgment. The resultant Kerygma in later Christian circles was that which described a messianic forerunner, Jesus, who came to prepare the way and bear witness to the Mansions of the "Next World", thought of as a future reward at the end of time, rather than anything which had a present reality. It is necessary to probe earlier strata of tradition than this, however, to exhume the original teachings of the Urgemeinde.

**The Stephen Kerygma:**

The singular occurring of the title (ὁ νῦς τοῦ ἄνθρωπου) in Luke's second volume (and that placed on the lips of Stephen), compared with its frequent occurring in his Gospel, has mystified critics for some time. The absence of this term is particularly noticeable in view of his use of the term "Righteous One" (3:14, 7:52, 22:14) which Enoch has used synonymously for "Son of Man". This suggests that Luke has purposely avoided its use in Acts for the benefit of the Pharisaic Christians who had gained prominence in the Church. Nevertheless, it is well to consider a few of the more recent alternatives which have been suggested concerning this fact. Dr. Cullmann has ascribed a primitive origin to the Son of Man Kerygma of "Christ at the right hand of God":

"The present reign of Christ is described by the
Primitive Church with the use of expressions from Ps. 110, interpreted to refer to Christ: 'Christ sits at the right hand of God,' 'all enemies are subjected to him.' The unusually large number of passages in which this 'sitting of Christ at the right hand of God' is expressed shows how great an importance the first Christians plainly ascribed to this faith.

It might be noticed that Prof. Cullmann's source (Ps. 110) does not mention the "Son of Man", but a passage from this Psalm which is quoted by the Epistle to the Hebrews does. Hebrews, however, provides an unusually straightforward presentation of the Urgemeinde Kerygma as we shall see presently. In a later writing, Dr. Cullmann has said of Stephen that Luke is representing in the figure of Stephen a "deviation Judaism" (elsewhere called "Esoteric", "Gnostic" and "Syncretistic" Judaism) in which Luke has had recourse to an old tradition which was not necessarily compatible with his (Luke's) own view, thus the kerygmatic title (Son of Man) is not a Lucan invention. One may wholeheartedly agree with Dr. Cullmann's premise regarding the existence of an earlier source without drawing with him the conclusion that the above facts offer proof of the Urgemeinde's belief that the reign of Christ (at the right hand of God) implies a fixed stage in redemptive history when the period of the church (as the body of Christ) is the period of "This World", followed by the "Next World", when Christ will return for a Parousia of Resurrection and Judgment.
carefully constructed scheme of "redemptive history"
(which bears many striking resemblances to the Pharisaic
notion of "destiny") does seem to apply to the later Kerygma
of the church of Acts, on which it sheds a great deal of
light. But it was, by no means, the only Kerygma within
the Early Church nor the Kerygma of the Urgemeinde. More-
over the whole plan impinges upon the ascension narrative
of Acts (1:11) with its promise that Christ will return in
the same manner by which he ascended, but it ignores the
It also ignores the duplicate ascension narrative in Luke
(24:50ff) which contains no promise of a return of Christ
in the same manner. Cullmann's plan somehow fails to ex-
plain why the Son of Man Kerygma of Luke's Gospel is almost
totally ignored in Acts, or why Stephen, the "Hellenists" and
the "Esoteric" Covenanters of Qumran should be considered
"deviation Judaism" when their eschatology and way of life
were so close to the legitimate (pre-Boethusian) Sadducaic
priesthood. But we shall return to this question once again.

The title "Son of Man", and its use in Stephen's
speech has evoked voluminous discussion. Prof. C.K. Barrett
has brought the whole discussion, for the past twenty-seven
years, up to date in the Festschrift for Ernst Haenchen.
He reviews the list of explanations put forth by Dr. Haenchen
himself and augments it with recent suggestions and several
contributions of his own. With reference to the Son of Man "standing at the right hand of God", Prof. Barrett has asked why the explicit (κατημένος) used with frequency elsewhere, should here be replaced by (ἐστιν) and has concluded: "What point could there be in making the change, unless the author intended to represent the Son of Man as standing upright" (also "standing" in Latin and Syriac versions). Dr. Barrett next examines several interpretations of this apparent "intrusion" into early Christian thought.

The solutions are as varied as Bauernfeind's "angel Christology", Stählin's, "Jesus standing to welcome the martyr", with which there is much to agree. He criticises some of the views of the Son of Man as "judge", i.e. the Paraclete-witness and defending counsel, as defined by Preuss, and Cullmann's "heavenly witness for his (Stephen's) earthly witness", as well as C. F. D. Moule's theory of a "double trial". The Parousia question, with which we are concerned here, gives rise to a choice in the interpretation of Stephen's Kerygma of the Son of Man, as either, "readiness for the Parousia", or "Parousia delay". The latter is exemplified by H. P. Owen's slightly Pharisaic "proleptic vision", in which Stephen is said to look forward to the glory of the Parousia. Such an explanation for the Parousia delay has been denied by Hans Conzelmann, who, on the contrary, has held that the Stephen Kerygma is original and that Luke's problem was to
find a substitute for the idea that the Parousia is near at hand. Prof. Barrett's analysis demonstrates the inadequacies of any solution which does not answer the question why, apart from the Gospels, the title "Son of Man" occurs nowhere else except in the Stephen Kerygma and, secondly, why the Stephen Kerygma should differ from the Kerygma of the post-70 church?

The conclusions to which Prof. Barrett comes are of particular interest to this study and it is along these lines that the whole discussion takes another step forward. He says: "The use of the Son of Man (terminology) in this context is part of the Lucan re-writing of the primitive Christian eschatology". Luke's frequent use of the term in his Gospel and its singular re-occurrence in his second volume, thus represents a reinterpretation of the "present" eschatology of the Urgemeinde into the "future" eschatology of the Pauline Christians, but in particular rather than universal terms. "Quite rightly, Luke saw that for the individual Christian death was truly an ἀνασκαρσία (though not the ἀνασκαρσία); it was therefore not wrong to think of it (as in another field Luke could think of the fall of Jerusalem) in eschatological terms. Thus the death of each Christian would be marked by what we may term a private and personal parousia of the Son of Man". The persuasive implication is that Luke's distinctive contribution was a
"particularisation" of Christian eschatology, traces of which may be found in his speeches of Paul who therefore employs substitute terms for the "Son of Man" eschatology. But one might ask, was this a unique contribution of Luke or was such a view already implicit in the Urgemeinde Kerygma which Luke has reconciled with later Christian teachings in his second volume? Also such a view does not appear to solve the problem of the "next world" and "this world" categories, which appear as a double tradition in both Jewish and Christian literature. Perhaps a few questions will provide further clarification.

**This World or Next World:**

If it is agreed that Luke's rewriting of the Son of Man (Jesus) Kerygma was in terms which particularised rather than universalised Christian eschatology, thus placing the particularisation at a later stage in Christian thought, two questions remain unanswered in regard to the Urgemeinde teaching about the parousia: a) Was it to take place in this world or the next, or were these categories important only to later Pharisaic Christians? b) Was it the return of Jesus as the Messianic Prophet, or the return of Jesus as the Son of Man with the power of God himself? If the Urgemeinde taught that he would return to this world (a), with the power of God (b), then their teaching was in direct opposition to the
Pharisaic doctrine of resurrection to the next world. But this would not be the case if his return was to be in the next world (future) or if his return were merely as the Messianic (Christ) Prophet (present) who as the "first fruits" of the resurrection would "prepare the way" and raise others in a general resurrection to the "next world".

In contrast to this latter view, the evidence in Luke's first volume, points in a most decisive manner to a tradition which, unlike the later Resurrection Kerygma, did not depend on numerous resurrection appearances for its authority. This underlying tradition, which is here called the "Urgemeinde Kerygma", is both revealed by, and may be considered one of the reasons for the existence of the "double traditions" already observed by several critics such as Robert Morgenthaler in the Lucan Gospel. The first occurrence of this Kerygma comes to light in a comparison of the John (the Baptist) traditions with the Jesus traditions. It was once thought that the parallel Infancy Narratives of John and Jesus represented a crude attempt to link the so-called alien movement of John the Baptist with that of Jesus. One recent trend has been to insist on the contemporaneousness and the close relationship of John and Jesus. But it then must be asked, how much of John is the literary creation of Luke? The place of John the Baptist is of first importance to any discussion of Urgemeinde teaching.
That he has a significant bearing on the eschatology of
the Urgemeinde is disclosed by the eschatological prayer
which Jesus gave in answer to his disciples request: "Lord,
teach us to pray as John taught his disciples" (Lk.11:1),
as well as what is said to be John's preaching of the
"Kingdom of God" which is "at hand" (Mt.3:2) which may well
have been an original teaching of Jesus attributed to John.
In the Lucan version, John's announcement has been watered
down to "Even now the axe is laid to the root of the trees"
(Lk.3:9). The difference in attitude between New Testament
writers toward John the Baptist and his relationship to Jesus
is by no means coincidental and sheds considerable light on the
Kerygma of the Urgemeinde.

It seems likely that in order to do justice to
the two Christian Kerygmata which were now before him that it
became necessary for Luke to place the words of Jesus in the
mouth of John the Baptist, as may be seen in various other
Jesus traditions: "know this, that the Kingdom of God has come
near" (Lk.10:11). This indeed is where Mark has placed
the tradition: "Jesus came preaching...saying, 'The time is
fulfilled and the Kingdom of God is at hand'" (Mk.1:15) as
has Matthew (4:17, 10:7). The above are only a few of the
examples which might be cited, but it is only important to
notice here the way in which the post-Pauline Church gradually
began to transfer the role of Messianic Prophet from John
the Baptist to Jesus. It fell to Luke to reconcile these
two divergent Kerygmata. If John the Baptist was the (foreordained) Messianic Prophet who was to anoint the Messianic Ruler, then the Kingdom of God, itself, was at hand in "this age", as the Urgemeinde taught, in Jesus Christ. If on the other hand, Jesus was the (foreordained) Messianic Prophet, as the other Kerygma taught, then the Kingdom of God was not an accomplished reality, but a future phenomenon to which the Resurrection Kerygma bore witness.

It seems likely that this was the sort of dilemma which Luke faced. His task was a theological one, to construct a theological bridge between the Kerygma of the Urgemeinde and the Kerygma of the later Pauline Church. These terms, employed in this sequence for the sake of convenience, strictly speaking do not always imply early and later time connotations as both elements of Christianity were often contemporaneous as they were in the time of Luke. "Urgemeinde", here, simply implies the pre-Pauline Jerusalem Christians, characterised by the pillar apostles who were non-Pauline in their eschatology and views on Immortality. "Pauline Church" does not imply a separate church or even one which replaced the Urgemeinde but simply the pro-Pauline Christians whose numbers were vastly expanded after the Fall of Jerusalem in 70 AD, whose eschatology and views on resurrection nonetheless had much in common with the Pharisaic outlook and thus in some respects predated both Paul and the
Church's vast missionary expansion. Thus Luke's task was much more than simply to be a historian who faithfully transmitted (without interpretation) two traditions or even manuscripts which occasionally overlapped. Prof. Barrett has recently suggested that Luke found an eschatological solution to the "this world-next world" dilemma by "particularising" the Parousia in the death of the individual Christian as a personal (ἐσκαρον). This important observation must be examined in greater detail for its many implications. Thus, if "only in dying" Stephen was in a position to see the coming of the Son of Man, it was not, to the Urgemeinde Kerygma, which Luke also transmits, a universal Parousia or an end of the world or aeon or even the day of the resurrection of the dead. These things had already been accomplished as far as scripture had foretold in the resurrection of Christ. This may have implied to the minds of the Urgemeinde "the Resurrection" and also "the Judgment of mankind" as an accomplished fact as is indicated by the words: "I am the resurrection and the life" (Jh.11:25) "the hour is coming and now is, when the dead will hear the voice of the Son of God and those who hear will live...and those who have done good to the resurrection of life" (Jh.5:25-29). But there is little evidence from the earliest level of Urgemeinde tradition that they found any scriptural basis for a general or universal resurrection of the dead.
They did, however, believe in a particular resurrection in which they themselves already participated. We will soon discover that the Urgemeinde considered itself to be already living in the post-resurrection age and in a stage of immortality, as one of Luke's traditions relates: "For they cannot die any more, because they are equal to angels and are sons of God, being sons of the resurrection" (Lk.20:36, cp. II Tim.2:18, Heb.9:26, 4:14, 12:23, 13:2, etc). Thus what remained for the Urgemeinde Christian was not death, for death is the experience of the living or those who remain (Jh.21:23, 8:51,52, 5:24, and Mt.8:22 "let the dead bury their dead"). Thus Stephen experienced, according to the Urgemeinde tradition which Luke retains, a "particular and immediate parousia" or coming of Christ for his elect. However, by particularising the "Resurrection to the Next World Kerygma", taught by the Pharisaic Christians, Luke was able to do justice to the imminence of the Kingdom of God (and Son of Man) which he knew was taught by the Urgemeinde. The result of this process was Luke's own unique reconciliation of two Kerygmata. Because this new element of "particularisation" seems to be Luke's own unique modification of the "futurist" Kerygma which the Pauline Christians gradually adopted, because it was closer to the familiar Pharisaic view of resurrection (it is not denied, here, that Paul had a
considerable influence on Luke), we may well ask then, are there other instances of a Lucan attempt to do justice to both Kerygmatata in addition to the example cited above? It is not possible to examine in depth even a fraction of the interpretative modifications which exist in Luke's writings, some major and some slight, or even treat of all his special material, but one or two additional examples may be cited which bear on the immortality Kerygma of the Urgemeinde.

"Jesus, remember me when you come (ἐὰν ἔλθῃς) in your kingly power (βασιλεία σου) And he said to him, 'Truly I say to you, today (σήμερον) you will be with me in Paradise'." (Lk.23:42-3)

The Urgemeinde tradition here preserved by Luke and discarded by the others, because of its anti-resurrection character, is perhaps retained for one reason. Its existence gives precedence and authority to his view of the "personal eschaton" or "particular parousia" which we have already observed. If the saying were a mere Lucan fabrication and not known, it would provide no support for his argument. The variant in this passage also shows the tendency of later interpretation. There is small support for (εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν) "when you enter into your Kingdom" but better authority for the originality of (ἐὰν ἔλθῃς ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ σου)" when you come in your Kingdom (as King), or as RSV has translated (ἐν) with the dative, "come in your kingly power". The
latter variant strengthens Jesus' words (ἀμὴν εἰς ἡγω, σήμερον) considerably, as an eschatological Parousia and supports this as an original Kerygmatic tradition of the Urgemeinde.

If it is understood that Luke's task was not merely to deal with two documents (or oral traditions) or simply two phases in the history of the church, but with two Kerygmata which were very much alive in his day and giving rise to the controversies described above, considerable light is thrown on Luke's distinctive theological point of view and the material, in the Gospel, which is peculiar to him. Such is the case with 17:20-37. Here, the Pharisees have been cited specifically as those who demanded of Jesus an answer to when the Kingdom of God should be (17:20). Indeed this appears to be an oblique reference to the controversy in Luke's own time between the Pharisaic Christians and the Urgemeinde Christians. In the light of the Pharisaic teaching on resurrection to the Next World, contrasted with the Urgemeinde Kerygma of the Parousia which has already occurred, the resulting solution which follows can be considered to be purely Lucan. He answers by saying the Kingdom is neither past nor future, but "within you":

"The Kingdom of God is not coming with signs to be observed; nor will they say, 'Lo here it is! (δοῦ ὡς) or 'There! (ἡ ἐκεῖ) for behold, the Kingdom of God is in the midst of you" (so RSV; Greek δοῦ γὰρ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν τοῖς ὑμῖν ἐστιν;"within you").
Luke possibly could not articulate in more direct terminology than this, his teaching regarding the "particular" rather than the "universal" coming of the Kingdom of God. His answer to the present (here) or future (there) dilemma, is that it is both. It is (ἐντὸς ὑμῶν) specifically, "within you". His assertion that the Kingdom does "not come with signs to be observed" (17:20) is a clear rejection of objective space or time categories. Not only is the Parousia a particular phenomenon as over against universal phenomenon, as held by the Urgemeinde, but Luke goes one step further to suggest in these words that it is a subjective as well as particular reality. A Kingdom which already exists beyond observable, objective and empirical apprehension. To the Pharisees who think in terms of past or future, ("this world" or "next world" time categories) Luke's "sign" is suddenness (17:24-37). To the Urgemeinde Christians who say that it is here, he replies, Yes it is already here, but it is not here or there spatially, but "here" within. What follows 17:21 is probably no longer original Lucan material with the exception of the verse: "The days are coming when you will desire to see one of the days of the Son of Man, and you will not see it." (17:22). This, again, is an outright rejection of the whole futuristic framework of resurrection to judgment upon which the entire Pharisaic system of reward
ethics was constructed. The Stephen and the Urgemeinde belief in the Parousia as a particular phenomenon at the point of death for the Christian, is not contradicted by Luke's modifications regarding the subjective and sudden nature of death, as seen in various other passages in his Gospel: "one shall be taken, the other left" (17:37, 35, 34), "Whoever seeks to save his life, shall lose it" (17:33) "As the lightning flashes...so will be the Son of Man" (17:24). These latter passages (17:23-37) form a tradition which Luke shares with Matthew (24:23-41) and have all the marks of original Urgemeinde Kerygma regarding the Son of Man and the Kingdom of God.

In summary, it might therefore be said, that Luke's unique method of handling his controversial sources and the nature of the solution which he provided, all strongly suggest that the task which he faced, as a writer, was to reconcile the Son of Man Kerygma of the Urgemeinde, which taught present immortality and the imminent occurrence of the Kingdom of God, with the resurrection Kerygma of the pro-Pharisaic Christians, who taught that Jesus, as the Messianic forerunner merely heralded the coming of a future Parousia which would be accompanied by a general resurrection of mankind at the end of time.
Luke and the Urgemeinde Kerygma:

Since the attention given by Harnack to what De Bruyne originally called the Anti-Harcionite Prologue of Luke, the writing of Acts has generally been placed somewhere in the vicinity of Corinth after the death of Paul. There have been many differing opinions about the date of Luke's composition of Acts ranging from 60-100 A.D. The traditional view has been to accept, on the basis of Eusebius' comment on II Timothy (4:18), a date for its writing sometime near the death of the Apostle Paul:

"The Lord will rescue me from every evil attempt and keep me safe for His heavenly kingdom", indicating his forthcoming martyrdom. This he foretells more clearly still in the same letter, when he says: 'For I am already being offered as a sacrifice, and the time for my departure has come'. (II Tim.4:6). In this second Epistle to Timothy he remarks that only Luke is with him as he writes, and at his first trial not even he: presumably that is why Luke concluded the Acts of the Apostles at that point." 416

Because of the advanced and almost stereotyped picture Acts presents of the newly-emergent (or later) Church, many have placed its writing as late as 80 or 100 AD. 417 Adolf Harnack has said with some plausibility that it is unlikely that Luke would fail to mention the martyrdom of Paul, if Acts were written later. 418 However, another trend of scholarship has placed the writing of both Luke's Gospel and Acts at a later date because of the parallels between Acts and Josephus' Antiquities and
the apparent knowledge Luke seems to have of Josephus (cp. B.J. II. xiii. 5 and Acts 21:38 with Ant. XX. viii. 8). Including the quotations noticed by Eusebius (Acts 5:34-6, 11:29-30 and Ant. XX. v. 1). Despite Eusebius' particular interest in the Lucan and Josephan parallels, which give stronger support for Rome, as its place of origin, and a date closer to 100 AD, it is not impossible that Luke and Josephus had recourse to the same sources. However, the greater probability lies, as a majority now hold, with the placing of its composition before the persecutions of Domitian, in 95 AD.

Contrary to the tendency of the Tübingen School to minimize the original creative contribution of Luke to Acts, H.J. Schoeps has gone to the other extreme by exaggerating his inventiveness. He denies the historicity of Stephen, altogether, and believes him to be the literary creation of Luke as an "Ersatzfigur" for James, to articulate an original Jewish Christian polemic against the "Temple cultus" in Jerusalem. He consequently has challenged the authenticity of Stephen's speech with its doctrine of the "Translated Christ", the implication being that the ascended or "Translated" Christ, as distinct from a resurrected Christ, was one of Luke's "Greek" notions rather than an original "Jewish" teaching and therefore imposed on Christian theology, at this late stage, by means of a Lucan interpolation.
Likewise, Dr. Cullmann has stated that what is essentially "Christian" and central to the Church's original eschatology, is the doctrine of the resurrection of the body. Notions of immortality (or pre-existence of the Soul) or the ascension (Translation) of Christ, are thus thought by Cullmann to be later accretions to Christian thought which came about through Luke's (and others') subsequent contact with Gnostics, Docetists and Hellenists. What follows below is an attempt to demonstrate that there is another side to this longstanding point of view, fashionable since the days of Tübingen, which can be seen in the early and essentially Jewish provenance of what may have originally been taught as a Translation Kerygma in the Urgemeinde.

If the writing of Acts took place after the important Pharisaic Council of Jamnia, and we have seen several of the reasons for holding that this was the case; then, we must allow for the possibility that in these drab (for Judaism) post-70 AD years, Luke's second volume may have gone through as much of a purge (by its author if not externally) as the rest of Jewish literature, which was divested of all Sadducaic elements, including "visions", Sadducaic doctrines, legal decisions, but especially teachings on the afterlife.

W.O.E. Oesterley and G.H. Box have called attention to the central importance of this Council in their explanation for the traces of "double tradition" (Pharisaic and Sadducaic)
which are particularly evident in the Talmud and other Jewish literature. Dr. Oesterley has concluded from his analysis of Josephus that there is an almost inexplicable change of attitude between the Jewish War, in which the high priests are represented as pious, noble, devoted to the law and wholly praiseworthy; and the Antiquities, in which they are denounced as deceivers, ambitious, secular and labelled "Sadducees" for the first time in this negative manner. An example of this may be seen in a comparison of War (ii.261-265) and Antiquities (xx.168-181) in which both describe the same event relevant to an Egyptian "false prophet" whom Josephus said gathered 30,000 men and became a threat to the Roman government. In the Jewish War no mention has been made of the part the high priests played in the disturbances of that time. War (ii.264) simply states: "The impostors and brigands, banding together, incited numbers to revolt". Antiquities (xx.168-181) describes the same "false prophet" who came out of Egypt in the time of Felix, but follows this by an account of sedition between the high priests who are clearly described as the "robbers". "Such was the shamelessness and effrontery which possessed the high priests that they actually were so brazen as to send slaves to the threshing floors to receive the tithes that were due to the priests, with the result that the poorer priests starved to death" (xx.181, see also 206). In the Jewish War (ii.272)
it was the Roman procurator Albimus who accepted bribes, in the Antiquities (xx.206) it is the high priest Ananias. Also in War (vi.114) the high priest Jesus, son of the high priest Damnaios is mentioned favourably among the priests and nobility who sided with the Romans. But in Antiquities (xx.213) the same high priest is presented as a usurper of office who created a sedition between the high priests by gathering a small army of toughs who not only hurled reproaches, but stones as well, at the other high priests. These, by oblique reference, may well have included James, "the brother of Jesus called Christ" (xx.200). The obvious difference between these two accounts is the change in Josephus' own attitude toward the high priests in the face of the Pharisaic (anti-priestly) rise to power as well as the new attitude toward Roman authority after the fall of Jerusalem in 70 AD. A similar "double tradition" may be seen in the difference between I and II Maccabees where Jason son of the high priest is eulogised among the Jewish nobility for his diplomatic achievements (cp. Sirach 50:27), but bitterly denounced in II. Mac.4:19. Although II Maccabees was written long before 70 AD, it was certainly compiled after the rise of the popular Pharisaic party in its first conflict with Hyrcanus II. It would be surprising if the rise of the Pharisaic movement, with its accompanying purges which so deeply affected most Jewish literature, resulting in censorship, "double traditions" and a
new need for pseudonymous writing, should not in some way be reflected in Christian literature. Because Acts is a post-70 AD writing (without the Temple traditions of Luke) and written at a time when the Pharisees had reached their highest point of expansion and power, it is not surprising that there is a significant difference in perspective between Luke's two volumes. This difference may well have been caused by the fall of Jerusalem, as B.H. Streeter and S.G.F. Brandon have suggested some time ago. But it has been seen, on the basis of this investigation, to have been more directly affected by the rise and dominance of Pharisaic influence at this time.

It is apparent that Luke was written at a time when the Pharisees were in the majority, but the last link of their legal supremacy was yet to be completed. By the time of Acts, however, the situation had changed. Previously, the Apostles were restrained from preaching the name of Christ, a crime for which Stephen was sorely punished. By the time of Acts, however, they were not even permitted to write about him at least not as the eschatological Son of Man after the manner of Enoch. It appears that this is a crime which Luke has taken pains to avoid in his second volume. This does not imply that the eschatological Son of Man was, therefore, a later teaching, but that Pharisaic dominance and censorship was a later development. Evidence of a transition, similar
to that which took place between I and II Maccabees, and between the Jewish War and the Antiquities, may be seen in the priestly and Temple orientated account of the ascension, as it is presented in Luke, and its duplicate account in Acts, which by comparison is divested of all Temple and priestly elements.

The Lucan Ascension Narratives:

P.A. van Stempvoort's analysis of the ascension narrative as it appears in Luke's Gospel (24:50-53) has caused him to place its whole setting in the region of the Temple. The narrative begins in the Temple (ἀρχάμενοι ἀπὸ Ἰερουσαλήμ: 47), from there he led them out (Ἐξῆγαγεν: 50). After the ascension they returned (ὑπεστρεψαν εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ: 52) and were continually (ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ: 53) blessing God. P.A. van Stempvoort has called attention to Jesus' last act as the blessing of a high priest (καὶ ἐπάρας τὰς κείρας αὐτοῦ ἐυλόγησεν αὐτοὺς: 50). It is significant that Luke both begins and ends his Gospel with priestly blessings of which this latter forms a natural part. It is significant that the whole setting of the first chapter of Luke is the Temple, but van Stempvoort perhaps presses the analogy too far in his comparison of the priestly blessing of Jesus, at the end of the Gospel (which is completed), with the priestly blessing of Zachariah (which was interrupted).
Nevertheless, the whole priestly and Sadducaic orientation of these passages cannot be disputed. They are in keeping with the Epistle to the Hebrews and the priestly, Sadducaic genealogy Luke has transmitted regarding Jesus (Lk.3:23ff). The list includes the name of "Jason the Son of Eliezer" and goes back to Enoch. Matthew's genealogy (Mt.1:1-16) also mentions Eleazer (but not Jason) and discloses Jesus' Sadducaic or "Zadokite" origins by the name "Zadok the father of Achim" (Mt.1:14). 429

The dispute over "supernatural visions" is not unrelated to the priestly benedictions cited above. We have seen that the particular form in which this dispute continued, was the Pharisees' prohibition against all "supernatural visions" on the part of priests. This was particularly true of the Shekinah presupposed by the high priest's kindling of the incense offering. The Sadducaic Temple rubric required that the high priest kindle the incense outside the Holy of Holies on the day of Atonement so that he might be wrapped in smoke while meeting the Shekinah within. 430 When the Pharisees came into power they repudiated the implication of these visions and demanded that the incense be kindled away from public view within. 431 However, Strack and Billerbeck suggest that a "mystic experience" during the incense offering was still remembered in the days of Luke (i.e. in the time of the Third Gospel's writing). 432 It should be noted,
however, that in Mishna, Thamid (טמ"א 7.2) the priestly blessing is given to the people after the incense offering. Whereas, the Translation of Jesus took place after his priestly benediction, according to Luke (24:50). It is nevertheless, reasonable to assume that the ascension (or Translation) of Christ fell within the category of such a priestly and Sadducaic "Shekinah" or "vision" and thus was denounced by both Pharisees and Pharisaic Christians who were more interested in the Resurrection.

It may well be asked, is Luke 24:51, in fact, an ascension narrative? Any answer to that question must explain why the words (καὶ ἀνεφέρετο εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν) are surprisingly missing from Sinaiticus and Bezae (but not the first corrector of Χ), and why they do stand in most other important manuscripts, including the earlier Bodmer Papyri, Alexandrinus, ________, Ephraemi, Paris (and Regius), Washingtonianus, Munich, St. Gall, Koridethi, Leningrad, Athos and many others. Serious scholarship has more recently argued in favour of including these words rather than rejecting them. Van stempvoort has argued strongly in favour of the inclusion of these words, on semasiological and stylistic grounds. He has held that their removal disturbs the order of the sentence, and argues convincingly that they were removed in order to harmonise Luke and Acts.
"The whole of my argument is really a plea for the full text of B, C and others. The shorter recension of the text (Lk.24:50-3) is in my opinion, the result of misunderstanding, harmonising tendencies and a lack of feeling for Luke's style."

It is not my purpose to add another to the arguments of Jeremias, Michaelis and van Stempvoort for the genuineness of these words. However, in the light of the double traditions contained in I and II Maccabees, B. J. and the Antiquities, and the Pharisaic and Sadducaic lines of Tradition which are evident in the Talmud and the Gospel of Luke itself, there is obviously more than just a simple need to "harmonise" the Ascension narrative of Luke's Gospel with the Ascension narrative in Acts.

Whether one agrees that a liturgical model for Lk.24:52 can be found in the blessing of the Sadducaic high priest Simon Onias with its accompanying praises to God (Sirach 50:20) it is certainly clear that Luke did not hesitate to call attention to the direct priestly relationship between Jesus of Nazareth and the Sadducaic priest Jesus Ben Sirach (Lk.3:29). He has done this by including in Jesus' genealogy the name: "Jesus the son of Sirach, son of Eleazar" (cp. Sir.50:27; also "Jason the son of Eleazar", I Mac. 8:17). This is the Sadducaic High Priest Onias, who appeared in a Translated form with the Prophet Jeremiah in a vision to Judas (II Mac. 15:12). Because of Sirach's priestly character, and the many striking parallels between his words and
the words of Jesus, the book of Ecclesiasticus' teaching on "translation" becomes particularly significant when compared with the Epistle to the Hebrews.

The Epistle to the Hebrews and the Translation Kerygma:

(Sir.) Sirach (44:14-16) contrasts the idea, "Their (Israelites) bodies were buried in peace (1:14) with; "Enoch pleased the Lord, and was taken up" (16 και μετέτηθη LXX).

(Heb.) Hebrews, 11:5, says (πιστεύεις μετατάσσεται τοῦ μη ἱδεῖν ἡμᾶς καὶ πιστεύεις διότι μετετεθέντοι δύον φθόνον τὸ θέον) and follows very closely to the plan of Sirach and lists Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Moses, etc. ending with Jesus who "is set down at the right hand of the throne of God" (12:2), who is the last of the "Great cloud of witnesses" (12:1).

(Sir.) Sirach's list includes Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Moses, Samuel (who anointed rulers and prophesied even after his death 46:20), Elijah (who "raised a corpse from Hades" i.e. to this life "by the word of the Most High", 48:5, followed by the expurgated passage "Blessed are those who saw you, and those who have died in love; for we also shall surely live" 48:11), Elijah, who was "taken up (ἀνεβαλεν) by a whirlwind of fire" (48:9), Elisha "who, when he was a dead body prophesied" (48:1), Ezekiel, who saw the vision of glory ("may the bones of the twelve prophets, revive from where they lie" i.e. to this life, 49:8-10), Zerubbabel (another of Christ's ancestors, 49:11 and Lk.3:27). Sirach's list concludes with a second mention of Enoch, who was, "taken up from the earth" (49:14).

(Heb.) Hebrews ends with the figure of Jesus (10:21, 12:2,23) the exalted High Priest.

(Sir.) Sirach ends with the figure of "Simon the High Priest, son of Onias" (50:1), the "Morning Star among the clouds" (50:6) who appeared in Translated form with Jeremiah to Judas (II Mac.15:12).

The early provenance of the Ascension Kerygma and
the priestly (Sadducaic) orientation of the Urgemeinde traditions preserved in Luke's Gospel are thus borne out by Sirach, which appears to have a direct link with the Kerygma of the Epistle to the Hebrews as well as that found in Stephen's speech. The Epistle to the Hebrews, like the doctrine of immortality itself, has been held to be late because of its classical Greek style (despite its priestly context and point of view) and because it is curiously said to be addressed to Gentiles (despite its title $\mu\rho\sigma\varepsilon$ $\varepsilon\beta\rho\alpha\iota\omega\upsilon\varsigma$ on the earliest extant text). Such theories do not appear convincing in view of the fact that the author clearly designates himself to be a contemporary of Timothy (Heb.13:22ff), reflects a priestly setting and orientation to the Temple and its priesthood with a greater frequency than any of the other New Testament Epistles and proceeds to define the heavenly sanctuary of the new covenant by a comparison with what appears to be an existing earthly Jerusalem Temple and old covenant. The best repudiation of the old covenant would have been the destruction of the Temple, which the epistle does not suggest has ————yet occurred. It is thus significant that the recent trend of criticism has been towards an earlier dating of the Epistle.

The Book of Sirach corroborates the Translation Kerygma as it stands in Luke's Gospel; and the Epistle to the Hebrews verifies its application to Jesus Himself.
Particularly, ἐξουσίας ὑπὸ ἀρχηγοῦ μεγὸς διελθοῦσα τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, Ἡσυχός τὸν ὦτὸν τοῦ θεοῦ 4:14. The verb ἀνεφέρετο (ἀνεφέρετο) generally has the meaning of "pass through" or "transfix", in Lk.2:35, it is used in the sense of "pierce". A common use of this verb in hellenistic literature is "to go across to" in its active form. The Vulgate translates "qui pene travit caelos". All of these are good equivalents for (ἀνεφέρετο).

By the use of these terms the author's eschatology is thus demonstrably at variance with the Pauline doctrine of resurrection, and stands closer to Sirach's doctrine of Translation and the Urgemeinde's ascension Kerygma. Hebrews refers to teachings about "ablutions", "resurrection of the dead" and "eternal judgment" as elementary doctrines of Christ which should be left behind as Christians go on to (τελειωτητα) maturity, 6:1. In the only passage where resurrection is specifically mentioned, the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews speaks of it as a resurrection to this life (ἐκ ζωῆς γυναίκες ἐκ ἀναστάσεως τῶν νεκρῶν αὐτῶν 11:35) and concludes that all of those (who were resurrected) "did not receive what was promised" (11:39), namely, the Kingdom of God (cp.13:20). It was perhaps because the notion of resurrection-judgment and resurrection-reward had been grossly exaggerated by the Pharisaic legal system, that the author of Hebrews, as well as Jesus in his parable of the rich man and Lazarus, felt it necessary to underscore the fact that resurrection is not
synonymous with salvation (Lk. 16:31). Nor was the Kingdom of God simply a futuristic hope to the mind of the author. The "great cloud of witnesses" are not said to look to a general resurrection in a future world, but to "us", "we are surrounded", he states (12:1). Another characteristic of the Urgemeinde's Kerygma is the "pre-existence" of the heavenly high priest which is similar to its teaching on the pre-existent son of Man. This "high priest forever after the order of Melchizedek" (6:20), who is, "without father or mother or genealogy, and has neither beginning of days nor end of life, but resembling the Son of God he continues a priest forever." (7:3). Pre-existence implies past existence or immortality and Christ who is this immortal high priest thus has become for the believer a sure "anchor of the soul" (6:19). These categories cannot be construed to be pro-Pharisaic or even Pauline, in any sense of the word. While one tradition, which Luke transmits, compares Jesus with the heavenly priest Onias, in accordance with the Translation Kerygma of Sirach, and another in the Epistle to the Hebrews compares him with the immortal high priest Melchizedek, it must follow that the Urgemeinde had a highly exalted view of the priesthood and associated with it specific immortality connotations. This theme is indeed reminiscent of the martyred Hasidim of the priestly Gerousia, perhaps drawn in sharp contrast to the secularism and dissension of the false priesthood in the writer's
"Now if perfection had been attainable through the Levitical priesthood (for under it the people received the law), what further need would there have been for another priest to arise after the order of Melchizedek, rather than one named after the order of Aaron?" (7:11)

Unlike Luke, the author of Hebrews does not base the heavenly priest's office on priestly succession, nor like Paul merely on the basis of the resurrection of his body, but his authority rests on his immortality, that is his immunity to death, endlessness and pre-existence.

"who has become a priest, not according to legal requirement concerning bodily descent, but by the power of an indestructible life (δύναμιν ζωῆς ἀκαταλύτου )." (7:16)

He further explains that there were many priests of a different order in the past, but these can be known to have failed to attain this eternally high office, simply because they died (7:23). Like Stephen, he stresses the present reign of the heavenly high priest, within this age but transcending this world: "We have such a high priest, one who is seated at the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in heaven, a minister in the sanctuary and the true tent (tabernacle) which is set up not by man but by the Lord" (8:1-2).

The Translation Kerygma preserved by Luke in his first ascension narrative, with its orientation to the Temple, high-priestly benediction and responses (προσκυνήσαντες αὐτὸν ) Lk.24:52 is not without reason found in a considerable number
of manuscripts of greatest textual importance. The words (μετὰ καράς μεγάλης, καὶ ἡ σαν διὰ παντὸς ἐν τῷ ἑρῴ εὐλογοῦντες τὸν θεόν) 24:52-3, appear to be intentionally cast by Luke himself in a form similar to that of the high priestly benediction of Simon, father of the immortal and ascended high priest, Onias III, which is preceded by the prayer and full toned "melody" of the congregation (Sir.50:14-21). It should be noted that Sirach has placed this passage in direct relation to the deliverance of Jason /Jesus/ (who was denounced as the brother of Onias, in II Mac.4:7) from the jaws of death and may well have been the author himself. "Thou...hast delivered by body from destruction" (Sir.51:2) "from the depths of the belly of Hades" (51:5) "My soul drew near to death, and my life was very near to Hades beneath" (51:6), "I sent up my supplication from the earth" (51:9). The close double relationship of Onias and Jason (Jesus) and their respective priestly and messianic functions has already been examined in some detail. There appears to be either a conscious or unconscious parallel to John the Baptist (whom Luke also presents in a priestly context, particularly, the announcement of his birth during the Shekinah (or vision of the angel of the Lord) to his father Zechariah after he administered the incense (later prohibited by the Pharisees. Lk.1:51), before the altar of incense in the Temple. Coming out, the people "perceived that he had seen a vision in the Temple" (Lk.1:11-22). John the Baptist
was the one who was executed (like Onias, outrageously),
and Jesus (Christ) like Jason, was the one who was delivered
from death. On formal grounds alone, the liturgy of the
high priest Simon with its symbolic sacrifice, "He reached
out his hand to the cup and poured a libation of the blood
of the grape; he poured it out at the foot of the altar"
(Sir.50:15) and its responses, "Then all the people together
made haste and fell to the ground upon their faces to worship
their Lord" (50:17), "And the singers praised him with their
voices in sweet and full-toned melody" (50:18); all indicate
an early rather than late provenance for the Lucan ascension
liturgy, as the whole of Sirach does for the Translation, or
ascension, Kerygma. That the author of Hebrews did have such
a typology in mind is indicated by the manner in which he has
even gone so far as to employ a similar framework of prophetic
sequence as that used by Sirach. The significant difference
is that Hebrews places Jesus at its climax as does Luke (24:27).
Hebrews, with its frequent references to the Temple, the
ascension of Christ, and its understanding of the coming of
Christ as the coming of the Parousia itself, reflects, perhaps
better than any other New Testament writing, the true character
of the Urgemeinde Kerygma.

The Urgemeinde Kerygma, in some respects, may at
first sight, suggest to some an anti-resurrection proclamation,
especially where it occurs in the ascension narratives of
Luke and the eschatological vision of Stephen. But it must be emphasized once again, that the Urgemeinde by no means denied the resurrection (or return) of Jesus in bodily form to "this life". We have seen that this early community readily accepted the return of Moses, Elijah, Jonah, the "Twelve Prophets" (and possibly Onias, Jeremiah and Samuel), back from the dead. They accepted the resurrection of those whom Elijah and Jesus raised from the dead, just as some of the Jews held that women, "received their dead by resurrection" to this life. Many of the Prophets were expected to return in order to fulfil their prophetic admonitions. But such resurrections could scarcely signify the coming of the Parousia. On the other hand, the appearance of the "Son of Man" at the right hand of God and the translation of a Son of Man to the throne of God to return (shortly) with myriads of angels, implied something more than a resurrection "appearance", as we shall see. However, the ascension, or Son of Man Kerygma, may be said to be anti-resurrection (in the Pharisaic sense) to the extent that it implied that Jesus was not a mere "resurrected forerunner", like Elijah (or any of the Prophets), and to the extent that they held the Parousia to have already commenced in the coming of Christ.

Thus, two alternatives remain. Either the Stephen Christophany and the ascension-Translation narratives are the literary creations of Luke, despite their mention outside
Luke; or, it must be held, that they are a genuine earlier tradition placed alongside the resurrection Kerygma and "prophet christology", which Luke has reconciled in his particular eschatology. One may see in the later Apocalypse a gradual disintegration of this highly advanced Lucan theology with its particular eschatology into a proliferation of secondary teachings. Recognizing Luke's past, it should not be suggested that Jesus, himself, had not already begun to reconcile the Pharisaic and Sadducaic eschatologies long before Luke. As the Early Church came to be dominated more and more by Pharisaic elements (we have already observed that the historical "tendency" was from Hellenised Judaism to Pharisaic Judaism, particularly after 70 AD, and consequently from the Sadducaic teachings on Translation and immortality to the Pharisaic view of resurrection to judgment) these opposing points of view had to be reconciled all over again when the controversy re-emerged within the Christian Church on the question of the relative importance of Easter as over against Ascension Day. The solution was, of course, the formula which now stands in the Apostle's Creed: "On the third day he rose (again) from the dead; ascended into heaven, etc."

That formulary should, perhaps, be recognised as the theological solution to a centuries long controversy and thoroughly understood as the final reconciliation of two divergent views which extend a good way back into pre-Christian times.
Indeed, the dating of the Epistle to the Hebrews is debatable as we have noticed, but the fact which we are seeking to establish here is that the epistle contains more of the original Kerygmatic tone of the Urgemeinde than the traditions which have passed through the layers of tradition in the Synoptic Gospels and Pauline literature. This is not to say, that there isn't already in Hebrews some evidence of a reconciliation of the Pharisaic and Sadducaic views by means of a "particularisation" of its eschatology. We find, on the whole, a proclamation in Hebrews orientated from a Parousia which has decisively occurred and is already in effect. The theologian who has articulated the Urgemeinde teachings in this document clearly repudiates the notion of a return (or resurrection) of the body on a "Day of Judgment" to die a second time. Examples of this are the (ἐκάθισεν) , in 8:1, which is a reference to the high priest who (ἐκάθισεν , aor. indic.) "sat at the right of the throne of the greatness in the heavens". Few translations seem to grasp the sense of this aorist as a Translation which has occurred. Another is 9:27-28, which has met with a surprisingly wide divergency in translation. "It is reserved ( ἀμόκατα) for men to die once ( ἀμακάθιασθαι ) and after this judgment, so also Christ having been offered once ( ἀμακακε προσενεχθεῖς ) for (to bear) the sins of many, will appear a second time ( ἑξῆςκεν instead of ἡμέρακεν ) χωρίς ἀμαρτίας (RSV says "not to
deal with sin", at least it can be said "having done away with sin") to the ones (τοίς) expecting him for salvation" (A, P and others add διὰ πίστεως). Whether one accepts this latter variant, which has the authority of Alexandrinus, it is clear that the second coming is not in a universal but particular and even subjective rather than objective sense. Man's having to die "once" and Christ's having been offered "once" are held exactly parallel (:27). This strongly suggests that Christ has not only borne the judgment of mankind, but has also done away with death, as the Apostle Paul was to proclaim (however, in a future sense, i.e. as the "last enemy"), against the views of the Urgemeinde at Corinth (I Cor. 15:26). The Corinthians on the other hand, appear to have seen these things as already accomplished, as we will see presently.

Other examples of this Urgemeinde view of the Parousia, already accomplished and in effect are seen in the words of 4:7: "Again he sets a certain day (και ὁριζόμενον ἡμέραν) 'today' (σήμερον) saying through David... 'Today (σήμερον) if you hear his voice, do not harden your hearts". This passage can only imply a Parousia and one which is already accomplished as seen from its application to those whom the message did not benefit: "because it did not meet with faith in the hearers" (4:2) contrasted with, "we who have believed enter that rest (salvation)" (4:3). The eschatological
The "Return" of Christ for the particular faithful, which to the Urgemeinde might happen at any moment, is distinguished from the Translational which is already accomplished (4:14): "Since we have a great high priest, having gone through the heavens (διὰ οὐρανοῦ), Jesus, the Son of God, let us hold the confession". That is by no means a future event, nor is 9:26, which states that the end of the age has already come: "But he has appeared (περανέβη) now once at the end of the ages (οἱ δὲ ἑκάτεροι ἐπὶ συντελείασιν αἰῶνων) to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." Thus 10:37 is not a reference to the Parousia, which has occurred, but a "return". "For yet a very little (while) (ἐν γὰρ μικρὸν ὅσον ὅσον) the coming one shall come and not delay (οὐ χρονίσει), but my righteous one (ὁ δὲ δικαιὸς μου) shall live by faith". Not only is the shortness of (μικρὸν ὅσον ὅσον) ignored, but (οὐ χρονίσει) as an outright negation of the tendency to postpone the Parousia to a future "resurrection", has yet to be taken seriously. It is only because the Parousia and the Kingdom have already occurred that the author can refer in the present tense to those who have "tasted the goodness of the word of God and the powers of the age to come" (δυσάκης τε μελλόντος αἰῶνος 6:5) and "Therefore let us be grateful for receiving a kingdom that
cannot be shaken", (12:28). It is thus the task of the believer to: "show the same earnestness in realising the full assurance of hope until the end" (not of the age, but of the believer's particular life (πληροφορίαν τῆς ἐλπίδος ἀκρι τέλους 6:11).

The arguments and doctrinal assertions of the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews appear to assume a certain knowledge on the part of his reader of the Pharisaic teaching on the "age to come", universal resurrection to judgment" and "second death" which he actively negates. It is indeed naïve to hold that these Pharisaic views were the only ones prevalent during the time of the Early Church, and least of all, during that of the Urgemeinde. It is thus not surprising that the author of Hebrews has chosen not to speak of a future resurrection and judgment, but imminent Translation and present immortality as the gift of the resurrection event which has occurred. In some respects the theologian appears to apply this doctrine of change or Translation to all of God's creatures, as well as man, when he says; "Like a mantle thou wilt roll them up, and they will be changed (ἀλλαγήσουσιν 1:12). To the word "changed" some manuscripts add (ὡς ἰμάτιον ). Thus to the author of Hebrews, Jesus' return will not be the source of "universal resurrection", with the connotations of judgment that implies, but of (σωτηρίας αἰωνίου ) to all who obey him", 5:9. Therefore, Hebrews by virtue of its content
belongs to the earliest sub-stratum of Christian tradition which gave rise to the important pre-Pauline Kerygma, which expressed its hopes within the framework of a doctrine of immortality rather than a doctrine of resurrection.

If the tradition behind Hebrews appears to minimise the importance of the body and flesh, these are nonetheless treated as a preliminary concern (τὰς μὲν τῆς σαρκὸς ἡμῶν πατέρας οὖσαν παιδευτάς) which it contrasts with the spiritual or obedience to the Father of Spirits, the higher source of life (οὐ πολὺ μᾶλλον ὑποταγὴσομεθα πῶς πατή τῶν πνευμάτων καὶ ζήσουμεν; 12:9).

Moreover, because all of mankind has been judged in the Passion of Christ, there is no point in another resurrection, as resurrection is not in itself a saving event. Hebrews repudiates the Pharisaic notion of resurrection and return with a teaching of "total change" or Translation:

"These all died in faith, not having received what was promised, but having seen it and greeted it from afar...If they had been (thinking) of that land from which they had gone out, they would have had opportunity to return. But as it is, they desire a better (country), that is, a heavenly one." (11:13-6)

The term for "land" or "country" is here used metaphorically for "state of being". Thus that which is "better", implied by the term (κράτον), strongly suggests a "condition" or "state of being". In the same context, the author of Hebrews applies this teaching directly to the subject of resurrection by analogy. Thus we see two kinds of "rising" or "awakening"
implied by the term (ἀναστάσεως). One merely implies a change in degree, i.e. a return, repetition or another chance at this life, as in the case of Jonah; the other, a change in kind, or "Translation", to a radically differing category or dimension of experience. The author thus distinguishes between a resurrection of the body and a "better resurrection" (κρείττονος ἀναστάσεως).

"Women received their dead by resurrection. Some were tortured, refusing to accept release, that they might obtain a better resurrection." (11:35)

The implication is that these heroes of faith have not returned to this life, because God had foreseen a better resurrection "for us (θεῷ περὶ ἡμῶν κρείττον τῇ προφητείᾳ) in the resurrection of Christ, 11:40. Only because the Parousia has taken place and the writer and his fellow Christians considered themselves to participate in the resurrection of Christ and stand at the beginning of eternal life itself, could they say that former heroes of faith are: "not perfected apart from us" (ἔστιν ἄνω Χωρίς ἡμῶν πεπληρωμένοι) 11:40. Now the heroes of faith would not be perfected in "us" (ἡμῶν), if the "us" referred to were also expected to die, like the heroes, and were not considered to stand within their immortality or "better resurrection" in Christ.

Thus the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews considers the universal judgment and resurrection to already
have occurred in the Passion of Jesus Christ. He also has particularised these universal events in Christ's sacrifice as the eternal high priest and Son of God:

"Since it was necessary for him to suffer repeatedly from the foundation of the world (ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου); but now once (νῦν δὲ ἕνα) at the completion of the ages (ἐπὶ συντέλεια τῶν αἰώνων) he has been manifested to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself" (9:26)

Here the theologian sets forth the pre-existent character of the Son of Man - Jesus, who has suffered from the "foundation of the world", but now "once and for all", in a decisive act which is not to be repeated. has put away (or annulled ἀθέτησιν ) sin by the sacrifice of himself. By no means a promised future event, these events have already taken place, "at the end of the ages", i.e. the Parousia which has already occurred. If it had not occurred, the sacrifice could be repeated. What remains is not a universal Parousia, but the particular "parousias" of individual faithful ones. Thus he says: "My righteous one shall live by faith, and if he shrinks back, my soul has no pleasure in him" (10:38). Only because these things are not to be repeated can he say: "We have been sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once and for all" (10:10). And therefore, "Let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith" (10:22).
The Urpemeinde and the Immortal Son of Man: Jesus

Attention has again turned to the Enoch literature as a possible pre-Christian source for some of the Urpemeinde teachings, especially its understanding of the "Son of Man". This has happened largely because of the numerous Enoch fragments which have come to light from the Dead Sea Caves, as we have noticed in some detail above. Before these discoveries, Enoch was thought by many to be a Gnostic influenced writing, possibly dependent on Christian texts. However, several critics, such as E. Sjöberg, S. Mowinckel and H. H. Rowley, have for a long time noticed the early character of Enoch's material, despite the strong resemblance of Enoch to several basic New Testament teachings. This resemblance is particularly evident in chapters 37-71 which contain passages describing the "Son of Man" as a mediator between God and man. It is indeed unfortunate that many of the Enoch fragments, found at Cave IV Qumran, have yet to see the light of publication, so many years after their discovery, and it does not seem likely that the full story of their contents will be made available for some time to come. These discoveries have placed the dating of Enoch in a completely new light. Regardless of how much of chapters 37-71 will appear among the 72 chapters of the Qumran Enoch identified to date, and quotations from these chapters have already turned
up in other Qumran documents, the trend of Enoch criticism over the past few years has been to attribute greater literary integrity to I Enoch, as a whole, than ever before.

There are some critics who still fervently reject the notion of any literary integrity or continuity in Enoch, altogether. J. Y. Campbell, has recently dismissed them as a "conglomeration of fragments". On the other hand, Dr. Erik Sjöberg in his detailed study of the Enoch literature has argued in favour of the integrity of I Enoch and appears to have met a great number of the arguments for "Christian interpolations" in I Enoch. Dr. Sjöberg has maintained what is now the more widely accepted view that the work is of purely Jewish origin and composition.

R. H. Charles, in his later critical edition of the Enoch texts, has said of chapters 37-71: "Rome was not yet known to the writer as one of the great world powers, a fact which necessitates an earlier date than 64 BC". Sceptical as some have been about using Enoch material as a source for Jewish Messianic ideas, Prof. Matthew Black has maintained: "Such scepticism does not do justice to the evidence". Dr. Black holds that: "Despite the anfractuosities of the transmission and its patch-work character, it contains old eschatological traditions". He has concluded: "The balance of probability favours a non-Christian origin of the work".

The important Enoch manuscripts found at Khirbet
Qumran now underline more than ever before the seriousness of H. R. Charles's judgment that "Enoch has had more influence on the New Testament than any other apocryphal or pseudepigraphical work". He lists some 60 allusions and direct quotations in the New Testament from Enoch. The superior quality of the Qumran manuscripts of Enoch, and their closeness to a major portion of the earliest Ethiopic manuscripts, make it increasingly difficult to maintain the old view of numerous Christian interpolations into its text. However, it is not denied that this might have happened in some portions of the Similitudes which have not been cited among the Qumran manuscripts or the later Slavonic Enoch and Third Enoch. One of the distinguishing marks of the later Enoch literature is that it tends to apply the eschatological title "Son of Man" directly to Enoch, whereas in the earlier documents, Enoch himself looks forward to the coming of the "Son of Man" as a distinct eschatological person. The circle of those who, along with Sjöberg and Charles, have recognised the profound influence of Enoch on the Urgemeinde, is ever widening. It is particularly the figure of the "Son of Man" which is most often noticed to have the greatest influence on Christian Kerygmatic traditions.

Enoch's part in the early dispute between the Resurrection Kerygma and the Immortality Kerygma, is an important one and is most definitely recognisable in the answers to
Jesus' famous question, "Who do men say that the Son of Man is?" (Mt.16:13), or, "Who do the multitudes say that I am?" (Lk.9:18). The answers vary according to the Evangelists' position in this controversy:

**Luke 9:19-21** (ἐίπαν, ἵωάννην τὸν ἑβαπτιστήν, ἄλλοι δὲ Ἡλίαν, ἄλλοι δὲ ὁ προφήτης τις τῶν ἀρχαίων ἀνέστη.)

Cp. finally, (τὸν χριστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ).

**Matt.16:14-6** (ἐίπαν, οἱ μίν ἵωάννην τὸν ἑβαπτιστήν, ἄλλοι δὲ Ἡλίαν, άτεροι δὲ Τερεμίαν ἢ ένα τῶν προφητῶν) and finally, (ὁ χριστὸς οὗ μίος τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζώντος).

Luke's answer to "Whom do the crowds say I am", namely, that "a certain prophet of the ancients has arisen", strongly suggests the popular Resurrection Kerygma which came into wide currency in Luke's time. We note again that the resurrection implied is to "this life" and that the "prophet" may or may not be Enoch, but Enoch is not mentioned in the Luke tradition.

Matthew's answer is in direct response to the question "Who do men say that the Son of Man is?". We are thus plunged immediately into the context of Enoch and the Translation Kerygma, but we discover that the "Son of Man" (which Enoch foretold) is Jesus, the "Christ the son of the living God". Here "Son of Man" and "Son of God" are joined together (both universals are particularised) for the first time in the person of Jesus Christ. This Kerygma is consistent with the Epistle to the Hebrews, which we have seen to reflect an early Urgemeinde
teaching rather than a late one, on this point. The conclusion we must draw is that the Translation Kerygma of the Urgemeinde has gone one step beyond Enoch and linked together the "Son of Man" and the "Son of God" in Jesus, as we have also seen to be the case in Hebrews (1:5, 2:5). However, both Hebrews and Matthew show their dependency on the earlier Son of Man traditions of Enoch, in several respects, as we shall note below. It is well to observe, in passing, that the Matthew passage, in answer to the above question, is the only one which mentions the prophet "Jeremiah" which shows that Matthew reflects the priestly tradition of II Maccabees (15:14), the only occurrence of a Jeremiah "appearance" (along with the high priest Onias), and is thus linked with the Translation theology of Sirach as well as Enoch.

The Particular Son of Man: Jesus.

The figure of Enoch, along with that of Elijah, plays an important part in both Christian and pre-Christian teaching for its bearing on the doctrine of Translation and immortality. The importance of this will be seen from the fact that at least one strand of early Christians held Jesus to be the particularisation of the Son of Man, translated to heaven. These differing views of Jesus come to light in the Kerygmata Controversy, in the first century AD, which also
disputed whether or not Moses was translated to heaven (cf. Jude:9). It may also be seen in the dispute which followed the appearance of Moses and Elijah to Jesus on the Mount of Transfiguration. Although there was no question in the mind of Christian or Jew alike about the translation of Enoch, they seem to have differed sharply about Moses as well as Jesus. It is likely that those who challenged the ascension of Jesus, challenged the Translation of Moses (and whether this teaching could be substantiated from the Torah). The Translation of Enoch must have been widely known, however, because Gen.5:24 clearly states: "Enoch walked with God; and he was not, for God took him". The Septuagint, has clearly translated, (καὶ εὐρηστηκεν Ἐνὼχ ἦ Θεὸς καὶ οὐκ εὐρήκατο, ὅτι μετεθηκεν αὐτὸν ὦ Θεός). The Hebrew text (הנהו יְזֵדוּ הָאָרֶץ) simply states "for God had taken him", i.e. into heaven. However, the act. aor. of (μετατιθημι; cp. μετακάθισις) in the Septuagint (as in Heb.11:5, 7:12) has the larger meaning of a 'translation' or 'transmutation' or 'change by the removal of one and the substitution of another'. It is perhaps in this latter sense that the author of Hebrews says, "Πιστεύετε ἐνὼ χ μετατάθηκεν τοῦ μὴ ἰδεῖν θάνατον, καὶ οὐκ ἐνδύματος διότι μεταθηκεν αὐτὸν ὦ Θεός" (Heb.11:5). It is not impossible that some among the less literate of the Palestinian Jews interpreted popularly, but wrongly, Moses's well known prophecy, "God will raise up a prophet from the midst of you, like unto me" in this manner as grounds for expecting a "resurrected prophet"
back from the dead. It would be a simple matter to assume that the Hebrews reference to Enoch is a simple quotation of Gen.5:24 (in spite of what it adds) if it were not for the fact that Hebrews discloses a thorough knowledge of both Sirach and I Enoch's teaching on the translation of Enoch. Proof of this is the fact that Hebrews quotes Enoch on other occasions as well, such as this direct quotation: "all things are naked and open in Thy sight, and Thou seest all things, and nothing can hide itself from Thee", Enoch 9:5 (cp. καὶ οὐκ ἐστιν κτισις ἀφανὴς ἐνυπίστοιν αὐτοῦ πάντα δὲ γνῶμα καὶ περαξαρήσιμα τοῖς ὁφθαλμοῖς αὐτοῦ, πρὸς ὅν ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος Ἰ Ημ.4:13); (cp. also Heb. 12:9 and Enoch 37:2).

In the light of these facts, it seems unlikely that Hebrews' particularisation of the eschatological figure of the "Son of Man" (2:6) in the person of Jesus (2:9) did not have its origin, or at least find its basic presuppositions, in the extensive "Son of Man" teachings of I Enoch. Since the discovery of the Dead Sea manuscripts of Enoch, R. H. Charles's view on the Son of Man Kerygma has become even more pertinent. He said: "This definite title (Son of Man as an eschatological title) is found in I Enoch for the first time in Jewish literature and is, historically, the source of the New Testament designation, and contributes to some of its most characteristic contents".

On the other hand, some including M. Black have gone
so far as to suggest that: "Enoch is not only 'translated' and 'transfigured'; he is declared to be the 'Son of Man', the 'Man par excellence', born unto righteousness, in union with whom the righteous shall have peace and an upright way". That conclusion is based on chapters 70 and 71 (partic.71:14) which he holds to be the earliest Enoch source from which the rest of the books of Enoch have grown. However convincing this argument may be, it is particularly difficult to draw a direct line of connection between 70-71 and 37-69 of Enoch. R. H. Charles suggested some time ago that something has dropped out of the text between verses 13 and 14 (of 71) because of the different form of the person addressed (in 46:3), he suggests that the third person was the original form, "this is the Son of Man" rather than "Thou art...". But is such an emendation justified when the meaning of the text is clear? The greatest problem is to establish that 70-71 and 37-69 are from the same strata of tradition. This dilemma is strangely similar to the double traditions in the Pseudo-Clementine literature relevant to John the Baptist, in one of which, the Holy Spirit says to John regarding Jesus: "This is my beloved son", and the other of which, held that John himself was the "more than Prophet", "the Elijah", etc. In the face of these two existing traditions about John, corresponding to the two differing Kerygmata in the Gospels, it is not surprising that there should be two traditions regarding Enoch and his relation
to the eschatological Son of Man. However, it is known that such an interpretation of Enoch (as with the later Pseudo-Clementine view of John the Baptist) was the trend of the later traditions which culminated in 3 Enoch by exalting him to the position of "Metatron" (on the "throne next to the throne of glory"). However, such an identification of Enoch is not substantiated by the Dead Sea Enoch fragments which bear out the accepted view of Enoch in which Enoch, himself, looks forward to the coming of the "Holy One" or "Holy ones". This expectation of the Sons of Righteousness is clearly articulated in reference to the coming of "a prophet and the Messiahs from Aaron and Israel" (IQS ix.11-16ff). In Enoch 1:1 Enoch himself is not a savour-Son of Man, divine redeemer or anything but a "righteous man", which is the earliest form in which this teaching occurs:

"Enoch a righteous man, whose eyes were opened by God, saw the vision of the Holy One in the heavens which the angels showed me, and from them I heard everything, and from them I understood as I saw, but not for this generation, but for a remote one which is for to come (do I speak)"

(Enoch 1:1)

That it was, in fact, the Son of Man, whom Enoch foresaw, is indicated by the following verse:

"And behold! He cometh with ten thousands of His Holy Ones to execute judgment upon all, and to destroy all of the ungodly: And to convict all flesh of all the works of their ungodliness which they have ungodly committed, and of all the hard things which ungodly sinners have spoken against Him".

(Enoch 1:9)
The above verse is quoted almost word for word by Jude (14). Although recognised as one of the latest of New Testament writings, it nevertheless identifies itself with the priestly Urgemeinde Kerygme by its ascription to "Jude, a servant of Jesus Christ and brother of James" (1). The whole letter reflects the Translation Theology of Hebrews and Sirach (21), but its main characteristic is that it shares, in common with them, Enoch as a source. However, as with Hebrews, the words (Ἐνώς ἠμνησάμενιν, Ἴδον ἢλθεν δυσμάς αὐτοῦ, ποιήσαι γερόν κατὰ πάντων καὶ ἐλέησαν πάντας τοὺς ἀσκήτας περὶ πάντων τῶν ἐργῶν ἀσκήτων αὐτῶν ἐν ἡσυχίαν καὶ περὶ πάντων τῶν σκληρῶν ἐν ἐλαίῳ κατ' αὐτῶν ἀμαρτωλαὶ ἀσκῆσις, Jude:14-15) are applied in the past tense (aor. ἢλθεν) directly to Jesus, "our only (μόνον) Master and Lord, Jesus Christ" (4) and by no means is this role attributed to Enoch himself. The author of Jude who seems to share much of the same point of view as the author of Hebrews, has clearly indicated his belief that the Parousia has already occurred in Jesus Christ, who was judged for all mankind. His use of the Enoch prophecy was thus not coincidental, for it was this prophecy which he interprets to now be complete. What now awaited Christians was not Judgment, according to Jude (and Hebrews), but "the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ unto (ὑς ὑμᾶν αἰωνίον) eternal life" (21, cf. Heb.9:28). Because the Judgment had already occurred, to the mind of the Urgemeinde, Jude thus speaks in the present tense of (οὐς μὲν ἔλεετε διακρινομένουσα ἀσκήτε ἐκ πυρός ἀρπαζόντες, οὐς δὲ ἔλεετε ἐν φόβῳ :22-3).
"And I asked the angel who went with me and showed me all of the hidden things, concerning that Son of Man, who he was, and whence he was, (and) why he went with the Head of Days? And he answered and said unto me: This is the Son of Man (ὁ άνθρωπος του Χριστου) who hath righteousness, with whom dwelleth righteousness, and who revealeth all the treasures of that which is hidden, because the Lord of Spirits hath chosen him, and whose lot hath the pre-eminence before the Lord of Spirits in uprightness for ever. And this Son of Man whom thou hast seen shall (put down) the kings and mighty from their seats, and the strong from their thrones and shall loosen the reins of the strong, and break the teeth of sinners". (Enoch 46:2-4)

The "I" in this passage is, of course, Enoch accompanied by his angelic guide who explains what Enoch sees in his vision of things to come, "not for this generation". Among these things of the future is the "Son of Man" who is chosen by the "Lord of Spirits", but has pre-eminence before the Lord of Spirits forever. The relationship of the Son of Man to the Lord of the Spirits is analogous to the Urgemeinde's interpretation of the relationship between John the Baptist and Jesus as the coming of the "mightier one" who will baptize with the "Holy Spirit (and fire)". Matthew who has the fullest account of Jesus' baptism, discloses his knowledge of Enoch when he states that it was to "fulfil all righteousness" (Mt. 3:15) and describes Jesus' vision of the "Spirit of God" as (ἰδοὺ ἐνεωχθησαν οἱ οὐρανοί, καὶ εἶδεν πνεῦμα θεοῦ καταβαίνον ώσει περιστεράν) 3:16. This is another example of the Urgemeinde's interpretation of the Enoch prophecy (or vision) in terms of fulfilment and
completion in Jesus, the Son of Man par excellence.

Another argument for the separate identity of the Son of Man, as seen by Enoch in his vision, is his pre-existence and immortal character. Although Translated and Immortal in that sense, Enoch has never been said to be "pre-existent", for unlike Jesus, Enoch's birth was not miraculous:

"And at that hour that Son of Man was named in the presence of the Lord of Spirits, and his name before the Head of Days. Yea, before the sun and the signs were created, before the stars of heaven were made, His name was named before the Lord of Spirits." 460

(Enoch 48:2-3)

This pre-existent Son of Man, who is clearly distinguished from Enoch, is further said to be a "staff to the righteous" (:4), "And he shall be the light of the Gentiles" (:4), and "The hope of those who are troubled of heart" (:4) "All who dwell on the earth shall fall down and worship before him" (:5).

Among New Testament writers, it is John the Evangelist who has most emphasized the pre-existent character of the Son of Man. The Fourth Gospel does not contain a miraculous birth narrative, but instead it says of Jesus: "No one has ascended into heaven, but he who descended from heaven, the Son of Man" (Jh.3:13). John also ascribes to the pre-existent logos a "glory as of the only Son from the Father" (1:14). However, it is not until the theologian and author of the Apocalypse turns to this theme, that all of these
elements of the pre-existent Son of Man are joined in the particular figure of Jesus. The first chapter of the Apocalypse and Enoch's vision of the Son of Man bear a striking resemblance. The difference being that Enoch speaks of the Son of Man who is yet to come, and the author of the Apocalypse speaks of the Son of Man who has already come: "I died, and behold I am alive for evermore" (Rev. 1:18). The forms of the two visions have so much in common (Enoch 46:2ff and Rev. 1:11ff), that it is unthinkable that the author of the latter did not have knowledge of the former. Both proclaim the pre-existent and eternal Son of Man, but John the Divine's vision interprets Enoch's prophecy (which is presupposed as known to the reader) in terms of Jesus as the Son of Man who has already come:

Rev. 1:12 "Then I turned to see the voice that was speaking to me, and on turning I saw seven golden lampstands, and in the midst of the lampstands one (θυρω) as a Son of Man...."

:15 "His voice was like the sound of many waters, in his right hand he held seven stars, from his mouth issued a sharp two-edged sword...."

:17 "When I saw him, I fell at his feet as though dead. But he laid his right hand upon me, saying 'Fear not,"

:18 I am the first and the last, and the living one; I died, and behold I am alive for evermore, and I have the keys of death and Hades."

Critics have occasionally held that Enoch's vision was dependent on the Apocalypse, but the subtle refinements and theological developments, which are abundant in John's vision,
preclude that Enoch could have modelled his from John's. Many have noticed the similarity in terminology between John's vision and Daniel's vision. However, the terms which coincide in the vision of Daniel, do not describe the Son of Man, but "The Ancient of Days", which is an altogether different vision and does not occur as a future prophecy. In Daniel there is no description of the Son of Man, himself, even though he is mentioned briefly (אַל אוֹבֶרְמָו) in a separate "night vision" (Dan.7:13). In John's vision it is (אַל אוֹבֶרְמָו) himself (1:13) who is described as the fulfillment of the pre-existent and eternal figure which Enoch foretold. It is Enoch, not Daniel, who says of the Son of Man: "For wisdom is poured out like water, and glory faileth not before him for evermore," (19:1). Enoch, not Daniel says: "And the word of his mouth slays all the sinners...And the mighty and all who possess the earth shall bless and glorify and extol him who rules over all, who was hidden. For from the beginning the Son of Man was hidden" (Enoch 62:2,6).

It is nevertheless clear that even John in his vision has interpreted Jesus to be the original and "particular" Son of Man; eternal, pre-existent and one who has already come (in his capacity of judgment), died, now reigns, and shall return in glory. It cannot be denied that the author of the Apocalypse also speaks of the resurrection as already having occurred. He does not deny the teaching of the
Urgemeinde, which yet had authority in his day, but seems to solve the problem of the two Kerygmata by what appears to be a prophetic announcement of another resurrection. On the other hand, this passage (20:5-6) may imply a "first resurrection followed by a state of immortality which is suggested by his words: "Blessed and holy is he who shares in the first resurrection. Over such the second death has no power, but they shall be priests of God and Christ, and they shall reign with him a thousand years" (Rev.20:6). This is by no means a contradiction of the Urgemeinde teaching that it is "appointed for man to die once" (Heb.9:27); that Christ has already died "once" for all (mankind) and thus he has made the sacrifice "once" for all (mankind) by his atonement (9:28). Nonetheless, the Apocalypse unmistakably reveals the Resurrection Kerygma to be a later tendenz and intrusion into the Urgemeinde theology rather than vice versa. It's treatment must also be viewed as yet another solution to the Kerygmata problem.

The Urgemeinde and the Return:

In view of the particular "Son of Man" (eschatological) connotations, which the Urgemeinde attributed to the miraculous coming, and atoning acts of Jesus, it does not seem likely that the "return" of Christ would have been envisaged by the Urgemeinde as the imminent Parousia, or Judgement or
Eschaton. That, "Judgement" along with the "Resurrection", had already occurred. Somehow, the term "Eschaton" is also inappropriate for a post-resurrection event like the vision of Stephen. It seems incongruous to use this term after the resurrection on behalf of mankind had already taken place. We shall therefore examine this part of the Urgemeinde's Kerygma as "the particular coming of Christ for the faithful", designated here simply as the "coming", as distinct from the Parousia and all the connotations that term was to acquire. In using this term one must distinguish between a "coming" to vindicate the righteous and Jesus' coming as a particular (σωτήρ). As Elijah was considered by the Urgemeinde a vindicator of the righteous and saviour in time of need (cf. Mt.27:49, Mk.15:36), so also the "Son of Man" (also called the Elect) was seen in the Enoch literature as the one "descending from heaven" (39:1-2) to deal with the wicked: "All the unrighteous are destroyed from before his face" (62:2) and he is the judge of "kings and the mighty and the exalted" (62:9). However, it is not in this sense (as vindicator) that the Urgemeinde traditions speak of the "coming" of Christ for the faithful.

Dr. Manson's well known discussion of the Son of Man has developed the concept of the "corporate personality" in which he says of the Son of Man: "Enoch was the first human to embody the Son of Man idea". This, he states:
"finds expression again in the Messiah who vindicates the saints", which view has not been contradicted by the Qumran material.462 There is much with which one can agree in Dr. Manson's hypothesis, but even if one accepts the "corporate nature" of the Church and the corporate nature of Christ's redemption, as a well-established belief in early Christian circles, or even considers this view of the Son of Man to have existed in Qumran circles, it is quite another matter to hold that Enoch himself was identified with the Son of Man in either the earliest Christian traditions or the earliest Enoch literature. If the Qumran Enoch included those portions (1:1-9) which portray Enoch and the coming "Holy One" as distinct figures, and J.T. Milik seems to indicate that this may well have been the case,463 in addition to the fact that IQS does distinguish sharply between the "Sons of Righteousness" and the coming "Prophet" and the "Messiahs of Aaron and Israel" (ix.11-16), we have no alternative, for the moment, but to consider this the earliest view. There are indeed earlier Son of Man traditions than those found in I Enoch. Dr. R.H. Charles has suggested that Enoch 46 may be a midrash on Daniel 7:13, which contains a brief mention of the Son of Man.464 But the Daniel passage neither identifies the "One like a Son of Man with Daniel, nor does it describe the Son of Man as a vindicator or returning saviour. That role is given to the "Ancient of Days" (Dan.7:22). There are numerous other Old Testament passages which speak of the
"Elect One" (Isaiah 42:1,4,2) and the "Divine Judge" who vindicates the righteous (Ps.3:7, 53:6, etc.) but none of them contains, in the manner of Enoch, the unique proclamation of a Son of Man who "comes" to save the righteous and grant immortality, as he himself is immortal and pre-existent.

Ezekiel, Daniel, Enoch-Noah and Stephen:

Stephen's vision of the heavenly Son of Man, Jesus, has all of the characteristics of a "coming", i.e. in a particular sense, but not a "vindication", in the universal sense of another "judgment" or atonement. The context in which this "coming" is described has several things in common with Ezekiel's vision (of the "Lord"), Daniel's vision (of the "Ancient of Days"), and Enoch's vision (of the "Great Glory"). But it has more in common with Noah's vision (an older tradition embedded in Enoch) of the "Ancient of Days and those who stand in array with Him. In any case, all of these traditions are pre-Christian and establish the early Urgemeinde quality of Stephen's vision. Luke has thus either re-written one of these earlier visions in terms of Jesus the Son of Man; or he has faithfully preserved an interpretation of Jesus or a Kerygma already circulating in his day.

H. L. Jansen, has taken the former alternative (despite the fact that Ezekiel's vision is of the "Lord" and
he (Ezekiel) is the one called "son of man") and treats this whole question as primarily a literary problem. On the other hand, two distinct traditions are apparent in the abundance of evidence before us; one that thought of Jesus, himself, as the "Son of Man", and another which thought of the Son of Man as yet to come with vindication. This will be seen as a strong argument in favour of these two points of view being more than just a difference in literary transmission. It will also be noticed that many of these quotations are early and cannot be separated from the original sayings of Jesus. Keeping Jesus' self-statements (i.e. as Son of Man) in mind, let us examine Ezekiel, Daniel, Enoch and Noah's visions as literary models.

Ezekiel sees the glory of the Lord: "the likeness of a throne, in appearance like sapphire (ὡς ὅρος Μιθών 
καταφέρου, ὡροίῳμα θύρων ἐν αὐτῷ) and seated above the likeness of a throne was a likeness, as it were, of a human form...so was the appearance of the brightness round about. Such was the appearance of the glory of the Lord."

(Ezek.1:26-8)

Other aspects of the appearance of the Lord are: gleaming bronze, surrounding fire, and fire steaming downwards from His loins, brightness and a rainbow,

(Ezek.1:27-8).

Daniel sees the throne of the Ancient of Days: "As I looked, thrones were placed and one that was Ancient of Days took his seat (Ἐσθεμόρου ἔλυς ὅ τοι ὁ θάνατος ἐστηθησον, και παλαιός ἔμερυν ἐκάθισεν)...his throne was fiery flames, its wheels were burning fire."

(Dan.7:9)

Other aspects of the appearance of the Ancient of Days are: raiment, white as snow; hair, like pure wool; stream of fire issued from Him; a thousand thousands
and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before Him, as at a court.  

(Dan. 7:9-10).

Enoch sees in his vision the throne of the Great Glory: "a wall which was built of crystals and surrounded by tongues of fire", beyond which is a magnificent mansion, within which he has a vision of a second mansion more magnificent, where he sees (therein) "a lofty throne: Its appearance was as crystal, and the wheels thereof as the shining sun" (Enoch 14:8-18).

Other aspects of the "Great Glory", who sits upon the throne are: cherubim, streams of flaming fire from under the throne, raiment more bright than sun and whiter than snow, no angel or mortal could behold His face for the magnificence and glory".  

(Enoch 14:19-22).

Enoch differs from Daniel and Ezekiel by the presence of the "Great Fire which stood before Him, and none could draw nigh to Him" (14:22). Also, "ten thousand times ten thousand (stood) before him, yet he needed no counsellor", (14:23).

Noah (in the older Noah Fragment incorporated into the text of Enoch; see note 467) also has a vision of the heavenly throne: "And the Host of the Most High, and the angels, a thousand thousands and ten thousand times ten thousand, were disquiet. And the Head of Days sat on the throne of His glory, and the angels and the righteous stood around Him". (Enoch 60:1-2).

Stephen by contrast sees in his vision the particular Son of Man: "The glory of God, and Jesus standing at the right hand of God; and he said, 'Behold, I see the heavens opened, and the Son of Man standing at the right hand of God'" (Acts 7:55-56).

Other aspects of the Son of Man in Stephen's vision: He is called the "Righteous One" by Stephen (7:52) and the "Angels" are those mediaries who delivered the law (7:53).

Only in Enoch and the Noah Fragment is there any mention of anyone standing in the presence of God and pre-existent with Him, the "Great Fire", in the case of Enoch, and "the
righteous" in Noah's vision. In Daniel the "one like a son of man" is brought into the presence of the Ancient of Days (καὶ ἔως τοῦ παλαιοῦ τῶν ἡμερῶν ἐφέστη, καὶ προσενεώθη αὐτῷ 7:13), he thus has no pre-existent status (or total immortality) as a divine being at the right hand of God. Ezekiel is himself a "son of man", without any divine or pre-existent status, who is commanded to "stand on his feet" (2:1) before the presence of God. Thus pre-existent Son of Man status can be imputed neither to Ezekiel nor Daniel. Only in Enoch and the Noah fragment do we find the beginnings of this teaching that the Son of Man figure is pre-existent with the Father. In no instance has pre-existence been imputed to Enoch himself. The doctrine of the pre-existent Son of Man became well established in Urgemeinde circles, perhaps largely because of Jesus' emphasis on the Son of Man teaching. One indication of this is its clear expression in Stephen's vision of the Son of Man, already standing with the Father. Stephen, like the early Noah fragment, mentions the "righteous" standing before the presence of God, but in Stephen's vision he has become the "Righteous One", i.e. Jesus Christ.

If in Stephen's vision Jesus is only a "son of man" (like the prophets Daniel and Ezekiel) his standing is merely to approach the throne of God. On the other hand, if he is the eschatological Son of Man in the Enoch-Noah sense, i.e. pre-existent with the Father, then his standing is not to
approach God, but to approach man in the sense of "visitati-
on" or "coming", to receive the faithful with the gifts of
immortality. This "coming" of the Son of Man, which must
not be construed as "Judgment", has theological foundations
only in Enoch and is not to be found in Daniel and Ezekiel.

Enoch prophesied concerning the "coming": "And he answered saying: 'This high mountain, which thou hast seen, whose summit is like the throne of God, is His throne, where the Holy Great One, the Lord of Glory, the Eternal King, will sit, when He shall come down to visit the earth with goodness". (Enoch 25:3)

The dwelling of the Holy Spirit: "Those who deny the name of the dwelling of the holy ones and the Lord of Spirits ...And into heaven they shall not ascend,...On that day Mine Elect One shall sit on the throne of glory ...Then I will cause Mine Elect One to dwell among them", (Enoch 45:1-4).

Translation to honour: "And I will bring forth in shining light those who have loved my holy name, and I will seat each on the throne of his honour". (Enoch 108:12).

Other points of similarity between the Daniel, Ezekiel, Enoch and Stephen visions, which should be noticed before we turn to the Son of Man prophecies of Enoch and the Son of Man Kerygma of the Urgemeinde, reveal the highest stage of development in the Enoch traditions:

a. Ezekiel falls upon his face: "I fell upon my face, and I heard the voice of one speaking". (Ezek.1:28).
   Daniel was already asleep: "Daniel had a dream and visions of his head as he lay in his bed", "I saw in my vision by night". (Dan.7:1-2).
   Enoch falls upon his face: "fear covered me, and trembling got hold upon me. And as I quaked and trembled, I fell upon my face. And I beheld a vision" (Enoch 14:14-15).
Noah falls upon his face: "I saw how a mighty quaking made the heaven of heavens to quake... And a great trembling seized me, and my loins gave way, and dissolved were my reins, and I fell on my face". (Enoch 60:1-3).

Stephen by contrast "falls asleep" after his vision: "And when he had said this, he fell asleep (ἐκοιμήθη). And Saul was consenting to his death (τῇ ἀναψευσκῇ ἀυτοῦ)" (Acts 7:59).

b. Daniel is not addressed personally: "I looked then because of the sound of the great words which the horn was speaking (Ἑλέρρως τοῦτο ἀπὸ φωνῆς τῶν λόγων τῶν μυστικῶν Dan. 7:11).

Ezekiel is addressed by the Lord: "Son of Man, stand upon your feet" (ὡς ἄνθρωπος, σταθή ἐπὶ τοὺς πόδας ) and I will speak with you" (Ezek. 2:1).

Enoch is addressed directly by the Lord: "And the Lord called me with his own mouth, and said to me: 'Come hither, Enoch, and hear my word'. (Enoch 14:24).

Noah is addressed by the angel: "And Michael said unto me: 'Why art thou disquieted with such a vision?" (En. 60:5).

Stephen addresses the Lord: "And as they were stoning Stephen, he prayed, 'Lord Jesus receive my spirit'." (Acts 7:59).

c. Daniel is not raised up, but approaches by his own volition: "I approached one of those who stood there and asked him the truth concerning all these things". (Dan.7:16).

Ezekiel is raised by the Spirit (to his feet): "The Spirit entered into me and set me upon my feet; and I heard him speaking to me" (Ezek. 2:2).

Enoch is aroused by a "holy one" and thus awake: "And one of the holy ones came to me and waked me, and he made me rise up and approach the door" (Enoch 14:25).

Noah is raised up by a "holy one": "And Michael sent another angel from among the holy ones and he raised me up and when he had raised me up my spirit returned". (Enoch 60:4).

Stephen is not raised (bodily): "And he knelt down and cried with a loud voice, "Lord do not hold this sin against them". (Acts 7:60).
d. Daniel beholds the clouds of heaven: "I saw in the
night visions, and behold, with the clouds of
heaven there came one like a son of man"
(Dan. 7:13).

Ezekiel sees the opened heavens: "The heavens were
opened, and I saw visions of God". (Ezek. 1:1).

Enoch is born into heaven: "Behold, in the vision
clouds invited me and a mist summoned me,...
and the winds in the vision caused me to fly
and lifted me upward, and bore me into heaven".
(Enoch 14:8).

Noah beholds the quaking of the heavens: "And I saw
how a mighty quaking made the heaven of heavens
to quake, and the host of the Most High, etc." (Enoch 60:1).

Stephen sees the heavens opened: "full of the Holy
Spirit, gazed into heaven and saw the glory of
God; and he said, 'Behold, I see the heavens
opened", (Acts 7:55-6).

e. Daniel was not translated, but transported in mind only:
"My thoughts greatly alarmed me, and my colour
changed; but I kept the matter in my mind".
(Dan. 7:28).

Ezekiel appears to have been translated to heaven: "And
above the firmament over their heads there was
the likeness of a throne" (1:26). "The Spirit
entered into me and set me upon my feet"...And
he said to me, 'Son of man I send you to the
people of Israel" (2:2-3). Presumably, if
Ezekiel must be sent to Israel, he is not there
but translated at the time of address. What he
must say to Israel is of some significance for
the Christian Son of Man Kerygma: "And you, O
son of man, thus says the Lord God to the land
of Israel: An end! The end has come upon the
four corners of the land. Now the end is upon
you", etc. (Ezek. 7:2-3).

Enoch is clearly translated to heaven: "And the course
of the stars and the lightnings sped and hastened
me and the winds in the vision caused me to fly
and lifted me upward, and bore me into heaven".
(Enoch 14:8-9).

"And he (Enoch) was raised aloft on the chariots
of the spirit and his name vanished among them." (Enoch 70:2).
"My (Enoch's) spirit was translated and it ascended into the heavens." (Enoch 71:1).

Noah appears to have been transported to heaven. "And the other angel who went with me and showed me what was hidden told me what is first and last in the heaven in the height, and beneath the earth in the depth". (Enoch 60:11).

"And these things I saw towards the Garden of the Righteous" (60:23). (cf. "And Michael sent another angel from among the holy ones and he raised me up". (Enoch 60:14).

Stephen appears to have been translated (in spirit) by the Son of Man himself: "I see the heavens opened, and the Son of Man standing (to receive Stephen) at the right hand of God". (Acts 8:56).

The Gospels and the Son of Man Kerygma:

At this point it would be well to examine a few of the Synoptic Gospel expectations concerning the "coming" of the Son of Man. Some of them combine the "vindication" and the "return", but usually these traditions are in the form of quotations attributed to Jesus and invariably before the crucifixion event. In no case does the "coming" imply a return to bring about a general resurrection event, rather than a particular Translation event, or "taking" of the faithful.

Matthew:

Matthew's "Q" traditions differ decisively from Mark which simply states: "this generation will not pass away until all these things are accomplished" (Mk.13:30); and
slightly from Luke, which hints of a possible source for his Son of Man traditions in the Noah Literature:

"But of that day and hour no one knows, not even the angels of heaven, nor the Son, but the Father only. As were the days of Noah, so will be the coming of the Son of Man... Then two men will be in the field; one is taken (ἐκ μαθημάτων καὶ ἀφίκων , during this life) and one is left. Two women will be grinding at the mill; one is taken and one is left... Therefore you also must be ready; for the Son of Man is coming at an hour you do not expect". (Mt.24:36-44).

The "return" of the Son of Man thus will be particular, rather than universal, it is a "taking" (receiving) of the elect. We note that it is not a resurrection (to this life) because some will be left (in this life), but a selection from this life. To Mark's concise statement regarding the imminence of the Parousia, Matthew appears to have appended the ancient eschatological expectations of the Book of Noah which make an imminent event in Mark appear less imminent and more futuristic than ever. Matthew's source presupposes the myriads of angels with the righteous in Noah's vision:

"And they will see the Son of Man coming on the clouds of heaven with power and great glory; and he will send out his angels with a loud trumpet call, and they will gather his elect (ἐπισωσάγοντας τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς αὐτοῦ ) from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other". (Mt. 24:30-31).

Luke omits the reference to the angels, the great glory, the four winds and the elect altogether (Lk.21:25-28) thus disclosing Matthew's greater dependence on his Enoch source. Luke's Parousia is far more particular; he simply
says, "look up and lift up your heads; because your redemption draweth nigh" (21:28). In Matthew the elect are gathered "from one end of heaven to the other".

Matthew makes no mention here of a general resurrection of the dead, although Judgment seems to be implied. Does this "return" then indicate that the elect already live in a state of immortality? That seems to be the implication of: "Truly, I say to you, this generation will not pass away till all these things take place". (24:34). Bodily survival appears to be even scorned in (24:28). Although the "coming" is a future event, immortality is described as a present reality:

"For the Son of Man is to come with his angels in the glory of his Father, and then he will repay (ἀποδώσως) each man according to (μὴ προξιν αὐτοῦ). Truly, I say to you, there are some standing here who will not taste death (δὲ οὐ μὴ γεύσωνται θανάτου) before they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom". (Mt.16:27-28=Mk8:38-9:1)

This passage, which also occurs in Mark, is both "particular" and positive in its view of immortality, in keeping with Enoch's teaching of the "coming" after Judgment.

Matthew's particular knowledge of Enoch's prophecy of "thrones of honour" is evident in his special material: "Come, O blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world"; (25:34). Although the setting is a Judgment (Christ has not yet been judged for mankind) there is no mention of the expectation that the dead would be resurrected for Judgment in this particular coming of the Son of Man, at
least in this source.

"When the Son of Man comes in his glory, and all the angels with him, then he will sit on his glorious throne. Before him will be gathered all the nations, and he will separate them one from another as a shepherd separates the sheep from the goats, and he will place the sheep at his right hand, but the goats at the left". (25:31-33).

If there is no mention of future resurrection at this point, there is abundant mention of immortality: "And they will go away into eternal punishment (ἀπελέυσονται δόμων εἰς κόλασιν αἰώνιον) but the righteous into eternal life" (δικαίου εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον) 25:46.

Matthew follows the futuristic Enoch imagery with another tradition which applies the resurrection expectations of Ezekiel and Isaiah directly to the events of the crucifixion as a present occurrence (in 27:51-53): "And the earth did quake; and the saints that had fallen asleep were raised and coming forth out of the tombs after his resurrection..."

Matthew has here included what might be called an anti-resurrection Kerygma, to the extent that it proclaims that the resurrection foretold has now occurred at the resurrection of Christ. Although, it might be objected that this was not a "universal resurrection", it must be answered that universal bodily resurrection was essentially a Pharisaic teaching and that at least one of Matthew's main source traditions directly agrees with the Urgemeinde teaching that in Christ's Passion the resurrection-judgment has already occurred, as we have
seen in the Epistle to the Hebrews and shall see elsewhere in the Gospels.

Although there is a clear indication of a future Judgment, in the traditional language with which Matthew clothes his description of the Parousia event, there can be little doubt that to Matthew's mind this Parousia (as well as the resurrection) had already taken place in the events of Calvary, by the time he (or his school of interpretation) gathered together their sources. The manner in which his gospel was compiled discloses in itself, that this Kerygma was not held by all; moreover, was a matter of some controversy in his day. If the Urgemeinde believed, as we have held, that the Judgment of mankind had already taken place in the Passion of Christ, then His lifting up was (to the Urgemeinde) that definitive Messianic event which separated the sheep from the goats described by Enoch. There was therefore no need for another Judgment or Parousia or universal resurrection. The terminology which the Urgemeinde traditions employ, neither permit such a conclusion (although it was held in the later church) nor did their view of the particular "parousia" (and present state of mortality) of the faithful require it. Dr. Cullmann has rightly maintained: "Jesus pointed to his death and resurrection as the beginning of the Kingdom of God". And this without question was a basic teaching of the Urgemeinde in Jerusalem. However, it is not necessary to conclude
regard to: the Urengemeinde view to see the "age of the Church" as corresponding to the life-span of the individual faithful. "How long will the Church last?" If such a question could be addressed to Stephen or Peter, it would be more in keeping with the Urengemeinde outlook for them to answer: That depends on you. But concerning the Kingdom of God that is a different matter: that depends on God. Because the resurrection of Christ as the Parousia (to the mind of the Urengemeinde) had already occurred, the Kingdom of God was already a present reality. After the resurrection, the "coming" of Christ, or "parousia" can no longer be considered to be a single event. "One will be taken", "one left behind", "Two women grinding at the mill; one is taken, one is left", "Two men in the field, one taken", "two men in bed, one taken": accordingly, the announcement is given that "there are some (τινες) standing here who will not taste death". Thus in terms of the Urengemeinde teaching, C. H. Dodd's view that Mt.8:11 and Mk. 14:25 do not refer to a future coming of the kingdom, because that has already come into the world in Christ, but to a
transcendent order beyond (but including) time and space, does not seem to be contradicted by the Urgemeinde Kerygma. The criticism that this concept of such a "transcendent order" is Greek and has no place in first century Judaism", discloses only a profound ignorance of the true nature of first century Judaism. Whether such a teaching of the Kingdom was held by the "other" Kerygma, or later Church, is entirely another matter.

_Luke:_

Matthew appears to have preserved more of the Son of Man Kerygma, characteristic of the Urgemeinde than any of the other Gospels, but that does not mean that this Kerygma is non-existent in the other Gospels. Luke has also included many fragments of this important tradition.

Luke, in the fine balance of his argument, has not ignored the Son of Man traditions of the Urgemeinde. While rejecting an over-concern for the future of the body, "do not fear those who kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do" (Lk.12:4), turns directly to the Son of Man Kerygma: "Everyone who acknowledges me before men, the Son of Man will also acknowledge before the angels of God" (Lk.12:8). Next, presupposing a knowledge of the Mosaic prophecy he states: "And everyone who speaks a word against the Son of Man will be forgiven; but he who blasphemes against the Holy Spirit will
not be forgiven" (Lk. 12:10). The Enoch prophecy says of "those who deny the name of the dwelling of the holy ones and the Lord of Spirits. And into heaven they shall not ascend And on the earth they shall not come" (Enoch 45:1-2). Thus, as is the case in Luke, those who deny the Holy Spirit and the "name of the dwelling of the holy Spirit are denied both immortality and resurrection".

Luke has preserved a "coming" tradition which he has conflated with a "vindication" tradition, but describes it in terms of particular deaths and immortality:

"And some of you they will put to death; you will be hated by all for my name's sake. But not a hair of your head will perish" (Lk. 21:17). "Men fainting with fear and foreboding of what is coming on the world; for the powers of the heavens will be shaken. And they (particular men) will see the Son of Man coming in a cloud with power and great glory. Now when these things begin to take place, look up and raise your heads, because your redemption is drawing near" (Lk. 21:26-28).

These events seen by Luke are not descriptive of a universal resurrection, because the resurrection is not mentioned. As for "Judgment", that is later associated with a separate event described by Jesus' words in 21:8. What we have in the above statements is a conflation of these notions with the "coming" which follows. It is "particular" by virtue of the particular terms employed and by no means a single universal event, as seen by the widely separated nature of the events described. The salvation implied is not resurrection at the end of the ages, but immediate Translation and immortality.
Luke also has a tradition which separates the "vindication" from the "coming" of the Son of Man or "return":

"And will not God vindicate his elect (ὁ δὲ Θεὸς οὐ μὴ ποιήσῃ τὴν ἔκδοσίν τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν αὐτοῦ) who cry to him day and night? Will he delay long over them? I tell you, he will vindicate them speedily. Nevertheless, when the Son of Man comes (ἐλθὼν δὲ τοῦ ἄνθρωπον ἐλθὼν ἀπακόμε) will he find faith on earth? Ἐλθὼν δὲ τὴν πίστιν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς; Luke 18:7-8.

In this passage two separate divine beings are named: "God" and the "Son of Man". It is possible to interpret the coming of the Son of Man as the instrument of vindication. But this need not be a necessary conclusion in the light of the terminology used here and in the Enoch prophecies. The condition of God's vindication, as implied, is election and righteousness. The necessary condition in the Son of Man's coming, as stated above, is (πόσιν). Luke's terminology discloses an old tradition which held in tension, Judgment-righteousness and return-Faith. From the other Urgemeinde sources we have examined, it is clear that they held the "vindication" to have been accomplished in Christ's passion, thus the coming of the Son of Man (above) must therefore be seen as a separate and particular event.

Luke's eschatology appears to reject the notion of a "single universal event":

"the days are coming when you will desire to see one of the days of the Son of Man, and you will not see it. And they will say to you, 'Lo, there!' or 'Lo here!' Do not go, do not follow them. For as the lightning flashes and lights up the sky from one side to the other, so will be the Son of Man." (Lk.17:22-24).
(μίαν τῶν ἡμερῶν τοῦ σώματος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου :22) is not easily rendered into a singular form. B and D are probably original in omitting (ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ αὐτοῦ, sing.) at v.24. In the same paragraph (ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τοῦ σώματος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου) "days" (plural) is used at v.26. "Lo here" or "there" repudiates the notion of only one universal event, but substantiates the notion of particular plural events. Thus Luke says:

"But first he must suffer many things and be rejected by this generation. As it was in the days of Noah, so it will be in the days (ἡμέραις) of the Son of Man". (Lk.17:25-26).

("πρῶτον τολμᾷ παθεῖν καὶ ἀποδοκιμασθῆναι ἀπὸ τῆς γενέσεως τούτης :25) is undoubtedly a reference to the "vindication". "First", implies a separate event from, "then" (or "days of the Son of Man") which may, or may not, occur in the generation of those who reject him, its plural aspect suggests that it can take place at any time after the "vindication". "As it was in the days of Noah" again brings us back to the Son of Man pronhecies in the "Book of Noah", which appear to have had more authority in the Urgemeinde than it did in the Pharisaic Canon. The particular nature of the "return" is underscored in the verses which follow (17:31, 32, 34, 35). This is followed by Jesus' rejection of the importance of the body and its future—ὁμοίως τῷ σώμα (Lk.24:28 says τῷ πτώμα "carcase") ἔκατον καὶ συνενακτήσου (Lk.17:37), a decidedly anti-resurrection saying in the general bodily-resurrection sense of the term.
Mark:

The dearth of Son of Man sayings in Mark, as compared with Matthew, does not indicate that its author was any less cognizant of the Urgemeinde Kerygma.

"For whoever is ashamed of me and my words in this adulterous and sinful generation, of him will the Son of Man also be ashamed, when he comes in the glory of his Father with the holy angels (ὤν ἐλθὼν ἐκ τῆς δόξης τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ μετὰ τῶν ἁγίων τῶν ἁγίων). And he said to them, 'Truly I say to you, there are some standing here (ποις ὄντες τῶν ἐστηκότων) who will not taste death (ἀποθνῄσκουσιν ταύτα) before they see the kingdom of God come with power'. Mk.8:38-9:1.

Mark clearly knows the Son of Man prophecies, as they were known in Enoch and circulated in the Urgemeinde. This may be seen by his reference to His coming with "glory" and "holy angels". Mark does not mention Enoch's prophecy of the mountain where the "Holy Great One" and the "Lord of Glory" and the "Eternal King" will sit when the heavenly visitation is made to the earth "with goodness" (Enoch 25:3). But he does follow the above saying (Mk.8:38-9:1) with the narrative on the "Mt. of Transfiguration" where Moses, Elijah and the transfigured Christ appear (9:1-8). The words (ποις ὄντες τῶν ἐστηκότων) again indicate the particular nature of the "coming".

Mark describes the vindication-parousia of the Son of Man in the terminology of Enoch:

"But in those days (μετὰ τῆς Ὀλίψιν) after that affliction, (i.e. after the vindication), the sun will be darkened, and the moon will not give its light, and the stars will be falling from heaven, and the powers
in the heavens will be shaken. And then (καὶ τῶν ὀφοντι) they will see the Son of Man coming in clouds with great power and glory. And he will send out the angels, and gather his "elect", Mark 13:24-27. "Truly, I say to you, this generation will not pass away (ἐν ὑμῖν ἡ γενική ἀγωνία) before all these things take place." Mk.13:30.

So Mark's source interprets these events to have already occurred. Because the first part of Jesus' prophecy refers to the vindication, e.g. "if the Lord had not shortened the days (i.e. to three) no human being would be saved" (13:20), and indeed the other Urgemeinde traditions interpreted the Passion as such, it is then not incongruous that some of them, such as Stephen, did see the Son of Man coming in his glory as is indicated by Mark. If the vindication event had not already taken place, then the words, "this generation will not pass away" would not make sense because then the vindication and Parousia were yet to occur and this would make Jesus a false prophet. If, on the other hand, the vindication had occurred and what remained was a particular "coming" (as particular parousia) of the Son of Man, rather than a general Parousia, then that particular coming cannot be measured as a "single" event in time as Mark has indicated:

"But of that day or that hour no one knows, not even the angels in heaven, not the Son, but only the Father. Take heed, watch: for you do not know when the time will come. It is like a man going on a journey, when he leaves home and puts his servants in charge". (Mk.13:32ff).

Mark continues by describing the coming after the vindication by the Son of Man as a "visitation", like the master of a house
who may return at any time. Christ's admonition is to watch, "lest he come suddenly and find you asleep" (13:36). In this context cannot be construed to mean "at the end of the age" or that it is a universal rather than particular event. Thus Jesus' words, which are cast in the terminology of Enoch's prophecy, are interpreted (either by the Urgemeinde or Jesus himself) in the parable which follows in the terms of a particular parousia which is neither predestinarian nor Pharisaic in character.

It is thus evident in the passages from the Synoptic Gospels cited above that the expectation of the Son of Man was clearly associated with the Parousia itself, to the mind of the Urgemeinde. The appearance of these expectations has been noticed both in the Q sources and Mark. It is not surprising that some should question whether Jesus himself was the source of Mk.13:26, 8:38 and 14:62, which appear to be an Urgemeinde interpretation of His significance in the language and imagery of Enoch, as do Mt.25:34, 16:27-28 and Mt.24:3-4. Jackson and Lake have pointed to Mk.9:10 and 9:32: "So they kept the matter to themselves, questioning what the rising from the dead meant", etc., as proof that these resurrection traditions became a later interpretation of Jesus sayings in the Church. In defence of the old Religionsgeschichte categories, Prof. R. Bultmann has perhaps mistakenly held, that all of these Son of Man sayings were the
creation of the "Hellenistic Church". Such terminology erroneously suggests that these eschatological teachings originated from a later "fringe element" of Christianity. This seems unlikely in view of the Urgemeinde teachings which we have found to be firmly embedded within the Synoptic Gospels as a distinctively pre-Pauline view of Jesus. Prof. Bultmann is probably correct in separating the sayings of Jesus into two important groups: sayings relevant to the Parousia, evident in all the earlier strata of traditions including Mark and \( \), and those anticipatory of his suffering (Mt. 9:12, 8:31, 9:31, etc.) which are found only in Mark. Thus two distinct traditions regarding Jesus as the "Son of Man" seem to be latent in the Synoptic Gospels. They have been found to bear a direct relationship to the Immortality Kerygma of the Urgemeinde and the Resurrection Kerygma of the Pauline Christians. The Urgemeinde Kerygma is that which we have traced above and have seen to be characterised both by its teachings on immortality and its view of the Parousia as already having occurred in the Passion of Christ. Moreover, it held that this event was the particular resurrection foretold by the prophets and accompanied by the "coming forth" of the Saints out of their tombs (Mt. 27:51-53). Even though it did not deny the resurrection, as such, we have seen that it did deny the notion of a future universal resurrection to Judgment, because it was thought to be an event which had already taken
place. Because the Son of Man teachings in the sayings of Jesus are entirely pre-resurrection statements, the Urgemeinde consequently applied to Jesus and much of the Son of Man imagery from the S"adduc"aic-Enoch tradition, in which it was deeply rooted. But nevertheless, the title "Son of Man" was soon modified to "Son of God", as we will see. Because the Urgemeinde considered itself to be living in post-resurrection times, this Kerygma not only spoke in terms of immortality of the elect, but also in terms of the particular, rather than universal, "coming" of the Son of Man to Translate the faithful individually to the presence of God.

The other tradition, namely, the Resurrection Kerygma held by the Pauline Christians is also evident, to some extent in the Synoptic Gospels. Because this Kerygma, which tends to portray Jesus as the forerunner, or "first fruits" of the general resurrection which was believed yet to come at the end of time, is most apparent in the Gospel of Luke, where it is placed side by side with the Urgemeinde Kerygma, we will now turn to the third Gospel and examine the Kerygmat"a controversy which confronted Luke at the time that he wrote his Gospel.
B. The Resurrection and Immortality
Traditions and the Later Church.

Luke and the Kerygma Controversy:

In his presentation of two Christian Kerygma side by side, Luke's Gospel differs decisively from the others. His intention has not been held here to be that of a historian of the Church or even a collector of Christian traditions, but that of a theologian who sought to reconcile the Son of Man Kerygma of the Urgemeinde with the Resurrection Kerygma of the Pauline Christians. The result is a unique theological presentation which contains elements of both a realised and future eschatology which Luke has reconciled in terms of what is here called a "particular" Parousia. Luke's "double traditions", 63 in his Gospel and 29 in Acts, have frequently been explained in terms of his use of "two manuscripts", or more recently, his use of the rule of "two witnesses", or because he was the first "objective historian" among the Evangelists, who attempted to deal factually with separate "historical sources". The evidence seems to indicate that Luke's task was not merely to deal with two written traditions or even two phases in the history of the church, but with two Kerygma which were very much alive in his own day and gave rise to one of the most important controversies in the history of the early Church. M. Dibelius was one of the first to lay stress on the importance of preaching, as the "Sitz im Leben" in which the gospel material was preserved. But his views must be developed further to disclose the relationship of Luke's own theology not only to a single proclamation but a proclamation controversy, which existed between two Kerygma within the Early Church at the same time. F. C. Baur, indeed, called attention to this controversy a few generations ago, but unfortunately sought to concentrate
the whole history of Christianity into a conflict between the Apostle Paul and the Law. Baur consequently interpreted Paul to be the gnosticising and hellenising element within the growing Church, which is now impossible to maintain. We have here been concerned, in one respect, with similar questions regarding the same events about which Baur enquired, but new discoveries and new evidence have not only required a fresh examination, but new categories and a totally new approach to these questions. The issue has now emerged, at least in the light of this investigation, as an internal one between two Christian Kerygmata, the one held by the "Sadducaic" Christians and the other by the "Pharisaic" Christians. These terms are used in a limited sense, as they are qualified above, with particular reference to their bearing on Christian eschatology. They are called, for simplicity's sake, the "Immortality Kerygma" and the "Resurrection Kerygma".

Luke's treatment of the Resurrection Kerygma includes certain presuppositions about the "Returning Prophet", which were already widely held by the Pharisees in his day. a) As we have seen, the "Son of Man" was known, within Urgemeinde circles, to be pre-existent from the beginning of creation (En.62:7, 48:2, Mt.9:19, Mt.17:17, Lk.9:41, Jh.1:3). However, outside the Urgemeinde, popular tradition held that it was the "Messianic Prophet" or the "Eternal Prophet", who was expected to return at any time.481 b) The Son of Man's removal to heaven, as with Elijah, Enoch and possibly Moses, was expected by the Urgemeinde to be accomplished by means of Translation or Ascension. Resurrection, on the other hand, had the general implications, as we shall see, of a return (ghostly or otherwise) to life on this earth for the sake of judgment or vindication. c) Thus resurrection of particular elect differed from the expectation of the eschatological Son of Man
who was known by the Urgemeinde to have been named before creation (En.69:26,29; 70:1-2). If the judgment of Strack-Billerbeck is correct in this matter, returning Messianic Prophets had already appeared in the form of Moses and Elijah (some traditions include Jeremiah, Samuel and Isaiah). Just as the Prophet Jonah was disgorged from the belly of the whale (or death as some interpreted) to return to this life, to fulfill the specific will of God, so also, the Messianic Prophet was expected to return at any time. Examples of such Messianic Prophets might include Samuel and Elijah who anointed kings, called a nation to repentance and Elijah, who was expected to return before the "great and terrible day of the Lord" (Mal. 4:5). Even the Qumran texts have disclosed the expectation of a Messianic "Prophet and the anointed ones of Aaron and Israel" (IQS ix.10-11, CD xix.10-11, xx.1, xii.23, xiv.19).

The Resurrected Prophet:

By the time that the popular expectations, above, came into the New Testament traditions, Luke had to deal not merely with the expectation of a Messianic Prophet, but with a kerygma which proclaimed Jesus as the Messianic Prophet. All three accounts in the Synoptic Gospels announce Jesus as the "Christ" (Mk.8:29, Lk.9:20, Mt.16:16). But Christ, or "anointed" could imply either a messianic Prophet (who anoints others) or a Messianic King. Significantly, Matthew has added to the title "anointed": "Son of the living God" (Mt.16:16). Luke has added to his designation "anointed of God" the charge that the disciples should tell no one (Lk.9:21) which has strongly suggested to some that the Messianic Prophet tradition, which he retains, was a later interpretation. It is not thereby denied that Matthew's was not an interpretation as well, we would simply point out here that it was a different one.
Reflecting the Urgemeinde Kerygma, Matthew says at 13:13: "Who do men say that the Son of Man is" (τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου) and the answer is: "John the Baptist, Elijah, Jeremiah, or one of the prophets". On the other hand Mark, reflecting the Resurrection Kerygma which interpreted Jesus to be Messianic Prophet, says: "Who do men say that I am?" (τίνα με λέγουσαν οὗ ἀνθρώπου εἶναι; Mk.8:27) and the answer is, "John the Baptist", "Elijah" and "One of the prophets". Luke, also says at 9:18: "Who do the multitudes say that I am? (τίνα με οὐκέτα λέγουσαν έλεύθρωσαν εὐφημία)". But he goes one step farther in the re-writing of his Marcan sources to identify the popular announcement with the doctrine of "resurrection to this life". The answers include: "John the Baptist", "Elijah" and "one of the ancient prophets rose again" (τινί προφήτης τών ἀρχαίων ἀνέστη). Luke's terminology suggests that the saying is an early one which has come from a time when people were speaking of Jesus as a Prophet resurrected to this life (like other prophets of the past). It may be supposed that by the time of Jesus' own resurrection those multitudes who held this doctrine would have no cause to abandon it. But who was it now that had arisen? Was this the Messianic Prophet or a Parousia event foretold by the Prophets? By the time Luke wrote his Gospel, one may be fairly certain that the answers to these questions had become part of a public explanation and proclamation. We will see that Luke had his own solution to the dilemma.

From the popular proclamation reflected in Luke's rewriting of his Marcan source, it may be inferred that the Resurrection Kerygma concluded that Jesus to be a Messianic figure, but which Messianic figure, the Son of Man? Matthew has stated outright that Jesus is both the Son of Man, i.e. the expected eschatological forerunner, and the "Son of the living God". Luke is strangely mute, at this point, regarding the nature of Jesus' Messianic office. In the story of Samuel, the alternatives of anointer and anointed are plainly set before the reader. Samuel fulfilled the important office of anointing kings, as did the prophet Elijah, who judged, counselled and anointed the kings.
of his time. The failure of Luke to mention the specific nature of Jesus' office is conspicuous at this point in view of his infancy narrative (1:47ff) which appears to celebrate the birth of Jesus in terms similar to the birth of the Messianic Prophet Samuel (1 Sam.2:1ff) and also conspicuous in terms of 1 Sam.4:5-46 and 14:41 which reflect a widely held expectation of a coming Messianic Prophet who will be higher in status than the anointed high priest. We have observed that the recently discovered Qumran manuscript (IQS 9.x.11) clearly refers to this coming Messianic Prophet whose function was, presumably, to anoint the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel. 1 Sam.4:5 as we have noted, describes Elijah as such a Messianic Prophet who was expected to return from the dead before the Day of the Lord. There thus seems to be no doubt that the popular Resurrection Kerygma, behind the re-writing of Luke's account, saw Jesus as this Messianic Prophet who was expected to usher in the Day of the Lord. But there are additional reasons for knowing that Luke has modified this Kerygma, to some extent, in order to render it more compatible with the Urgemeinde Kerygma, if not to actually reconcile their differences, as we shall see.

Luke's effort to present both sides of the case, is borne out by the speech which he places opposite to that of Stephen's Son of Man Kerygma. That is, Peter's speech (Acts 3:17-26) addressed to the "Sons of the Prophets" in which he expounds the doctrine of the returning Messianic Prophet:

"But what God foretold by the mouth of all the prophets, that his Christ should suffer, he thus fulfilled... that times of refreshing may come from the presence (προσώπου) of the Lord, and that he may send the Christ appointed for you, Jesus (καὶ ἀποστείλῃ τὸν προκεχελνημένον ὑμῖν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν), whom heaven must receive until the time for establishing all that God spoke by the mouth of his holy prophets from of old. Moses said, 'The Lord God will raise up for you (ἀναστήσετε) a prophet from your brethren as he raised me up.'" (Acts 3:18-22).
Noticeable in this Kerygma is the obvious manner in which Jesus is announced as the particular anointed one "appointed for you", i.e. as distinguished from the other holy ones appointed for other generations, such as Moses and Elijah. Moreover, by the direct application of Moses' prophecy which had become somewhat of a central theme among the Pharisees, Jesus is identified as the prophet foretold, clearly designated in this Kerygma as a Messianic Prophet. Luke has thus gone one step beyond the Pharisaic expectations and particularised all of the events of which the prophets spoke in the coming of Jesus. Moreover, he has also implied that Jesus should be placed in the tradition of the Messianic Prophet Samuel (3:24). This may be seen in the strong resemblance of his infancy narratives (Lk.1 and 2) to the Samuel infancy narrative (I Sam.1 and 2). His resurrection here, as with the other ancient prophets, is not suggested by Luke to be a resurrection to heaven, but a resurrection from death to "This Life" to fulfil a particular prophetic mission. He is "raised up and sent to you" (ὑμῖν πρῶτον ἀναστήσας ὦ θεός ἐν πάθε αὐτοῦ ἀπέστειλεν αὐτὸν), "to bless you in turning every one of you from your wickedness" (3:26). If Christ's mission is clear, his use of (ἀναστήσας) is not obvious unless "risse up" was popularly interpreted, by the Pharisaic traditionists, to imply a "resurrection". Nevertheless, in his presentation of this Kerygma, which Luke has attributed to Peter, he has included traces of the popular Messianic Prophet tradition (Resurrection Kerygma) as well as his own solution to a theological dilemma.

The Mount of Transfiguration narrative is included in all three Synoptic Gospels. In Matthew's interpretation of Mark, the descent down the mountain, during which time, Peter, James, John and Jesus discuss Elijah and John the Baptist as the Messianic Prophet, is just as important to
the narrative as the ascent up the mountain (Mt.17:1-13, Mk. 9:1-13). Luke conspicuously omits the discussion during the descent and the great enlightenment which accompanies it, altogether, and strangely avoids all discussion of Elijah in the role of the Messianic Prophet. Luke retains the tradition, but places it in a different context with a different implication, namely, that in which Herod "hears" that Jesus himself is the Elijah. The reason for this may well be that the Resurrection Kerygma held Jesus himself to be the Messianic Prophet. The Elijah question has thus been taken out of the mouth of Jesus, in Luke, and reframed in terms of its contemporary interpretation:

"Now Herod the tetrarch heard of all that was done, and he was perplexed, because it was said by some that John had been raised from the dead, by some that Elijah had appeared, and by others that one of the old prophets had risen. [ἡγεμόνας τῶν ἡρῴδων Ἄρχαίων] Herod said, 'John I beheaded; but who is this about whom I hear such things?' And he sought to see him. (i.e. Jesus)." (Luke 9:7-9).

By direct implication Jesus himself is shown to be popularly designated as the resurrected Prophet, whom Herod wanted to see, once Luke has dismissed the rumours about Elijah and John the Baptist. If Jesus was the Messianic Prophet, then Jesus was the forerunner of the Eschaton yet to come and his coming and Passion were not, in themselves, an eschatological event. And if the "Day of the Lord" was yet to come, that suited the eschatology of the Pharisees well.

In Matthew and Mark, it is an entirely different story. Both identify themselves with the "Son of Man" Kerygma, which term Luke avoids in this context altogether, (Mt.17:9, Mk.9:9). Both ask why the Scribes (Pharisees) say that Elijah must come first, (Mt.17:10, Mk.9:11), to which Jesus gives the following answer in both accounts:
"Elijah does come first to restore all things; and how is it written of the Son of Man, that he should suffer many things and be treated with contempt? But I tell you that Elijah has come (\(\text{\textmu}^{\text{\textmu}}\)\text{\textmu}^{\text{\textmu}}\text{\textmu}^{\text{\textmu}}\text{\textmu}^{\text{\textmu}}\)), and they did to him whatever they pleased, as it is written of him". (Mk.9:12-13 cp. Mt.17:11-2).

To the Matthew and Mark Kerygma, the Messianic Prophet has come and it is Elijah (John the Baptist) who has restored all things. This messianic forerunner is held in direct relation to Jesus, who therefore is the Son of Man, who will usher in the Parousia itself, an event already accomplished in this Kerygma.

Luke's most obvious attempt to reconcile these two Kerygmata may be seen perhaps in the double infancy narratives. It is not improbable that his excellency Theophilus heard, as did Herod, about the controversy and also wondered who Jesus really was. Was he John the Baptist back from the dead? Was he the Elijah? Was he the Messianic Prophet who was to come before the great and terrible day of the Lord as the Pharisees claimed? The infancy narratives indeed answer these questions and more. And from the beginning they focus attention on the figure of John the Baptist. Thus an equally important question in the Kerygma controversy, and not separate from the first one was, who was John the Baptist? Was he the expected Elijah?

Luke begins his account of John by identifying him, from the start, with the priestly and Sadducean traditions. His father was a priest of the order of Abijah (of the same tribe as the Sons of Zadok, 1 Chron.6:28) and thus to be associated with the Urgemeinde Kerygma. Luke is said, according to some recent critics, to have incorporated into his text two ancient John hymns in their entirety (1:14-17 and 68-79). These may well go back to older pre-Christian Zadokite hymnic traditions we have examined above. P. Winter has held, regarding these pre-Christian hymns: "It can be positively
proved that the Baptist document (containing the hymns) was composed in Hebrew". However, that does not establish that it was in documentary form when it came to Luke. H. L. MacNeill, has perhaps, rightly considered this narrative a separate tradition, but there are perhaps little grounds for holding that it was, "The first attempt to link the movement of John the Baptist with the primitive Jewish Christian Church." Particularly, in view of the dominant place which the Elijah traditions have in Mark and Matthew. E. Käsemann has presented several good arguments for holding that the John hymns are to be associated with Ephesus.

In the context of the Urgemeinde Kerygma, the John cycles are an indispensable element because they portray John as the Messianic Prophet and forerunner of the Parousia itself. The words: "He shall drink no wine nor strong drink" and "filled with the holy Spirit, even from his mother's womb" (1:15), places John in the tradition of the Messianic Prophet Samuel, who also was consecrated from the womb and bound by the vows of the Nazirite (I Sam.1:11). The tradition intended, however, was most probably that of Elijah, who anointed kings (II Kg.9:1-4) and whose followers observed the Naziritic vows of abstinence (II Kg.4:39). "He will go before him (the Lord God) in the spirit and power of Elijah" (Lk.1:17), designates John specifically in the role of the Messianic Prophet. Thus it is natural that he should resemble Elijah who was to come before the "great and terrible day of the Lord" (Mal.4:5).

On the other hand, if Jesus himself was the Messianic Prophet, as the Resurrection Kerygma held, then the Parousia was yet to come.

The second John hymn (Lk.1:68-79) is more complex. It is commonly agreed, as is seen in A.R.C. Leaneey and Klosterman, that this hymn is a compilation which divides into two
parts (68-75 and 76-79) because of the variety of those seemingly addressed by its prophecy. The arguments for two separate documentary sources, less convincing in the light of the evidence we have examined here. It seems more likely, at least in view of the abundance of evidence for the two proclamations we have seen in Luke, that Luke has reconciled two Kerygmate rather than two manuscript traditions. One hold Jesus (as designated, "of the House of David") to be the coming Messianic Ruler (καὶ ἦν Ἐρεν κέρας σωτηρίας ἡμῖν ἐν οἴκῳ Δαυὶδ παιὸς αὐτοῦ, 1:69), which by no means could apply to John the Baptist, who was not of the house of David; the other, if it should be considered a separate tradition, designates John as the Messianic Prophet (καὶ σὺ δὲ, παιδίον, προφήτης ὑψίστου κηθήσον, 1:76). "For you will go before the Lord to prepare his ways", again has reference to the eschatological events foretold in Mal.4:5. If this is the case, it must then be asked if in reconciling two Kerygmate, Luke has not also conflated two separate eschatological hymns in 68-79? Apart from the major incongruity of the "House of David", the couplets appear to run straight on, without a deviation in style. Indeed verse 78 appears to be a natural conclusion of 69. Moreover, "To give knowledge of salvation to his people in the forgiveness of their sins, through the tender mercy of our God" somehow does not seem characteristic of John the Baptist. He was a preacher of judgment, "the axe is already at the root, etc.", whose theology contained little tender mercy: "Who warned you to flee from the wrath to come", etc. However, because of the major incongruity of the reference to the "House of David" we must ask if these descriptive statements in the hymn do not more adequately fit Jesus according to what may actually be known of his ministry? Verses 78-79 are of particular interest because they disclose the origin of this hymn to be in the Resurrection Kerygma and therefore applied to Jesus as the
Messianic Prophet:

"Whereby a rising from on high will visit us (ἐν δὲ ἐπισκέψις ἡμᾶς ἀνατέλλῃ ἐκ ὕψους), to appear to the ones sitting in darkness and the shadow of death (ἐμισάνατος ἐν σκότει καὶ σκιᾷ θανάτου καθημένοις), 1:78-79.

This transference is understandable, as with the Elijah-Luke conversation on the Mt. of Transfiguration, if Luke has reconciled the Kerygma by applying this eschatological hymn, which was originally about Jesus (of Davidic lineage), the Messianic Prophet, to John the Baptist. In the light of Luke 9:7-9, 9:18 and Acts 3:18-22, which substantiate the fact that Jesus was held by an important group to be the Messianic Prophet, this view is not as improbable as it may first appear. Other instances of this may be found, as well, such as the ascription of, Acts 3:26. (Jesus' mission as the one raised up to bless and turn everyone from his wicked ways), to John the Baptist in the John hymn. In Luke 10:9, 11, 11:20., 13:29, etc., Jesus himself is seen as the Messianic Prophet who announces the "Kingdom of God" which is "at hand". Matthew, reflecting the Urgemeinde Kerygma, places these words of Jesus in the mouth of John the Baptist (Matt.3:2, 4:17), who is thus cast as the Messianic Prophet. All of these differences strongly suggest that there were in fact two Kerygmata which differed regarding the role of Jesus and the identification of the Messianic Prophet.

Regarding the Magnificat, a great deal has already been written and it is not my purpose to add another to the voluminous arguments already put forth about its origin. It should be mentioned here, however, that most experts consider it older than its present setting in Luke. P. Winter who considers this primarily a documentary problem, has conjectured that the Magnificat and the first part of the Benedictus were originally patterned after Maccabean battle Psalms, on the basis of their metric arrangement in Hebrew. As for the rest of
the infancy narratives, he has held that 1:5-30 and 2:1-21, have their origin in what he calls (B), a Baptist document, which dealt with the birth of John. On the other hand 2:29-39 and 41-51, are supposedly from (T), a document originating in the circle of James the Righteous. Curiously enough, he states that a "follower of James" combined these documents and made some changes and modifications. Luke's part was merely to add the introduction (and 2:1-3), slightly modify the rest and then add his gospel. Winter's study throws a great deal of light on the subject, but seems to unnecessarily minimise Luke's own part as a theologian in reconciling two great traditions regarding Jesus. In emphasising written sources he overlooks the controversy, which existed in Luke's own time, between two important Kerygmat
c which were still very much alive and required a theological solution. Without detracting from the stylistic similarities between the Magnificat and the Maccabean Psalms, its relation to which 62:1-9 and 63:1-13 must also be considered. Here, the relationship of the coming Son of Man (here named, unlike the Maccabean Psalms) to the kings and the mighty is described in some detail. Winter's theory overemphasises the difference between Luke 1 and 2 and the rest of the Gospel, in both of which there is evident a great similarity of purpose. More recognition and serious consideration, at least in the light of what has been found here, should be given to a position such as that expressed by P. Benoît. Benoît, in rejecting elaborate documentary source theories, has built a strong case for holding that Luke was himself the redactor of various oral rather than written traditions. He has held that it is impossible to give an adequate explanation for the Semitisms in the Benedictus because they are far too ambiguous. His conclusion regarding 1:68-75 is that it is possibly a primitive Christian hymn based on a Jewish messianic Psalm. Because one tradition clearly viewed
John as the Elijah, or Messianic Prophet, we may infer that this was not only a popular dispute in Luke's time but one of the problems which he actively sought to resolve in the writing of his Gospel and cannot be separated from his presentation of the two Kerygmata.

**Luke and the Two Careers of Christ:**

The Kerygmatic controversy, which Luke has presented as a "double tradition" in his Gospel, has been treated in these last pages as a developing difference of opinion between those who held the Resurrection Kerygma, with its view of Jesus as the resurrected Messianic Prophet who, himself, was the forerunner of the Parousia, and those who held the Urgemeinde (or Ascension) Kerygma, which believed the Parousia to have already occurred in Jesus Christ, with John as the Messianic Prophet. Once these basic presuppositions are clear, it is possible to see how Luke has effected the reconciliation of these two Kerygmata in his own theology by particularising both of them in his teaching on what might here be called the "Two Careers of Christ". In some respects, this question has been treated extensively under the heading of the "Concealed and Revealed Messiah" or "The Messianic Secret". Because many of the theories regarding the "messianic secret" have not seemed convincing to the present writer, he has endeavoured to treat the matter here, for the sake of a fresh view of the question, in relation to Luke's solution to the Kerygmatic dilemma.

**The Sign of Jonah:**

Because of the strong indications that the "multitudes" of Luke's contemporaries, who were also contemporaries of
Jesus, held him to be the promised Messianic Prophet, as we have seen, there are numerous instances, recorded in the gospels, in which Jesus is questioned about signs of the end times, (e.g. Mk.13:1, Mt.24:3, Lk.21:7, Mt.16:4, 24:30, Lk.11:16, 23:8, Jh.6:30 and Jh.2:19). To the mind of the Pharisee, any sign like those performed by Elijah, would be proof that Jesus was the expected Messianic Prophet. If it is accepted that these questions were actually addressed to Jesus in his own time, it was in such a spirit that the Pharisees asked Jesus for a sign in Mk.8:11-13. Jesus' answer to these who looked either for a Messianic Prophet, or the coming Parousia itself has all the marks of an original saying before the emergence of the Kerygmatika controversy: 'Why does this generation seek a sign? Truly, I say to you, no sign shall be given to this generation.' (Mk.8:12). Matthew preserves two traditions of this incident, one presumably from a source common with Luke, but the other reflecting its own Kerygmatika Mark. Luke develops the theme in his own unique manner as this comparison discloses:

"And the Pharisees and the Sadducees came, and to test him they asked him to show them a sign from heaven. He answered them, 'When it is evening, you say, 'It will be fair weather,' for the sky is red.' And in the morning, 'It will be stormy today, for the sky is red and threatening.' You know how to interpret the appearance of the sky, but you cannot interpret the signs of the times. An evil and adulterous generation seeks for a sign, but no sign shall be given to it except the sign of Jonah.' So he left them and departed." (Mt. 16:1-4)

"Then some of thescribes and Pharisees said to him, 'Teacher, we wish to see a sign from you.' But he answered them, 'An evil and adulterous generation seeks for a sign; but no sign shall be given to it except the sign of the prophet Jonah. For as Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the whale, so will the Son of Man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth. The men of Nineveh will arise at the judgment with this generation and condemn it; for they repented at the preaching of Jonah,"
and behold, something greater than Jonah is here. The queen of the South will arise at the judgment with this generation and condemn it; for she came from the ends of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon, and behold, something greater than Solomon is here."

(Mt.12:38-42)

"When the crowds were increasing, he began to say, 'This generation is an evil generation; it seeks a sign, but no sign shall be given to it except the sign of Jonah. [For as Jonah became a sign to the men of Nineveh, so will the Son of Man be to this generation]" (Lk.11:29-32 et seq. as "Q")

The first obvious fact about this comparison is that Matthew has given two interpretations of the "Sign of Jonah" saying by placing it both in the Marcan and the "Q" forms of the saying. Luke on the other hand, has reconciled them and produced one conflated form. From the reference to the (σημεῖα τῶν καιρῶν) in Mt. 16:3, it can be deduced that the question about "signs" was an eschatological one. The passage reflects an Urgemeinde point of view in its terse repudiation of those who still looked for signs of the Judgment. The reason another sign shall not be given is that it has already been given once in the "Jonah" who preached "repent" before the Judgment. This appears to be cryptic allusion to John the Baptist. (As Ἰωάννης is an abbreviation of Ἰωάννης in Jh. 1:42 "son of", or disciple of, Ἰωάννου A B K X ΔΠΨ and numerous minuscules read Ἰωάννης as does Tatian's Diatessaron). We have observed that, as far as the Urgemeinde was concerned, the Judgment had already occurred. It was only the Pharisees who still looked for the forerunner of the great and terrible Day of the Lord and the age to come. By no means could Jonah be considered the Judgment or himself the bringer of the Eschaton, even though these were the things which he preached. If any of those whom Jesus was addressing knew the popular Jonah cycle, and the evidence is that they did, they would immediately recognise Jonah as the one who preached
"repent" and "the End!". But they would also know that Jonah was sorely disappointed when Nineveh actually did repent and there was no "End" (Jonah 4:11). Thus Jonah was a "sign" rather than the instrument of Judgment or the bringer of the Eschaton. The conspicuous absence of this tradition from Mark suggests that the whole Jonah narrative was part of the popular Resurrection Kerygma. Against the notion of fixed ages, predestination and a future Eschaton and Judgment, which was part and parcel of the Pharisaic system of reward and punishment, the Urgemeinde appears to have interpreted Jonah (or John) as a sign for "repentance" and "the End" before the sovereignty of a living God rather than a fixed order of Fate as may be inferred from the first Matthew tradition and Luke.

To the Pharisees Jonah was the "sign" of a resurrected Messianic Prophet; to the Urgemeinde, the eschatological "sign of the Judgment or Parousia.

Matthew's second tradition (12:38-42), although placed first in his Gospel, discloses its later origin by its labouring dependency on the first tradition. It does not appear that Matthew (or his school) composed it, but that it originated from the circle of those who held the Resurrection Kerygma. Matthew's special material (ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ τῆς γῆς τρεῖς ἡμέρας καὶ τρεῖς νύκτας 12:40) is an interesting development because it implies that the "sign" of Jonah is not repentance, but resurrection with Jesus as the resurrected Prophet, by analogy with Jonah who was three days in the belly of the whale. This indeed contradicts the first form of the tradition in which the main point was that there would be no "sign" except repentance because the end is already at hand. Thus the utter folly of those who attempted to predict the "end of the ages" (or Parousia) by means of signs. Not only is the doctrine of resurrection proclaimed, by means of a questionable analogy, but also its inseparable counterpart, resurrection as the reward
of Judgment, (νυνεύμαι ἀναστῆσονται ἐν τῇ κρίσει, 12:41). These latter additions strongly suggest teachings against which the Urgemeinde fought, namely the notions of Fate and Judgment, against which Jesus said, only sinners speculate and look for the signs of these things (Mt. 16:4).

If the "Sign of Jonah" could be construed to imply only a prophecy foretelling Jesus' resurrection, simply because Jonah was in the belly of the whale (sea-monster) three days, there is no reason why one resurrection from the dead should be recognised by Jesus' contemporaries as a sign of the Eschaton or the "final Judgment". However, we have seen that the Pharisees did presuppose that the Eschaton and a universal or general resurrection were synonymous. It has already been observed that numerous prophets were believed to have been "resurrected" or called back from the dead or near death. But each for a specific purpose (cf. Lk.16:31). But in no case was such a resurrection in itself a "sign" of the Eschaton or Parousia. Among the resurrections well-known to a greater or lesser degree in Jesus' time, were those of Elijah, Moses, Samuel, Jeremiah, Onias and those whom Elijah and Jesus themselves raised from the dead. If the Jonah argument as used by the Resurrection Kerygma is weak, because of its dependence on analogy, and appears to be a contradiction, both in terms of its own premises and at variance with the teachings of the Urgemeinde, it is at least consistent (in Mt.12:38-42) with the other examples of Resurrection Kerygma, we have examined, which depicted Jesus as the Messianic Prophet. The terms "greater than Jonah" and "greater than Solomon", in verses 41-42, most appropriately suggest a Messianic Prophet who was expected to rise up (perhaps even come back from the dead) to anoint high priests and kings and restore the reign of the Kingdom of God. However, a resurrected prophet does not always imply an eschatological figure. Matthew has rightly included the original Urgemeinde tradition in his Gospel as well, rather than let
this Kerygma stand by itself. But we find that Luke has done more than record parallel Kerygmata.

Luke clearly appears to have had two separate traditions in front of him as did Matthew. He has, however, reconciled the traditions (in 11:29-32) and presented them as one. The similarities are frequent enough between Luke and the Matthew passages to consider 11:39-42 strong grounds for the existence of "O", as a common documentary source for both at this point. But where Luke differs, he does so significantly. It is with these differences that we are concerned here. In Luke, a direct comparison is made between the figure of Jonah and the Son of Man, who shall be a similar "sign" to "this generation". We have noticed that in the Matthew 16 account, Jonah has some eschatological connotations. But the only thing the "Son of Man" has in common with Jonah in Matt.12, is his resurrection, and this he would have had in common with several prophets. Therefore, resurrection is not in fact the "sign" but an interpretation on the part of Matthew's later tradition. What then, was the sign of Jonah? Was it his preaching of repentance? This does not seem likely since others had done that as well. Was it the resurrection, as Jonah's disgorgelement from the whale is commonly construed? An indication of Luke's dissatisfaction with the effectiveness of resurrection as a "sign" may be seen in his unique conclusion to the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus:

"They have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them." And he said, "No, father Abraham; but if someone goes to them from the dead (ανεισχως, μετανοησουσιν ) they will repent'. He said to him, 'If they do not hear Moses and the prophets, neither will they be convinced if someone should rise from the dead.'

(Lk.16:29-31).

Thus it seems to Luke that the Resurrection Kerygma is also misleading in some respects; there are more important issues at stake than such "signs". What then is distinctive about
Jonah, which is also true about the Son of Man, and relevant to Christians of all time? One suggestion which might be offered for the sake of a new look at this question is the two careers of Jonah and, consequently, the two careers of Jesus, as both Son of Man and Son of God, corresponding to the two Kerygmatas examined above.

The Two Careers:

The significant fact about Jonah under consideration here may appear to be an obvious one, namely, that he was not two persons, but one man with two careers. In Jonah's case, the first career was one characterised by rebellion (or flight) away from God. Nonetheless, he was a prophet whom God told to "rise up" (καθαρίζοντας τό ευαγγέλιον καθ' ὑμᾶς, ἵνα σοὶ καθημερίνα ἀναφέρῃς τὸ καθάρισμα τοῦ σώματός σου; Ἰωνᾶς 1:2, 3:2) for a specific purpose, even though that purpose, or ministry, was ineffective and not fulfilled. His second career, which was effective, was more than the mere appearance of a prophet back from the dead, but one who fulfilled the will of God and caused Nineveh to repent albeit after spending three days and three nights in the belly of the whale. The point often overlooked regarding Matthew's second tradition is that Jonah's "resurrection", even if it was from the bowels of death itself, was to "this life".

The popular Resurrection Kerygma had, in addition to Jonah, other traditions to threaten its position in the controversy such as Ezekiel, who was "lifted up by the Spirit" and sent to the exiles in Telabib (Ezek.3: 14-15), as well as Daniel who escaped from the jaws of death by being "taken up out of the den" for the purpose of proclaiming to Darius and the people the "living God" (Dan.6:19-26). Resurrection from death or near death was a common theme among the ancients, as may be inferred from, "O, Lord, thou hast brought up my soul from Sheol, restored me to life" (Ps.30:3). Jeremiah, nearly
dead, was "lifted up" out of the cistern where he was left as dead (Jer. 23:10), but in order that he might fulfill a specific prophetic function. However, II Maccabees (15:14-15) presents an appearance of both Onias and Jeremiah together to Judas for a specific purpose. Ezekiel clearly spoke of resurrection as resurrection to this life: "Behold I will open your graves. 0 my people; and I will bring you home into the land of Israel" (Ezek. 37:12). The Samuel appearance was another popular cycle. After the prophet Samuel died, the old woman of Endor said to King Saul, "I see a god coming up out of the earth" (I Sam. 28:23). Samuel then speaks: "Why have you disturbed me by bringing me up?" (:15), whereupon Samuel then proceeded to fulfill his prophetic function in disciplining King Saul, whom he, as a messianic (anointed) prophet had himself anointed.

Before one dismisses this as a mere folk tale, one must take cognizance of the fact that the context of this narrative clearly implies that the intended "wizardry" turned out to be more than either King Saul or the old woman — had anticipated. In view of the "resurrection appearances" of Moses, in the Synoptic accounts and the appearance of Onias and Jeremiah in II Maccabees, one is inclined to take the Samuel tradition more seriously. Another curious aspect of the Samuel appearance is his command that Saul himself will prophesy and be "turned into another man" (I Sam. 10:6) "And you shall go down before me to Gilgal" (10:8), all of which may be seen to shed light on Luke's handling of the traditions which portray Jesus as the Messianic Prophet.

It may thus be assumed here that those circles of Christians (and we have reason to believe that they were large) who adhered strictly to the Resurrection Kerygma, would probably reject most of the prophetic appearances and heavenly visions above in their own day if they seriously believed that Jesus was the Messianic Prophet, par excellence. That the
Pharisees rejected the appearance of the high priest Onias and Jeremiah (II Macc. 15:12), who returned to fulfil a prophetic function, may be seen in the complete omission of this appearance in I Maccabees which contains nothing but denunciation for the high priest Onias. So also, they violently denounced the vision of the Son of Man by Stephen; significantly with the consent of Saul. On the other hand, the Urgemeinde Kerygma, which also reflects a priestly milieu, singularly maintained the appearance of Elijah in John the Baptist, as the forerunner of Christ. The Pharisees, along with the later Christian Pharisees, were thus known to have rejected all priestly visions and appearances, as we have seen, including ascensions and theophanies. One of the Pharisaic Christian's reasons for doing so, was obviously because they considered Jesus himself to be the promised Messianic Prophet, sent to "this world" to restore all things. And the non-Christian Pharisees reason for rejecting them, of course, was because of their Futuristic resurrection-Judgment eschatology.

The "Sign of Jonah" has been given a place of considerable importance by Luke and he has included most of Matthew's material on the subject. His conspicuous omission of Matthew's interpretation of the sign serves to underline his own "repentance" and "two careers" interpretation of the sign, as it applied to Jesus. But Luke by no means has rejected the role of the expected Messianic Prophet, which others saw in Jesus. In Matthew, the notion is rejected when the disciples conclude that John was the Elijah (17:13). Luke portrays Jesus himself taking up the role of Messianic Prophet in a time of crisis when the career of John the Baptist is cut short (Lk. 7:18ff, 13:34). In this manner he has started with the Urgemeinde position but later transferred the whole "resurrected Prophet" discussion to apply to Jesus, thus doing justice to the fact that this was the popular interpret-
ation in his day (Lk.9:7-9). Likewise, we have already observed the manner in which he applied the eschatological hymn, which was circulating about Jesus, to John the Baptist because of his basic agreement with the Urgemeinde tradition which held John to be the messianic forerunner rather than Jesus (Lk.1:68-79). However, in his handling of the Sign of Jonah material, unlike Matthew, Luke applied the Urgemeinde's Son of Man Kerygma to Jesus (οὗτος ἦσθαν καὶ ὁ υἱὸς του ἀνθρώπου ἡ γενεά ταύτῃ Lk.11:30) which affirms that he is the Son of Man who will rise up as the particular Son of God. Is this not a contradiction? Not to Luke's own theological view. Luke's finely cut logic manages to affirm both premises and more.

(a) He does not deny: The Resurrection Kerygma, but holds that John was the Messianic Prophet whose career was taken up by Jesus when John's life was cut short.

(b) He affirms: The Urgemeinde Kerygma, that Jesus' primary function as the eternal Son of Man was to bring in the Parousia, announced by the Messianic Prophet. Jesus thus had to fulfil both functions by his two careers as (a) Messianic Prophet and (b) Son of Man.

(c) Therefore: Luke has reconciled the two Kerygmata in his own Gospel, by means of the two careers of Jesus, and by means of the "secret" tradition that Jesus was more than either of the above titles (a) or (b) implied, because he is also the particular Son of God.

From this scheme it is possible to gain some indication of the extent to which the Kerygmata Controversy had already developed in Luke's time. It also discloses the subtleties and refinements of Luke's own position. It is necessary to hold a logical progression, at least roughly similar to this, in order to grasp Luke's inconsistent technique of applying both
the Resurrection Kerygma and the Son of Man Kerygma to Jesus' two separate but inclusive careers.

Luke's analogous portrayal of the "Two Careers" by means of the Sign of Jonah, was a natural step for him to take in his desire to reconcile the two Kerygmata. There were even precedents for this "Two Careers" teaching; one which included the words of the Messianic Prophet Samuel to the anointed Saul:

"Then the spirit of the Lord will come mightily upon you, and you shall prophesy with them and be turned into another man. Now when these signs meet you, do whatever your hand finds to do, for God is with you."

(I Sam.10:6-7)

An important variant of Lk.3:22, places a similar interpretation on the baptism of Jesus by the Messianic Prophet John. Others treat it as a secret kept until after his resurrection (cf. Mt.16:20, 17:9, Mk.9:9), but it is surely an error to call it a "messianic secret" in this context. In his handling of the two traditions as the "two careers" of Jesus, Luke does not deny that Jesus took on the role of the Elijah or the Messianic Prophet as foretold by Moses. Indeed, that was what one popular contemporary interpretation held him to be, as seen by the fact that he was often mistaken for John the Baptist himself. Lk.9:8, we note, does not deny the rumour, "that one of the ancient prophets has risen". Nor is the popular interpretation of the Mosaic Prophecy, as seen in Acts (3:18-22) "that he may send the Christ appointed for you, Jesus,...as Moses said, etc.", here denied. Nor are the words: "and the third day I finish my course. Nevertheless, I must go on my way today and tomorrow and the day following; for it cannot be that a prophet should perish away from Jerusalem" (Lk.13:23). This passage is somewhat reminiscent of the decision of King Saul, who temporarily joined Samuel's "Sons
of the Prophets" to prophesy. It does not suggest that Jesus was the Messianic Prophet, but perhaps that he, like Saul, "became another man" to fulfill the function of the Messianic Prophet. Clearly, to Luke's mind, Jesus was not simply a Messianic Prophet, but also the eschatological Son of Man. But because Jesus was required to take up John's career as Messianic Prophet, the Resurrection Kerygma was applicable to him, which Luke thereby conflated with the Son of Man Kerygma. The other "career" which Luke (9:21-22) underscores with secrecy, is Jesus' career as the Son of Man who will not only be raised up (9:22) to bring about the End of the Age, but will also bring about the Parousia as the Son of God. This is more than a messianic secret, it is the Urgemeinde Kerygma.

The teaching on the resurrected Messianic Prophet was therefore not denied by Luke. But he nevertheless considered it ineffective, or thwarted because of John's untimely death. Nor was this teaching fully descriptive of the Son of Man, Jesus, as was popularly held. "If they do not hear Moses and the Prophets, neither will they be convinced if someone should rise from the dead" (Lk.16:31). Writing in the midst of the Kerygmata Controversy which now was at its height, Luke perhaps saw that it was only as the eschatological Son of Man, who ushered in the Parousia, that Christ succeeded in causing the masses of Pharisees to turn; and not merely the hope of a new royal establishment. Thus by means of the "Sign of Jonah" and the two careers of Jesus as Messianic Prophet and Son of Man, Luke succeeded in reconciling the two Kerygmata. In his theological task, Luke has availed himself of the Jonah typology and the Enoch Son of Man prophecies, and other sources of which he has made no secret: "Everything that is written of
the Son of Man by the prophets will be accomplished" (Lk. 18:31). He thus may be said to have reconciled the divergent interpretations of a deep rooted Kerygmata controversy about the events of the Passion; by which means, Jesus himself reconciled an even longer standing difference between the Pharisees and Sadducees regarding the afterlife, and an even deeper division between all mankind with his very life.
C. Paul and the Kerygmata Controversy.

When the questions of this investigation are addressed to the Pauline letters, they shed a considerable amount of light on the Kerygmata Controversy, and thus are an indispensable source of information for the beliefs of the pre-Pauline or Urgemeinde Christians, as they are called here, on the question of Immortality. These views are thrown into sharpest contrast by Paul's own interpretation of the Resurrection, particularly in his letters to the Corinthians and some of his other writings examined below.

Attention has already been called to Paul's strained relations with the leaders of the Urgemeinde. This was also true of his relations to the leaders of the church at Corinth, who found Paul to be "misrepresenting God" because of the nature of his proclamation regarding the resurrection (1 Cor.15:1-15). The views of these leaders correspond to the first of the two levels of early Christianity with their corresponding Kerygmata, which for convenience sake have here been called the Urgemeinde and the Pauline Christians. The name of the former implies a certain priority, and certainly a definite authority among the early Christians, but both groups obviously stood side by side at various times within the pre-70 AD church. This appears to have been the case at Corinth. In view of the long history of the immortality-resurrection controversy, described in the chapters above, and the open support which both Peter (at one stage) and Paul derived from Pharisees of standing in Jerusalem, it is indeed an oversimplification to conclude that Paul's differences with the Corinthian Christians were merely the fruits of two separate missionary policies or merely a dispute over practical matters
of church discipline, as we shall see.

I and II Corinthians:

By reference to "first" and "second" Corinthians, it is by no means tacitly implied here, that all of II Corinthians is from the same hand or that these comprise but two, rather than a collection, of Paul's Corinthian letters. Because several recent and detailed documentary analyses have been made of these letters, I shall refer the reader occasionally to the work of others. Nonetheless, several of the differences between I and II Corinthians will be examined here, as they bear on the pre-Pauline view of immortality and the two main Kerygmatic points of view which were current within the pre-70 AD Christian Church.

"Each one of you says, 'I belong to Paul', or 'I belong to Apollos', or 'I belong to Cephas', or 'I belong to Christ'" (I Cor.1:12). It has already been observed (above p.196) that in this statement, Paul has probably distinguisished between two rather than four basic groups at Corinth. They are the "Pharisaic" Christians, who rallied to the teaching of Peter (before his "conversion" in Acts 10) and Paul; as distinguished from the Urgemeinde Christians, who rallied to the teaching of Apollos and the original teachings of Jesus on the question of immortality and resurrection. The church in Corinth apparently "boasted in the Lord" in a manner contrary to Paul (II Cor.10:7#). Their slogan, "We are Christ's" (I Cor.1:12), also contains the assertion that they did not particularly accent Paul's authority. Indeed from the letters it is evident that some of them would have little or nothing to do with Paul. This is not surprising if one of their leaders was Apollos, perhaps the most complete opposite to Paul of
all the early Christians: "What then is Apollos? What is Paul? Servants through whom you believed, as the Lord assigned to each" (I Cor. 3:5). Paul hints at Apollos' equality in prestige and authority (3:22) and his dependency on these Urgemeinde leaders, but does not venture to say one depreciating word against Apollos in any of his letters. However, he does complain about the claims of Corinth's "false apostles" to be "Hebrews (Eβραίοι)" and "Israelites (Ἰσραήλιται)", II Cor. 11:13, 22. These leaders were men, however, who had credentials for their ministry, whether from James or Peter is not known, but it is clear that they challenged Paul for his lack of supporting letters of endorsement from the appropriate source (II Cor. 3:1). They, on the other hand, had commissions from the Urgemeinde. Moreover, the Corinthian church appears to have held a special place of honour (I Cor. 4:10) and was perhaps the most favoured among all the churches (II Cor. 12:13). But they had, for some reason, clearly passed judgment on Paul (I Cor. 4:3). Paul is openly on the defensive, both as to the genuineness of his apostleship (I Cor. 9:1, 15:9) and the genuineness of his Kerygma (I Cor. 15:15), as well as his manner of living:

"This is my defence (ἀπολογία) to those who would examine me. Do we not have the right to our food and drink? Do we not have the right to be accompanied by a wife, as the other apostles and the brothers of the Lord and Cephas?" (I Cor. 9:3-5)

These words are not those which would be addressed to a libertine or immoral community, if Corinth should be considered such (cf. I Cor. 6:3). Yet because of certain charges Paul has hurled against Corinth in his own defence, some have drawn this conclusion. There is no evidence, in these letters, of the Corinthian Church being dominated either by pagan philosophies or pagan religious practices. On the contrary, they
are called the elect (τοὺς κληρούς ουδαίοις τε καὶ Ἐμμνείν, I Cor. 1:24) and the ἐκκλησία τοῦ Θεοῦ τῇ οὔσῃ ἐν Κορίνθῳ, ἡγιασμένοις ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, κληροῖς ἀγίοις I Cor. 1:2), which words by no means suggest fallen Christians. The greater probability is that the opposite was true. There are good grounds for holding that it was because of their strictness that two bothersome questions regarding things sacrificed to idols and the question of marriage, are discussed at length by Paul in this letter.

The question of food sacrificed to idols is mentioned specifically in I Corinthians (8 and 10) and it is not impossible that Paul's hypothetical situation had actually occurred (9:10). But, Paul's answer to the Corinthian's stringency in this matter, is not one of greater strictness, but of greater reasonableness. Prof. C. K. Barrett, in his detailed study of the question of food sacrificed to idols has concluded: "Paul's own view was that, provided that no other Christian was hurt thereby, a Christian might freely buy sacrificial food in the open market, might sit at table with non-Christians (who were also non-Jews) and might eat food of any kind whatsoever."

The Corinthian's position may be inferred from that to which Paul agrees: "You cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of demons. You cannot partake of the table of the Lord and the table of demons." (I Cor. 10:21). Paul sought to ameliorate this ethical distinction "without giving offence to the church of God". (I Cor. 10:32).

But the Church in Corinth was by no means a unanimous body, as we shall notice.

The other part of Paul's defence (ἀπολογία, I Cor. 9:3) before his Corinthian critics, regarding the institution of marriage, is of particular interest for the light it sheds on the eschatological views of the Corinthian church. Along with the other Christians of the Urgemeinde,
whom we have examined, the Corinthian Christians held abstinence from marriage in particularly high priority because of their view that the Parousia had already occurred. This policy was in sharp contrast to Jewish custom which required marriage of every young man as a duty and that no young woman should remain unmarried. Moreover, the root of this Urgemeinde view perhaps may be found in Jesus' own words: "For in the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are like the angels in heaven" (Mt.22:30,cf. Mk.13:17, Mt. 24:19, Lk.21:23). The Corinthian Church, along with the rest of the Urgemeinde, believed that the resurrection foretold had occurred in the resurrection of Jesus, as we have observed. Another view held by the Urgemeinde was that the resurrection is particularised for the individual believer in the rite of baptism. It was thus by this means that one participated in the Resurrection of Christ which has already occurred, (thus the special hazard for those who are with child because a foetus cannot, in the ordinary sense, be baptized). Notwithstanding, in this elite of early Christian churches, the policy became either complete abstinence from marriage or, if that was impossible, that it should be left to the spiritually immature and weak. The Encretite practice of continence did not necessarily abolish marriage, but made of it a highly spiritual association (I Cor.7:3). This occasionally resulted in divorce when one partner became a Christian (I Cor.7:10) and a "present situation" in which doubt was cast on the advisability of fathers permitting their daughters to marry "because the time is short" (I Cor.7:25-38). This was consistent with their expectation that the Lord would come at any moment to take one in the field and "leave the other" and their woes against those who were "with child". These beliefs also emphasize the seriousness with which the Urgemeinde took the resurrection to have already occurred, the gift of immortality already bestowed upon
them, and the Parousia already at hand. Another aspect of this present state of immortality with its accompanying eschatological expectations was their "speaking in tongues" of which we shall hear more.

Substantiating this picture of the Urgemeinde given in I Corinthians, is evidence of an independent occurrence of this same Urgemeinde Kerygma in the Second Epistle to Timothy (2:18). Here, its author (who speaks from the Pauline point of view, if these fragments are not actually Pauline) inveighs against Hymenaeus and Philetus for, what he considers, their mistaken teaching that the resurrection is already past (ζήνοις ἀνάστασιν ἡδὲ γεγονέναι). This passage is traditionally interpreted that their "error" lay in confusing the resurrection of the body with baptism. However, evidence for a wide-spread teaching of baptism as participation in the resurrection Christ, within the Christian church, extends well into the 2nd century AD, and cannot be dismissed lightly from the writings of the early church fathers. The late currency of this teaching strongly indicates that many leaders of the Church in the second century did not follow the interpretations of Paul, but that of the Urgemeinde in this matter. Indeed the Pauline letter to Timothy indicates that this was the case in his own day: "You are aware that all who are in Asia turned away from me" (II Tim.1:15). H.R. Swete has indicated that there was a Pauline renaissance at the time when the later Christian creeds were formulated, and in reaction to the notion that resurrection has already occurred in baptism, the insistence on the resurrection of the "flesh" (σάρκος ἀνάστασιν) made its mark on the creeds. In the perspective of this investigation, however, the creeds have not appeared as a reaction so much as a solution, or reconciliation, of the two main Christian Kerygma examined above.
L. L. Lane, in his important interpretation of I Tim. 4:1-3 has perhaps applied more weight to this simple passage than it will bear, but nonetheless has observed that it is, "most intelligible on the assumption that Hymenaios and Philetos taught that by virtue of the resurrection of Jesus Christ, the Christian community had been projected into the age to come, and that the conditions of life in that age were now in force. The resurrection lay in the past, and therefore Jesus' statement, that in the resurrection men neither marry nor give their children in marriage, required of them that marriage should cease". While one can accept the general implications of this position which seems to rightly portray the true character of the Urgemeinde, it is difficult to draw all of these inferences from I Timothy 4:1-3. It is also difficult to accept that it was only the particular "error" or problem of Hymenaeus and Philetus, that they "failed to distinguish the 'present times of refreshing' which the resurrection of Jesus had initiated, from the consummation to be inaugurated by the yet future resurrection". While some early Christians may have thought of the time after the Crucifixion as "present times of refreshing", it does not seem likely that either Paul or the Urgemeinde Christians thought of it as such. Moreover, it is impossible to accept that this was a private heresy of Hymenaeus and Philetus in view of the position of the Urgemeinde, including the church at Corinth in these matters. Nor was it a particular error in view of the similar teachings expressed in the Colossian church (Col. 2:12, 3:1), the church at Ephesus (Eph. 2:6, 5:14), at Galatia (Gal. 1:9, 3:27-9), Rome (Rom. 6:1-11) and at Thessalonica (I Thes. 4:13ff II Tim. 2:1-3 esp.). These churches not only identified the resurrection with baptism (through which rite, believers had particular access) but they
believed that the Day of the Lord (Parousia) had already come and all that remained for accomplishment was the "return" (coming) of the Lord for the particular elect who already participated in the gift of immortality. To these the Apostle Paul said:

"Now concerning (ὑπὲρ) the (coming) of our Lord Jesus Christ and our assembling to (meet) him, (ὑπὲρ τῆς παρουσίας τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν) Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ ἡμῶν ἐπισυναγωγῆς ἐπὶ αὐτὸν )we beg you, brethren, not to be quickly shaken (in) mind or excited, either (by) spirit or (by) word, or (by) letter (purporting to be) from us, (μὴ διὰ πνεύματος μὴ διὰ λόγου μὴ δι᾽ ἐπιστολῆς ἐκ να ήμῶν), (to the, effect) that (by) effect, that the day of the Lord has come (ὡς ἐν εὐανεδρίᾳ ἡ ἡμέρα τοῦ κυρίου )."

(II Thes.2:1-2).

This passage brings into sharp focus the nature of Paul's theological battle, one for which he was equipped from his early days as a Pharisee, as not only a personal warfare against the "principalities and powers" but an intensive and lifelong antipathy toward the teaching that the Parousia had already occurred in Jesus Christ. In attacking the occurrence of the Parousia in the coming of Jesus Christ, he also repudiated the hopes of the Thessalonians who assembled together in the expectation of the "coming" of the Lord to them in a particular manner. In doing so, he found it necessary to repudiate the basis for this assumption on their part which was: a) the spirit (πνεύματος), b) the word (λόγου ) and c) some authoritative Epistles which he disclaims to have written (but see I Cor.7:29). In place of these things he admonishes them to recall the things he personally taught them when he was last with them. This he calls "our gospel" (εὐαγγελίου ἡμῶν 2:14), presumably to distinguish it from the "other" gospel (II Cor.11:5). Paul's gospel will be seen to centre in the notion of a future resurrection as seen in the Epistle to the Philippians (3:10-12, etc.). But is that not precisely
what the Pharisees taught? Yes, except that when Paul applies this teaching to Jesus Christ, it becomes the Resurrection Kerygma. Fortunately, Paul does not always stop here, but occasionally reconciles the Resurrection Kerygma with that which he attacks and thereby produces his most important conclusions, as we shall see in our examination of I Cor. 15. However, because the teaching that the Parousia as well as the Judgment is already accomplished in the coming and Passion of Jesus Christ, is well attested in Hebrews, various Gospels as well as Paul's letters to the Asian churches, it is clear that Paul was not dealing with a private "heresy" of Hymenaeus and Philetus, but with the well known and widely held Kerygma of the Urgemeinde. It is that Kerygma which prevailed in Corinth and opposition to that Kerygma, more often referred to by Paul as "another Gospel", which provided the motivation for some of his finest theological apologetics, as we shall see.

The intense eschatological climate within the Corinthian church provides the only adequate explanation for both the subject matter and motivation of Paul's letters to the Corinthians. Speaking with tongues, abstinence from marriage and certain foods all come under this heading. That strict abstinence from certain foods was a practice at Corinth, is a fact which we have deduced from Paul's opposition and modifications on the subject of food offered to idols. The eschatological significance of this may be seen in the specific foods which Jesus is said to have eaten during his resurrection appearances: Lk. 24:42 (broiled fish), Jn. 21:12 (bread and fish), Acts 10:11 (ate and drank) and variants, esp. Lk. 24:42 (honey). It is likely that those who believed that they stood within the resurrection would feel it incumbent upon their participation in the resurrection likewise to restrict
themselves to these foods in their communal meals. Only if their Agape feast were directly related to their eschatological beliefs, which tended to repudiate the importance of the body as well as its resurrection, could Paul have grounds for his attack upon it (for its failure to "discern the body") in his words, "That is why many of you are weak and ill, and some have died" (I Cor.11:30). Likewise, it is only on eschatological grounds, and not on the grounds of general Pharisaic practice, that abstinence from marriage is explicable. This may well have been the case with the Essenes, who also considered themselves to be living at the threshold of the Eschaton. The Corinthians thus believed themselves to be living within the resurrection and Parousia as Jesus had said they would be: "like angels in heaven", who "neither marry nor are given in marriage". The intensity of these times, and the extent to which they believed themselves to already participate in immortality, is demonstrated by the unique problem of speaking with tongues.

Jesus' prediction of these happenings appears in the longer ending of Mark which even if not by Mark is nevertheless early: "And in my name they will cast out demons; they will speak in new tongues;" (16:17).507 The actual occurrence of speaking in tongues is well documented by Acts as a commonly known gift within the early community in Jerusalem (Acts 2:1-35 where it is associated with the Urgemeinde Kerygma), as accompanying Peter's ministry to the gentiles (Acts 10:46) and as a phenomenon among the Corinthian Christians and Apollos (Acts 19:6). Peter, himself, has interpreted the speaking with tongues in Jerusalem as a sign of the (ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις).

"For these men are not drunk, as you suppose, since it is only the third hour of the day; but this is what was spoken by the prophet Joel; 'And in the last
days it shall be, God declares, that I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh.'" (Acts 2:15-7)

Peter also applies two prophecies to the coming of Jesus as a Parousia event; the prophecy of Joel, regarding the "day of the Lord", "the great and manifest day" (Acts 2:20) and the prophecy of David, "I saw the Lord always before me, for he is at my right hand that I may not be shaken; therefore my heart was glad, and my tongue rejoiced; moreover my flesh will dwell in hope. For thou wilt not abandon my soul to Hades, nor let thy holy one see corruption" (Acts 2:25-6).

Thus the teaching that the day of the Lord has already come in the resurrection of Jesus, should be considered an inherent part of the Urgemeinde Kerygma as well as the out-pouring of the Holy Spirit which is documented mainly in two places: Jerusalem and Corinth.

The book of Acts contains six references to "speaking tongues" as over against twenty references to it in Paul's first letter to the Corinthians. We may thus infer that it was a well-established phenomenon in the Corinthian church for Paul to address himself to it in this way. In view of the basically eschatological character of the gift of tongues, according to Peter's view of the matter, it is not surprising that Paul should oppose it. Did it not imply to the minds of the Corinthians that the end times had already come? Paul therefore sought to minimize the eschatological importance of this phenomenon by dismissing it as one of many Christian gifts (1 Cor.12:4ff) and thus placed it last in the list of eight possibilities (12:28). He placed above it, love and prophecy, and not only considered it childish (13:11,14:1,3) but went so far as to suggest that it was a "sign not for the righteous but for the unrighteous" (14:22). Either opposing or ignoring Peter's teaching on tongues and its exercise in
Jerusalem, Paul, because of his own eschatological presuppositions, cannot accept the phenomenon. His awareness of its eschatological implications and potential cause of division is disclosed by his admonitions: "Since you are eager for manifestations of the Spirit, strive to excel in building up the church" (14:12). Paul seems to have taken it for granted that the speaker in tongues still possessed self-control and that if he so desired he might well choose to remain silent (14:23). Of the physical compulsion to speak, involved in this phenomenon, the apostle appears to actually know very little. We may infer that his boast in (14:13) is in fact a boast, by his disclosure that he has never exercised this gift in public where it might be known to the churches. Moreover, his criticism of this gift of the Holy Spirit may well be one of the reasons why Paul's relationship to the older communities of Christians was always in a state of tension.

Paul's rejection of Corinthian practices is by no means characterized by a "new way" which he puts in their place. His alternatives are more in the character of critical modifications. They are in most instances an appeal to reason and reasonableness. His recommendations have the force of de-eschatologising Corinthian orthopraxy. Why, then, has he written the refutation contained in I Corinthians? If it was not for the sake of an alternative "way", to what end has he employed his best theological powers? It is increasingly apparent that Paul saw the refutation of the Urgemeinde Kerygma as one of his central responsibilities. It is a Kerygma to which he has made reference at several points in his epistles and, on occasion, one which he even sought to reconcile with his own point of view.

The Urgemeinde Kerygma provides the framework for
most of Paul's first Corinthian letter. It is noticed first at 1:7 where Paul says to the Corinthians: "you are not lacking in any spiritual gift, as you wait for the revealing of our Lord Jesus Christ; who will sustain you to the end". Taken in the sense of Stephen's vision, this may suggest a particular sort of (ἀποκάλυψις), vision or appearance which the Urgemeinde awaited. The expression, "To the end" appears to be something Paul has added, which does not seem to agree with the general Urgemeinde view, unless "the end" implies the particular end of the believers life as (ὁ Καθαρὸς ὑμῶν) strongly suggests. The expression, "guiltless in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ", is certainly true to the Pauline position and presupposes that great and terrible Day, with further judgment yet to come proclaimed by the Pharisees. The belief that the resurrection had already occurred and that the elect already participated in a state of immortality, as they awaited the particular coming of the Lord, is dismissed by Paul both with the arguments mentioned above and his emphasis on the difficulty of living such a life of expectation. Some of the risks of this eschatological manner of living may have been real, but it is likely that many of the complaints against it existed only in Paul's mind. The acrimonious nature of his occasional threats and intimidations suggest that this was often the case. Paul follows his truculent assertion, "But with me it is a very small thing that I should be judged by you or any human court" (4:3), by an accusation of immorality against the Corinthians; specifically, one instance of which he has heard from an unnamed source (5:1-5). And all this, in spite of their "ten thousand teachers in Christ" (μαρτυρεῖν παιδαγωγοὺς ἐξ ἐμῆς ἐν Χριστῷ 4:15). Paul's implication is clear, that none of this would have happened, if it were not for the Corinthian's strict
eschatological views regarding abstinence from marriage. If his accusation were anything more than bluster, he probably would not have ordered that the man be sentenced to death at their next church assembly (5:5); which strong words he appears later to deeply regret (II Cor. 2:5). Nonetheless, by every means at his disposal, Paul has criticized most aspects of the Corinthian Christians eschatological way of living, yet with a curious respect for them. If they spoke with tongues, he thanked God that he spoke with tongues more than any one; if they did not marry or practiced continence, he boasted that it is well that others remain single as he does (I Cor. 7:8); if they were careful about food offered to idols, he justified his own position: "Do we not have the right to our food and drink? Do we not have the right to be accompanied by a wife?" (I Cor. 9:4-5). Nonetheless Paul's criticism of the Corinthians included their strict views on marriage, their intensity of spirituality, including their speaking in tongues, their strict food laws and communal meals, their exclusiveness and authority, all of which were directly related to their belief in the gift of immortality as a present reality (I Cor. 9:10ff).

Paul, in his letter to the Corinthians, next turns to the central issue, or cause, from which most of these objectionable problems have, in his view, sprung: the Urgemeinde Kerygma. Paul has clearly stated his manifesto to be "erygymatic in nature: "For though we live in the world we are not carrying on a worldly war, for the weapons of our warfare are not worldly but have divine power to destroy strongholds. We destroy arguments and every proud obstacle to the knowledge of God and take every thought captive" (II Cor. 10:3-5). He next turns to the root of the problem:
"Now if Christ is preached (κηρύσσεται) as raised from the dead, how can some of you say that there is no resurrection of the dead?"

(I Cor. 15:12)

The Urgemeinde has, in no instance, denied the resurrection of the body to this life; nor have they in any instance denied Christ's resurrection, but we have noted on all sides their stringent repudiation of the Pharisaic teaching of a future general resurrection and Judgment. Such a teaching was abhorrent to the Urgemeinde, not only because it continued life under the threat of the law and Judgment, but because it rendered meaningless the atoning work of Christ who was judged for mankind. Paul was well aware that the Corinthian Christians (whom he acknowledges to have faith) believed firmly in the resurrection of Christ from the dead. But he then reverses the logic of their belief and proceeds from a negative universal to a negative particular: "But if there is no resurrection of the dead (universal), then Christ has not been raised" (15:13). Paul's method of argument is specious because he and the Corinthians clearly meant two different things by (ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν)—Paul, a universal Resurrection and Judgment; the Corinthians, the particular resurrection of Christ in which believers participated by means of baptism. The Corinthians' view of the resurrection, as a present reality rather than a future possibility, may be seen behind Paul's question: "What do people mean by being baptised on behalf of the dead? If the dead are not raised at all, why are people baptised on their behalf?" (15:29). This remark discloses a general practice among the Christians in Paul's time to undergo baptism for their departed ancestors to ensure their participation in the resurrection of Christ (cf. Heb. 11:35) as many of them would not have been Christians.507a
Baptism for the dead does not make sense, if it simply implied purification from sin, but becomes both appropriate and intelligible if it was understood as a participation in the resurrection of Christ.

Paul's use of logic has caused many to believe that the Corinthian church had no hope of immortality, or belief in the "coming" of the Lord, or heaven. From the mention of this practice of (παραξένων ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν; 15:20) we may be fairly certain that they considered the resurrection of Christ a decisive event in which they wanted even their ancestors to participate. This, by no means, implies that they had no hope for the future. Prof. A. Schlatter has reasoned that the divisions in the church resulted from a disillusionment at Corinth: "Another result was that the hope of the church began to waver, and this was of special importance, because her whole life had been built upon it...The prospect of living in a body was utterly repellent, and Greek rationalism had demonstrated its absurdity. Now this hope of the resurrection of the body began to carry less conviction among the Christians at Corinth." 503 Unfortunately, the premise of this argument that the Corinthian Christians started with a belief in a future resurrection of the body, about which they became disillusioned, requires considerable substantiation. There are no grounds for that assumption, just as there are little grounds for the supposition that they became strongly influenced by Greek rationalistic philosophies or by Gnosticism and thereby disillusioned about the resurrection. Prof. Bulmann tacitly implies this was the case; however, when he says of the Corinthian Christian's views:

"Es sind gnostische Vorstellungen, und es handelt sich im Grunde um das gleiche Thema wie I.Kor 15."
This argument discloses that A. Schlatter and others, who have reasoned that the Corinthians must have been influenced by hellenistic scepticism or hellenistic Gnosticism, have based their assumptions on the erroneous supposition that because the Corinthians rejected the notion of a future resurrection and judgment, the Corinthians therefore rejected all resurrection teachings and therefore had no hope regarding the afterlife whatsoever. Such arguments are weakened by the fact that the Corinthian Christians were, more than any other Christian community, characterised by their realisation of the view that they already participated in a state of immortality (1 Cor. 15:8ff, 11:30) which influenced their whole eschatological outlook, including food, property, marriage, communal meals and spiritual gifts. Paul himself seeks to correct the flaw in his general assumptions by admitting that the Corinthians believed in the resurrection of Christ and the baptism for the dead, which are not two dissociated facts. It was, therefore, not scepticism or disillusionment which lay behind the Corinthian views, but simply the well-known Kerygma of the Hauptsache which differed considerably from that of Paul.

The Corinthian Christians quite naturally did not look to a future resurrection–Judgment because of their firm conviction that it had already occurred in the Passion of Jesus Christ. They nonetheless looked with an even greater expectation to a particular "coming" of the Lord with his myriads of angels, or perhaps in the specific manner of
Stephen's vision. According to the Urgemeinde Kerygma, the extension of God's reign over the whole universe had already begun. Already God had accomplished his ultimate purpose and had placed all his enemies under his feet. Paul frequently spoke of the kingly role of the coming Lord in his epistles, without expecting any of his readers to contradict him. "Here he met with opposition, was in his suggestion that this had not yet happened, that the elect had not yet received the gift of immortality or the reign of God commenced (15:6, 10:9ff, 11:30).

Paul's modifications of the Urgemeinde Kerygma are seen by a comparison with his own views on the resurrection. Unlike the Urgemeinde Kerygma which applied the titles "Son of Man", "Son of God" and "Lord" to Jesus, Paul's kerygmatic statements simply refer to Jesus with the general title "anointed one" without designating what anointed figure is implied: messianic king or messianic prophet (I Cor.15:20).

"But in fact Christ has been raised from the dead, the first fruits of those who have fallen asleep" (ἀπαρχή τῶν κεκοιμημένων).

Paul departs from the present and particular categories of the Urgemeinde Kerygma to the future and universal categories of a Resurrection Kerygma by two steps (I Cor.15:20-22):

(a) "by a man" (past, particular) "come death" (past, universal) "by a man" (past particular) "also came a resurrection" (past, exclusive). "of dead persons" (qualified).

(b) "In Adam" (pres., partic.) "all die" (pres., universal) "also in Christ" (pres., partic.) "all will be made alive" (fut., universal), (unqualified).

While the Urgemeinde could easily accept premises (a) on the basis of its own Kerygma, it would find it difficult to accept the conclusions (b), because Paul has introduced two new elements: the future tense and the unqualified universal.
These may be considered to be the essence of the Resurrection Kerygma, i.e. its general and future nature. By these steps Paul has negated the very heart of the Urgemeinde Kerygma by asserting that both the Eschaton and the Kingdom of God are yet to come. But first he dissociates the resurrection of Christ from the Parousia:

"But each one in his own order: Christ the first fruit, afterward (ἐπιγέρσισα) those of Christ (ἐν τῇ Παρουσίᾳ αὐτοῦ, 15:22)."

Although this view harmonises agreeably with the Pharisaic understanding of Jesus as the messianic prophet, Paul's dissociation is in direct opposition with the Kerygma expressed in Matthew (27:52) and by Peter (Acts 2:17-26), as seen from what follows:

"Then comes the end (ἐσκέρα τοῦ θεοῦ) when (ever) he delivers the kingdom to God the Father after (ἐκκέρα) destroying every rule and every authority and power". (15:24)

Paul's implication is plainly that this end has not yet come; again, contrary to the Urgemeinde Kerygma: "he has appeared once for all at the end of the age" (Rev.9:26). Paul clearly sees this as a future event. But more importantly, as far as his contemporaries were concerned, it was also in obvious contradiction to Peter's announcement of the events surrounding Jesus' "Last Days" as an eschatological occurrence (Acts 2:17-24).

In support of his argument, that the Parousia had not yet come, Paul quoted a familiar teaching of the Urgemeinde Kerygma:

"For he must reign until he has put all his enemies under his feet. The last enemy (to be) destroyed is death. "For (God) has put all things in subjection under his feet". (15:25-27)"
This quotation, repeated by Paul, was perhaps one of the oldest of the Urgemeinde teachings and it is evident that the Corinthians already firmly believed that all of these things had been fulfilled by Jesus. Not so with Paul: not only does he here conspicuously omit the title "Lord" (nor does the title "God" stand in the text πάντα γὰρ ὑπέραξεν), but he uses this well-known quotation to suggest that these things have not yet taken place, and therefore the end time had not come.

This saying might well have been used originally by Jesus in an anti-Pharisaic polemic and thus may be known as an early Urgemeinde teaching:

"Now while the Pharisees were gathered together, Jesus asked them a question saying, 'What do you think of the Christ? Whose son is he?' They said to him, 'The Son of David.' He said to them, 'How is it then that David, inspired by the Spirit, calls him Lord, saying, The Lord said to my Lord, sit at my right hand, till I put thy enemies under thy feet'? If David thus calls him Lord how is he his son?"

(Mt.22:41-45, par.Mk.12:35.
Lk.20:41-44.)

The Pharisaic expectation was that the Messianic Prophet would be forerunner to a Messianic King of the Davidic line. This Jesus has clearly refuted by pointing out that the Messiah is called "Lord" by David and therefore could not be his son.

We may assume that Jesus' refutation of the Pharisees continued as a popular argument in the Urgemeinde which continued to use the eschatological terms, "Lord" and "Son of God" despite Pharisaic objections. The importance of the saying to the Urgemeinde may be seen by the place of priority given to it at the beginning of Hebrews (1:13) where it has strong eschatological and anti-Pharisaic connotations (1:3-14) and has incorporated with its exposition the teaching of the pre-existent
Son of God. The original quotation from the Psalms (110: 1-7) was important not only because it was used by Jesus but it was significant to the Urgemeinde for its references to the eternal (immortal and pre-existent) messianic high priest (after the order of Melchizedek or Melchi-Zedek), the holy mountain (foretold by Enoch and reflected in the Mount of Transfiguration narrative and its eschatological connotations relevant to the Day of Wrath. Peter's use of the saying (Acts 2:22-36), in his articulation of the Urgemeinde Kerygma also demonstrates its centrality, but more importantly, his view of Jesus as this "Lord" and "Christ" in a non-Davidic sense: "For David did not ascend into the heavens, etc." (2:34) and "Let all the house of Israel therefore know assuredly that God has made him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom you crucified" (2:36).

It is therefore in direct contradiction to the teaching of Peter and the Urgemeinde, who held that the Day of the Lord had occurred in Jesus, that Paul argues against the Corinthians: "When (ὅραω ) all things are subjected to him, then the Son himself will be subjected to him (ἐμποτογηγήσεται πᾶ ὑπερέξωμα αὐτῷ) who put all things under him, that God may be all in all" (I Cor.15:28). Paul thereby sought to persuade the Corinthians that that great and terrible day (the Day of the Lord) was yet to arrive. Against the teachings of Peter, Paul boldly announced that the "Son"(simply ὅσον ) only represented the first fruits of what is yet to come.

To the Corinthians, who believed that they were indeed participating already in the resurrection, through baptism into a new body, i.e. the spiritual body of Christ, the resurrection had already come as a present fact. Paul's new position required that he next deal with the question:
"But someone will ask, 'How are the dead raised? With what kind of body do they come?'" (15:35). This was, by no means, a problem to the Corinthians who understood their resurrected body to already have become immortal. Paul seems to have answered with bluster: "You foolish men! What you sow does not come to life unless it dies. And what you sow is not the body which is to be" (15:36 or II Cor. 12:2-3). We may infer that the Corinthians strongly defended the position that theirs were already resurrected bodies through baptism. Against the notion that Christians already had the gift of resurrection and immortality, Paul reasoned that one needed a completely different body: "There are celestial bodies and there are terrestrial bodies, etc." (15:40) and, "So it is with the resurrection of the dead. What is sown is perishable, what is raised is imperishable." (15:42), also "It is sown a physical body, it is raised a spiritual body." (15:44). These statements must be appreciated for their direct relationship to the Urgemeinde teachings. They also are sharply distinguished from the Urgemeinde teaching on the pre-existent "Son of Man", "Lord" and "Son of God", already noted in Hebrews, Snach and the Gospels. In this context Paul has reaffirmed the fundamental principle of his Kerygma: "The last Adam became a life-giving spirit. But it is not the spiritual which is first but the (physical), and then the spiritual" (κύριος πρωτόν ἐκ πνευμάτων ἀλλὰ τὸ σώματος, ἐπείτα τὸ πνευματικόν 15:45-46). The futurist element, including Paul's distinction between the coming "spiritual" and the present unspiritual "soul" (fleshly) may be considered the very essence of the Resurrection Kerygma.

This Kerygma controversy which stretches its roots far into pre-Christian times, may well have anticipated various controversies between the Scholastic Theologians and
the Nominalists who at a much later date articulated the basic difference between these Kerygmatas in terms of a philosophical dilemma: Does existence precede essence? Or, does essence precede existence? Without judging the outcome of that philosophical dispute (if, indeed, it can be said to have ever been settled), it may be noted that modern Existentialist theologians are closest to Paul in their basic presumption that existence precedes essence, at least in view of Paul’s assertion that the "physical" must precede the "spiritual". This basic question has given rise to much of Existentialist thinking in our own day, but it should not be assumed that one who holds this basic proposition is necessarily "Existentialist" or "Pauline" in doing so.

Unlike Paul, the Urgemeinde Kerygma starts with the "spiritual" and eternal and proceeds to the particular and physical by means of a supertemporal type of divine deduction, by means of which, Christ becomes the logical (rather than simply chronological) conclusion or fulfilment. The Fourth Evangelist has expressed this "logical", rather than chronological or spatial process, by his use of the term "logos". Jesus was thus known to the Urgemeinde as the particular Son of Man, "the one appointed for you", who was a particularisation of the pre-existent and eternal Son of God. Because they believed the Day of the Lord had already occurred, the believer was seen to participate in the resurrection of Jesus (of which baptism was a particularisation for the believer) and thereby become a "part" of the body of Christ which is more than the Church and consequently more than a "period" in history. This deductive process depends on what is already established by God (non-chronologically) for its particular ramifications. It was because of its non-chronological
character that the Corinthian Christians could conceive of "baptism for the dead" and the Urgemeinde could hold that the patriarchs and prophets are "perfected in us" (Feb.11:40). Because of its non-chronological character, they also recognised themselves to be participating in a present state of immortality as a part of the body of Christ.

Paul's Kerygma, by contrast, appears to be totally inductive in character. He reasons that because of the fact of a particular resurrection of the body (as "first fruits"), there shall be a universal resurrection of the body. His Kerygma has been held to rest on chronological presuppositions which hold Christ to be the point of departure, or "middle point" of the ages. Paul's "futurist" or chronological argument may also be seen to be deeply rooted in the "cause and effect" nature of his induction. An example of this is found in his handling of the "man of dust" argument (15:47-9):

A.1 Because: the "first" man of dust,
   2 Was followed by: the "second" heavenly man,

B.1 Because of: the (particular) man of dust, there are many (universal) of the dust;
   2 Because of: the (particular) man of heaven, there must be many (universal) of heaven;

   therefore

C.1 Because: we have (first) borne the image of the man of dust,
   2 It follows that: we shall also (secondly) bear the image of the heavenly man (universal).

Paul's Kerygmatic induction has not only shifted from the particulars (A) to the universals (B), but in his transition
from (A) to (C), he has erroneously held that (C.2) is the
chronological consequence of (C.1) because (A.2) was the
chronological consequence of (A.1). But as the "man of dust"
(A.1), by no means, can be said to be the cause of the
"heavenly man" (A.2), neither can the "image of the heavenly
man" (C.2) be held to be the necessary universal future
consequence of (C.1) the present "image of the man of dust".

The cause and effect logic of Paul's Kerygma,
consistently places the Parousia in the future: "For now we
see in a mirror dimly, but then face to face. Now I know in
part; then I shall understand fully" (13:12). He does not
speak in terms of what has been established, but what has yet
to be established. It is with the chronological aspects
of his argument that he is at greatest variance with the
accepted Urgeneinde Kerygma. The latter held that because
the Parousia had occurred, the particular believer was raised
(translated). Paul reversed this; because Christ raised
(resurrected), the Parousia will occur (future), "And God
raised the Lord and (therefore) will also raise us up by his
power" (6:14). Those who ignore the significant difference
in these Kerygmatata and seek to reconcile them by holding that
Christ should be viewed as the mid-point, or turning point, in
what is assumed to be a "Divine time scheme" (with the implicit
cause-effect logic that requires) have begged the question by
presupposing Paul's chronological argument. It is far more
difficult, but far more faithful to the earliest traditions to
reconcile them, as has John the Evangelist, by placing Christ
at the mid-point, not only of time but of logic as well, as
the particularisation of all revelation. He thus has placed
the "Logos" between what has been roughly described here as the
Kerygma via deduction and the Kerygma via induction. This, perhaps, is one of the reasons why the pre-existent Son of Man and Son of God was a more important teaching to the Urgemeinde Christians than a future Son of Man (Christ), as seen by Paul as the end point or culmination of an earthly chronological sequence beginning with Adam. The Resurrection Kerygma appears to be limited by its time categories which were rightly rejected by the Urgemeinde, at this early stage, as a defect inherited from the Pharisaic teachings on Fate and Judgment.

When these distinctive characteristics of Paul's Kerygma are recognised, it is a much easier matter to recognise the technique by which he sought to reconcile his own Kerygma with that of the Urgemeinde. This task has been attempted by Paul at the end of I Corinthians; almost as an afterthought:

"Lo! I tell you a mystery. We shall not all sleep, but we shall be changed (πάντες οὖν κοιμηθεὶσιν, πάντες δὲ ἀλλαγθεὶσι) in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye (ἐν ἀτομή ἐν χρόνῳ) at the last (ἐσχάτη) trumpet. (15:51-52)

The Corinthians would have no quarrel with this; it is, in effect, the Translation theology of the Urgemeinde, apart from what Paul has added in the reference to the (ἐσχάτη σάλπιγγι; 52). Such an instantaneous change or translation of the elect was part of their basic expectation, but not in a universal or judgmental sense. In the light of Psalm 47:5, "God has gone up with a shout, the Lord with the sound of a trumpet", Paul's reference to the "last trumpet" must have appeared as an innovation of Christian thought at this point. Christ had already ascended. In him the Eschaton had already happened to the mind of the Urgemeinde. If not with a trumpet, Christ's Passion was seen by more than one Urgemeinde
source to have been accompanied by an eschatological shout. Thus the Gospels state that Jesus "cried with a loud voice" (Lk.23:46, Mk.15:35, Mt.27:46). Paul's projection of this event into the future by means of the quotation from Psalm 47, which he expanded considerably, is evident in his next statement:

"For the trumpet will sound, and the dead will be raised imperishable, and we shall be changed (οι νεκροί ἐγερθοῦνται ἄφθαρτοι, καὶ ημεῖς ἀλλαγηθὲμεθα)."

(15:52)

To Corinthian ears these words would imply that the ascension of Christ had not occurred and that his judgment on behalf of mankind was yet to take place. Moreover, it would appear to contradict the promises of Christ, that some of the elect would "not taste death" (Mt.16:28, Mk.9:1, Mk.9:27, Jn.8:51) and that those who keep his word shall "never see death" and "inherit eternal life" (Jn.8:51, Mt.19:29, Jn.3:36, 5:24, 6:40, 47, 51, 10:28, etc.). In contrast to these views, Paul asserted that death and resurrection must occur first, as the "seed must die first" (15:36). By no means does his inductive logic imply that any change will occur before the trumpet sound. Thus, to the Pauline view, death became a causal prerequisite:

"For this perishable (nature) (τὸ φθαρτὸν τοῦτο) must put on the imperishable, and this (mortal nature τὸ θανήτον τοῦτο) must put on immortality (αἰθανασίαν)."

(15:53)

Only when this has been accomplished (but not before) does Paul venture, "then shall come to pass (τὸτε γινησεται ὁ λόγος) the saying that is written: 'Death is swallowed up in victory!' (15:54). That which the Corinthians held central to their Kerygma and that to which they orientated their whole manner of living, was not outrightly negated by Paul, but
carefully relegated to the future. It was thus by this means, that Paul sought to reconcile his Kerygma with that of the Urgemeinde in Corinth.

II Corinthians:

There is little room for doubt about the strained relations between the leaders of the Corinthian Church and the Apostle Paul. Their antipathy toward Paul does not imply that they were lacking in spiritual intensity, as we have noticed from the first letter, but that their loyalties had become firmly orientated to the accepted Kerygma of the Urgemeinde. We have also noticed instances of the particular distress their close ties with the Jerusalem church caused Paul on occasion. Of all the early Christian communities the Corinthian Church perhaps, bears the closest resemblance to the Covenanters of Qumran in their formal rejection of marriage, strict food laws, communal meals, pre-occupation with the Holy Spirit, eschatology (as living in the "last days"), and possibly the phenomenon of "interpretation", as in the "interpretation of tongues". Nonetheless, to this community as a fellow Christian church came the leaders of the Jerusalem church. In all probability, Peter himself and some of the "brethren of the Lord" visited Corinth with a certain undetermined frequency. It is clear that they gave the Corinthians a teaching which differed so seriously from that of Paul that he soon began to refer to it as "another Kerygma" (καίδελλ' ἰησοῦς κριστοῦ II Cor.11:4) and "another gospel" (εὐαγγέλιον ἐκατέρων). It should be noted that despite what Paul said about it, this "other gospel" had the authority of the leaders of the Jerusalem church, the first apostles themselves. It
is apparent that the "other Gospel" was also accompanied by a rejection of Paul's Kerygma on the grounds of his denial of the Parousia in Jesus Christ. To this must be added their concern about Paul's lack of apostolic authority. If this was not the case, it must be explained why Paul went to such lengths to defend his position employing the best of his argumentative powers as a writer. The feelings against Paul in Corinth made matters particularly difficult because his mission had already been restricted by the Apostolic Council to the Gentiles in Asia Minor of which Corinth was the key community. The undisputed Apostolic authority of the leaders of the church in Jerusalem, made Paul's authority by contrast, impossible to maintain without considerable justification and apology. In the eyes of some, Paul's collection for the church in Jerusalem probably had the appearance of an attempt to maintain his position. It can at least be known to be his only concrete point of connection with Jerusalem. 513

Prof. Brandon, in his important study of Paul's relationship to the Jerusalem church, has referred to this situation as the "crisis of AD55-66." 514 Although Prof. Brandon has concentrated mainly on Galatians and Romans, he has tended to conclude, in his invaluable examination of this problem, that Paul's struggle was one for power and authority between himself and the leaders of the Jerusalem church. Such a view, perhaps underestimates the serious theological nature of Paul's "Kampf" with the Jerusalem Urgemeinde and his essential bearing as a theologian, first and foremost. Prof. Brandon recognises the essentially theological nature of their differences, lest he be misrepresented, but implies that these differences had their roots in the political issue concerning Jesus as the Jewish Messiah. Thus he has presupposed: "According to lots, the Christology of Apollos had been
regarded as seriously defective by the friends of Paul – a
tendentious presentation which is tantamount to a condemna-
tion of the Christianity taught at Alexandria.515 He has
concluded: "The Gentile Christians of Corinth, unable to
appreciate the significance of the Jewish context of this
new doctrine (i.e. Paul's view of the political Messianic
vocation of Jesus), regarded the special presentation of
Jesus as the Messiah as some distinct doctrine".516 Brandon
thus requires that one view the Corinthian church as essent-
ially hellenised, and the Jerusalem church essentially unhellenised.
From what has been demonstrated above, and in the preceding
chapters, it is not possible to make such an assumption.
One is again left with the question, whether the differences
between Paul and the Urgemeinde in fact political and messia-
nic, or essentially Kerygmatic and eschatological in
character. In view of the fact that the other Christian
emissaries from Jerusalem were also "Hebrews", known to be
the seed of Abraham and recognised as "ministers of Christ"
(II Cor.11:21), it seems most unlikely that Paul's bitter
differences with them could have foundation in the former alter-
native.
II Corinthians, whether it consists of one or
several letters from the hand of Paul, takes special pains to
set forth the theological and non-political nature of Paul's
struggle with the Urgemeinde. "For the weapons of our
warfare are not worldly" (10:1). The strife is ideological:
"We destroy arguments and every proud obstacle to the knowledge
of God, and take every thought captive to obey Christ" (10:5).
With reference to the "other Kerygma" and "other Gospel"
(11:14), Paul has made no secret of his intention to "undermine
(ὑπαγεῖν ἐκκέψω) the claims of those who would like to suggest
that in their mission they work on the same terms as we". In
his conflict with his rivals he is waging a Kerygmatic battle with Jerusalem; not one of authority but essentially theological and Kerygmetic in nature.

The tone of II Corinthians differs so greatly from that of I Corinthians, apart from the last four chapters, that its harmony with I Corinthians has long been disputed. Dr. Bornkamm has called attention to several church fathers who have freely quoted I Corinthians; who might well have quoted II Corinthians to even greater advantage, but refrained from doing so.\(^{517}\) It is not possible, within the scope of this investigation, to analyse the Kerygmetic views of Clement, Ignatius and Polycarp, but it is not impossible that they had particular reasons for refraining from quoting II Corinthians, at least the first nine chapters.

The "reconciliation of God" and the "ministry of reconciliation" (διακονίαν τῆς καταλλαγῆς, 5:18) are a dominant theme throughout chapters 1-9. Paul, perhaps, could not state in more direct terminology than that used here, his willingness to reach an amicability with the dissident Corinthian Christians and his desire that they should end their hostility and be reconciled (6:11-13, 7:2). However, none of this same diplomacy is evident in chapters 10-13, in which Paul appears to have given up hope of a reconciliation between himself and the Corinthians. Chapters 1-9 present a positive attempt to reconcile the Pauline and Urgemeinde Kerygmata with several concessions, on the part of Paul, not seen in I Corinthians. He also attempts here, to make amends for his stringent judgment on the Corinthians which, in his anger, he carried to the excess of suggesting the death sentence for one of them. The conciliatory nature of chapters 1-9, has one explanation in Paul's emissary Titus who brought good news from Corinth: "And not only by his coming but also by the
comfort with which he was comforted in you, as he told us of your longing, your mourning, your zeal for me (ἐπάθειαν ὧν ὠρός ἐμοῦ), so that I rejoiced still more" (7:7). So Paul indicates this to be the cause of his new accessibility (7:12). On the other hand 10-13 appear to have been written after Paul himself had visited Corinth and found neither the reception he had hoped for, nor the conditions he might have wished (12:1, 13:1). If the chapters of II Corinthians are left in their present position, two letters of varying temperament are clearly discernible without further complicated explanation. 513

The present state of criticism on the Pauline letters is such that some have found as many as four or six letters in this collection which make up II Corinthians. 519 The whole discussion has taken another turn in Prof. Bornkamm's hypothesis that chapters 10-13 are fragmentary but an essential part of the whole. He is convinced that they were written after a short and painful visit by Paul to Corinth, provoked by a single member of the community, but argues that these "warnings against false prophets" have been placed at the end for literary reasons. 520 His theory, in brief, is that the compiler of these letters a) took Paul's "Letter of reconciliation" (1-7) as a basis, b) into which he introduced an "apology of his apostolic office" (2:14-7:4), c) he next added the "collection chapters" (8-9) and finally d) appended the "letters of tribulation" (10:13) to round off the document after the style of other epistles which end with warnings and admonitions. 521

Although Bornkamm's hypothesis is complex, it is not as complex as Bulmann's alternatives which assign the apology (2:14-7:4) to the "letter of tears" (10-13), as a single unit. 522 But is 10-13 in a unit with the rest? It may be noticed that in (2:14-7:4), Paul is still sure of his position
and confident that the Corinthians will respond to his
appeal. However, in 10-13 the situation is vastly chan-
ged. Paul now argues from a position of weakness rather
than strength: his position is hopeless and he seems to have
no following (cf. 11:20). Thus the apology (2:14-7:4) cannot
be assigned to the "letter of tears" (10:13), as Bultmann
suggests. Bornkamm's conclusion that after the apology the
situation got worse at Corinth and Paul finally paid them a
visit has much to recommend it. Only after he returned to
Ephesus, did he write the "letter of tribulation" (10-13).523
It would appear that in this latter visit Paul became sorely
disappointed in not finding the reconciliation he had hoped
for, despite the concessions he had made to their point of view
in 1-7. We shall see that it was this lack of reconciliation
and response to his appeal (8-9) which was more directly
responsible for the bitterness of (10-13) than any extensive
immorality within the Corinthian church.

Many of the above theories treat II Corinthians
in isolation from I Corinthians, thus tending to establish its
questionable character. All depend on a complex sequence of
arguments to substantiate their chapter rearrangements. If
the chapters are permitted to stand in their present form,
1-9 not only disclose an internal continuity, but reveal a
relationship between this "second letter" and I Corinthians.
The "second letter" (1-9) makes reference to a previous string-
ent letter of judgment, almost with some embarrassment: "For
if I cause you pain who is there to make me so glad but the
one whom I have pained? And I wrote as I did, so that when
I came (\'iνα μὴ ἐφώνω) I might not be pained by those who
should have made me rejoice" (2:2-3). This does not appear to
refer to any trip Paul has already made, but to the strong
condemnation contained in his first letter (I Cor. 5:3-5) in
which he urged that action be taken at the next assembly of
the church in Corinth regarding a certain offender who he
said was deserving of death. In his second letter Paul seems to
retract this statement; he suggests that he only sought to
test them. "For such a one this punishment by the majority
is enough: so you should rather turn to forgive and comfort
him, or he may be overwhelmed by excessive sorrow. So I
beg you to re-affirm your love for him. For this is why I
wrote, that I might test you and know whether you [like
Abraham] are obedient in everything, etc." (2:8-9). This
theme is continued throughout his second letter of reconcil-
iation. "For even if I made you sorry with my letter, I do
not regret it (though I did regret it), for I see that that
letter grieved you" (7:8). "My letter" by no means refers to
10-13, but to his first letter. He continues. "At every
point you have proved yourselves guiltless in the matter. So
although I wrote to you, it was not on account of the one who
did the wrong, nor on account of the one who suffered the
wrong (not Paul), but in order that your zeal for us might be
revealed to you in the sight of God." (7:12). However, the
repentance which was purported to have taken place, as the
result of Paul's first letter, was that reported by Titus
(7:6ff, 13ff) and not Paul's own observation. When Paul
himself finally went to Corinth, he found that either the
repentance was short lived, or that it did not exist at all.
It may thus be supposed that the result was 10-13, which is
as bitter as his first letter and definitely written after
Paul himself had been to Corinth.

Paul's "second letter", which still glows with the
hope of râpûrochement and co-operation with the Corinthians,
particularly after Titus's reception and consoling report,
bears another strong point of continuity with I Corinthians. And that is Paul's fervent desire to reconcile his own theology and Kerygmatic expression with that of the Corinthians.

The first concession Paul made to the Corinthians, who believed that the gift of immortality had already been bestowed in the one decisive work of Christ, was his affirmation of the gift, with the qualification that the change takes place by degree, rather than a sudden qualitative change in the nature of human existence. "And we all, with unveiled face, reflecting the glory of the Lord (as "in a mirror" τὴν ὀψιν κυρίου κατοπτηρίζομενον) are being changed into his likeness from one degree of glory to another" (μεταμορφοῦμεθα ἀπὸ δόξης εἰς δόξαν) 3:18.

He implies in (4:7-15) that his Kerygma is on a par with that of the Corinthians, but makes an important concession to them in v.12: "So death is at work in us, but life in you" (ὦστε ὁ θάνατος ἐν ἡμῖν ἐνεργεῖται, ἡ δὲ ζωὴ ἐν ὑμῖν). This is preceded by the statement: "We have this treasure in earthen vessels" (4:7), "We are afflicted in every way, but not crushed...always carrying in the body the death of Jesus, so that the life of Jesus may also be manifested in our bodies" (4:8-10). Thus, even though it was death which was already at work "in our bodies", according to the Pauline Kerygma, and eternal life already at work, according to the Urgemeinde Kerygma, Paul, nonetheless, asserts that it all will come out the same in the end:

"He who raised the Lord Jesus will raise us also with Jesus and (bring) us with you (καὶ ἡμᾶς σὺν Ἰησοῦ εγερεῖ καὶ παραστήσει σὺν ὑμῖν)"

(4:14)

Against the notion that the resurrection had already occurred in Christ, Paul states, "We look not to the things that are seen
but to the things that are unseen' (τὰ γὰρ βλέπομενα πρόσκαιρα, τὰ δὲ μὴ βλέπομενα αἰώνια , 4:18), Paul reasons, if not future, then transcendental, but surely the eternal has not yet begun: "If the earthly tent (ἐπίγειος ἡμῶν οἰκία τοῦ οἰκίων) we live in is destroyed, we have a building (οἰκοδομὴν) from God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens (αἰώνιον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς). Here indeed we groan, and long to put on our heavenly dwelling" (5:1-2). He explains that while we are in this "earthly tent", we sigh with anxiety to put on the eternal: "that what is mortal may be swallowed up by life" (Ἐνακαταποθήκη, ὁ θνήτον ὑπὸ τῆς ἀναστάσεως , 5:4). However, to his characteristic doctrine of future Resurrection-Judgment (5:10), Paul adds a new element which he acknowledges to be a contradiction of his position. However in making this concession, he states that he might be beside himself or not in his right mind, but nonetheless this is his concession:

"One has died for all; therefore all have died (εἰς ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀπεθανεν ἀρα οἱ πάντες ἀπέθανον)", 5:14.

"From now on, therefore, we regard no one from a human point of view (Ὄσι ἡμεῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν οὐδένα οἴδαμεν καὶ τάρκᾳ); even though we once regarded Christ from a human point of view, we regard him thus no longer. Therefore, if any one is in Christ, he is a new creation (καὶ ὃς ἐν αὐτῷ τῇ κτίσις); the old has passed away, behold, the new has come (ἰδοὺ γένονται καὶ ἁμαρτία")", 5:16-17.

Significantly, Paul concludes this re-statement of the Urgemeinde Kerygma, to which he has made the above concessions, with the remark: "All this is from God, who through Christ reconciled us to himself and gave us the ministry of reconciliation", (5:18). Nowhere, in any of his writings, has Paul risen to the height of diplomacy achieved here in the fifth chapter of II Corinthians. He almost appears to concede the Urgemeinde's point that the judgment has occurred in Jesus: "For our sake he made him to be sin who knew no sin, so that in him we
might become the righteousness of God" (5:21, but cf. 5:10). That, by no means, should be considered an original Pauline doctrine, but the fruit of a creative theological tension between the Pauline and the Urgemeinde Kerygmatia. Such is the case with Paul's assertion (which later may have been retracted in II Thes.2:2): "Now is the acceptable time; behold, now is the day of salvation. We put no obstacle in any one's way, so that no fault may be found with our ministry" (6:2-3). This agreement with the Urgemeinde is remarkable when compared with Paul's stern admonitions elsewhere: "Now concerning the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ...we beg you, brethren, not to be quickly shaken", as he is purported to say in II Thes. 2:1-2, and what is set forth in II Tim.2:13, as an admonition against those who believed that the resurrection was already at hand.

The conclusion of this chapter discloses another concession by Paul's appeal to the fundamental Urgemeinde traditions held sacred by the Corinthian church. Paul here contrasts the figure of Christ with the figure of Beliar (or Belial, τὸς δὲ συμφώνησις Χριστῷ πρὸς Βελίαρ 6:15), without introduction or explanation. The rare occurrence of this name has no parallel either in the New Testament or the Pharisaic canon of the Old. Beliar does, however, play a significant role in the "Martyrdom of Isaiah", which B. H. Charles has dated before 50 AD.525 The name refers to the notorious priestly opponent of Isaiah's "vision of the Lord", who caused Isaiah to be sawn asunder (Mart.Is.1:9, 3:6), known and alluded to by the author of Hebrews (11:37). This tradition was important for its bearing on the Martyrdom of Stephen, which was also occasioned by a vision of the Lord, and thus highly
cherished by the Urgemeinde. Paul's allusion to this tradition appears to have been an important step to dissociate him from those Pharisees who were dedicated to persecuting such "visionaries" even to the extent of stoning, as was seen in their opposition to Sadducaic high priests who held to such visions in addition to Stephen. Paul himself was undoubtedly known as one of these persecutors before his remarkable conversion, by means of a vision. It is significant that he should later go on to "visions and revelations of the Lord" (ἐνεπεργεῖ ὁ χριστός τοῦ θεοῦ, 12:1), mentioning Damascus, without stating that he personally had received a vision of the Lord. Rather, he says: "I know a man in Christ who fourteen years ago was caught up to the third heaven (τρίτου οὐρανοῦ), whether in the body or out of the body I do not know. God knows (εἰς ἐν σώματος οὐκ οἶδα, εἰς ἐκτὸς τοῦ σώματος οὐκ οἶδα θεός οἶδεν), 12:2. This event about which Paul disclaims firsthand knowledge, may or may not be reminiscent of the many interrogations and trials in which Paul took an active part before his conversion, but it does in this context represent an appeal, at least the Corinthians would have recognised it as such, to the Enoch traditions cherished by the Corinthians. For it is 1 Enoch 14, which provides the definitive example of a Translation to heaven and a mansion beyond a mansion (or third heaven) where Enoch saw the Lord with his myriads of angels and the height and the depth of the heavens. Paul's originality should not be seen in the content of these traditions, but in the apologetic manner in which he employs them to reconcile his Kerygma with that of the Urgemeinde.

To the evidence of J. Weiss and R. Bultmann, these additional arguments may be added.
the collator of II Corinthians placed 10-13, which they believed to be a part of the apology (2:14-7:4), at the end. Prof. Bornkamm has called attention to what he believes is almost a "literary rule" that among various New Testament epistles, warnings against false teachers are generally placed at the end as a matter of practice. He holds that the collator of II Corinthians has underscored Paul's admonitions with an eschatological force by placing them at the end because it was an "acknowledged view that the appearance of false prophets is a sign of the last times". A fact of singular importance, whether or not Prof. Bornkamm proves this point, is that the precedents for this "acknowledged view" are largely from Urgemeinde sources (II Pet.2:2, Heb.13:9, Jude 17, etc.).

The inverse of the above argument, i.e. that because there are false prophets about, therefore the end times are at hand and Paul's words should be taken with greater seriousness, may have even greater validity; namely, that because the end times were believed to be at hand, Paul may have been treated with even greater suspicion because the apostles foretold that false prophets will rise up in the end times. Two things about which there is complete certainty are a) that the Corinthians did believe that the end times had begun, and b) Paul was treated with the utmost suspicion by them. In order to hold the Bultmann-Bornkamm arrangement of 10-13 which would place these chapters at the beginning of II Corinthians, one must explain, how 10-13 can imply that Paul has just made a disappointing trip to Corinth, and twice speak of Paul intending to make a "third" visit to straighten matters out (12:14-13:1). This is particularly difficult in view of the clear implication in 1-7 that Paul has not yet made his trip to Corinth and has based his good will toward them on the good report of Titus
who has just returned from a visit in his stead. Even up until the events in 8:6, Titus is still the only one to have begun a rapportement by actually going to Corinth. On the other hand, 12:18 also refers to a trip of Titus to Corinth, but this seems to be distinguished from his first trip and thus probably is a different visit altogether. Secondly, the parallelism between 8:6-8 and 12:18 shows that the mission of Titus which followed Chapter 8 precedes Chapter 12. Thus it is impossible to hold with Bornkamm and others that the defeat isolation of 10-13 should be placed earlier than the strength and confidence of 1-9. Thirdly, and most importantly, it must explain why Paul or the Pauline collator should wish to suggest that the Last Days or Eschaton is at hand at all, by including a warning against false prophets.

Colossians:

Among historians of primitive Christianity, of a generation or so ago, it was particularly fashionable to hold up the church at Colossae as an example of early Christianity which was the most deeply corrupted by the influences of Gnosticism and popular hellenistic gnostic "philosophy". Indeed, it is so regarded by a decreasing number today. F.C. Baur believed that Paul was an active helleniser of Christianity and thought the Epistle to the Colossians to have been written from an early Gnostic point of view at a time when Gnostic ideas first came into vogue. He held that the errors which the Early Church was combating were early forms of Ebionitism with its strict food laws, Sabbath laws, angels, and most importantly, its view of Christ as one of the angels rather than the "fullness" of God himself. However, many critics today, with perhaps the exception of H.J. Schoeps, have for a long time
reversed Baur's argument and grown accustomed to a view of
the Colossian Christians as gnosticising Hellenists. Neither
position appears to adequately explain Paul's differing point
of view or do justice to the evidence at hand. We can now
be certain that it was not simply a matter of Hellenism versus
Judaism in early Christian circles.

The existence of a Jewish element among the first
century inhabitants of Colossae has been recognised for some
time. But there is little agreement on what kind of Jewish
element this was. In the past, the Urgemeinde status of the
hellenised Jews in Colossae has not been treated with the
seriousness it deserves, as is indicated by the tendency of
commentators to dismiss them as proselytes, gnostics or Pharisees.
However, we have already observed in considerable detail, the
benevolence and special concessions of Antiochus III (the
Great) toward the priestly class of hellenised Jews in the
Jerusalem of his time. It is not entirely clear how Dr.
Morgen, on the basis of Polybios, was able to infer that
Antiochus, with the administrative help of Zeuxis, was responsi-
bale for the transportation of some two thousand Jewish
families into the region of Phrygia, of which Colossae was a
major stronghold.530 But if this event actually took place
it would have occurred shortly after his conquest of the prov-
enes in Asia Minor from Achaeus (213 BC), on the occasion of
minor revolts caused by the people in Phrygia and Lydia. That
it did happen seems to be clear from Josephus, who quotes
Antiochus' letter to Zeuxis which not only states that there
were two thousand Jewish families (Ἰουδαίων οίκων δευτερογένες), but
aristocratic families with property and servants, who were
sent to the "fortresses and most important places" (εἰς τὰ φραγματεῖα
... kal touts 'anaygavatous'). 531 But most significantly, these Jews were held to be reliable "because of their piety to (their) God" (dia tivan prox ton theon [aunon] evxerian). 532 It is thus probable that these pious Jews were not only resettled in large numbers in strongholds such as Colossae, but were given land, exempt from taxes for the first ten years and given grain allotments for their servants. With such a beneficial start, it is unthinkable that their numbers would not have vastly multiplied after approximately 276 years, when they were contacted there by Paul.

The Colossian Church may thus be assumed, with a certain degree of probability, to have consisted largely of Jews who were hellenised Jews rather than Pharisees converted to Christianity. They will have been characterised by the religious traditions of Jason and Onias rather than those of the Pharisees which Paul knew. Their lack of circumcision, which has often been held as proof that they were gentiles (2:13), is explicable on this ground, as well as many of their other Sadducean tendencies such as, liturgical purity, Sabbath laws and heavenly visions. The other passage which is most often cited as proof of their gentile character are Paul's words at 1:27: "To them God chose to make known how great among the Gentiles are the riches of the glory of this mystery, which is Christ in you". Paul does not say that the Colossians are "great among the Gentiles", but that the mystery is. Nor does this imply that the Colossians were Gentiles. Moreover, the mystery is applied directly to the Colossians: "Christ in you". The "you" (and the mystery) are clearly distinguished as those who are great "among the nations" (en tois ethnesiv) 1:27. Neither they (the Colossian
Christians) nor the mystery can be construed to be synonymous with the world, but those set in the world.

The church at Colossae was, in the truest sense, pre-Pauline and Urgemeinde in character. Their un-Pauline character is most notably reflected in their differing Kerygma, as we shall see. The Colossian church was not founded by Paul, nor had he ever visited it (1:4, 7-8, 2:1, cp. Acts 16:6, 13:22). Nonetheless, it was a recognised Christian community (1:2) well known for its faith in Jesus Christ, love for the whole church (πάναν τοὺς ἁγίους) and eschatological expectation (1:4, 5). The Christianiser of this Jewish community, on the basis of what little Paul says about him, is traditionally held to be Epaphras, the Christian who in all likelihood was the first to bring the good news that the judgment had occurred on behalf of mankind in Jesus Christ. Paul said of him: "from the day you heard and understood the grace of God in truth, as you learned it from Epaphras our beloved fellow servant. He is a faithful minister of Christ" (1:6-7). This is the only hint the scriptures give about the origin of the Colossian church. The dearth of information regarding Epaphras strongly cautions against considering him either the originator of the Jewish religious community at Colossae, or the founder of the Church there. But Epaphras is clearly presented as the one through whom Colossae received the Kerygma. If they were halalised Jews, founders of the Sadducean tradition, now Christian, it would be more than natural for Paul to say to them: "In him (Christ) also you were circumcised with a circumcision made without hands" (2:11), "having cancelled the bond which stood against us with its legal demands" (2:14), and, "Therefore let no one pass judgment
on you in question of food and drink" (2:16). These statements, by no means, imply that the persons addressed are Gentile converts, nor would they be appropriate to any later Ebionites (or earlier Ebionites, if their origins could be established as early as this), who held tenaciously to these rules. Moreover, they would be totally inappropriate if addressed to Gnostics holding beliefs similar to Cerinthus or Valentinus (or Simon Magus for that matter). For none of these earliest Gnostics worried about "circumcision", "written ordinances" (\[χειρόγραφον τὸς δόμασιν\]), or "festivals, new moons or Sabbaths" (2:16). But the Urgemeinde faithful did worry about these things because they are precisely the issues over which the Pharisees bitterly opposed the Sadducees (and ultimately the Sadducean Christians of the Urgemeinde). There are thus strong reasons for holding that Paul in his letter to the Colossians, has addressed himself not to Ebionites, Gentile converts, or Gnostics, but to Urgemeinde Christians and that his purpose in writing was both apologetic and kerygmatic in nature.

It might rightly be asked: Is Paul's Epistle to the Colossians, Kerygma? We first notice that the epistle differs from what we have seen of the Urgemeinde Kerygma in that it is specific, direct and addressed to a particular body of people for a specific purpose. It does not give a public proclamation of the Gospel in an unrelated or impersonal manner. It cannot be considered missionary preaching because Paul is writing to an established church, namely, to Christians. It thus has a different type of apologetical purpose in its intention to persuade and enhance the thinking of this congregation. It does not purport to found or organise the Colossian church, nor does it seek to attract new converts. But it is deeply
concerned with the preaching at Colossae, which Paul does see as to influence. Thus it may be rightly held to be an apologetic for Paul's own Kerygmatic point of view.

The Colossians were not heretics, in Paul's eyes, but they were in danger of being led astray by another Gospel. Perhaps this is the reason he is repeatedly concerned with Kerygma in this epistle. "Of this you have heard before in the word of truth, the gospel (ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τῆς ἀληθείας τοῦ εὐαγγελίου) which has come to you, as indeed in the whole world" (1:5).

Their preacher was Epaphras, "our beloved fellow servant" (τοῦ ᾠαφρασοῦ συνδόμου ἡμῶν ; 1:7) who is called a "faithful minister of Christ on (your) behalf" (ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν διάκονος ). Salvation itself became contingent upon faithfulness to this Kerygma: "Provided that you continue in the faith, stable and steadfast, not shifting from the hope of the gospel which you heard (οὗ ἡκούσατε) which has been preached (κηρύχθησας) to every creature under heaven, and of which I, Paul, became a minister (οὗ ἐγενόμην ἐμὸς Παῦλος διάκονος )", 1:23. This establishes that Epaphras' preaching of the Gospel preceded Paul's Kerygma, but Paul next seeks to assure them that his Kerygma does not differ from this generally accepted teaching. Having thus given his credentials and the credentials of his Kerygma, Paul goes on to disclose his motives: "I say this in order that no one may delude you with beguiling speech" (2:4). This strongly suggests that what Paul feared most was that the Colossians had already begun to turn against him, as had the other churches of Asia. He repeats the admonition to remain loyal to the things they had been taught as they were taught by him, so often, that it may be considered one of the themes of this Epistle (2:6, 1:6, 1:22, 2:5). To one of them he said: "See that you fulfill the ministry which you have
received in the Lord" (4:17). Paul's fear, now that he was in prison, was that they would revert to their previous beliefs, turning away from his Kerygma, especially when he was not able, at present, to influence them.

What then, was the nature of those who represented a threat in Paul's eyes, to the Pauline Kerygma at the Colossian church? Were they innovators, or did they simply represent the conservative Urgemeinde teachings which pre-dated Paul? A pattern is discernible from the numerous facts Paul gives about them. These may be summarised briefly as: particular eschatological beliefs, denial of Paul's view of the "fullness of God in Christ" as over against their view of Christ's participation in the God-head, and their allegiance to the bond of the written law, food laws, liturgical festivals, new moons and sabbaths, asceticism, heavenly visions and angels. Let us examine some of these in more detail.

When Paul says, "Why do you submit to regulations?" (συμματίζεσθε) "Do not handle, Do not taste, Do not touch", which he calls "human doctrines" (διδασκαλίας τῶν ἀνθρώπων 2:22) he is in all likelihood referring to Jewish liturgical regulations. This is paradoxically followed by an even longer list of moral regulations (3:5-4:5) and virtues which are part of the "new nature" which is above "Greek and Jew, circumcised and uncircumcised" (i.e. Pharisee and Sadducees) (3:11).

His objection, thus, was mainly against a levitical, aristrocratically, purify characteristic of the early Sadducees and the Urgemeinde. The same is true of the reference to "eating, drinking or in respect of ( bbcns ἥ νεομήνιας ἥ σάββατων", 2:16). Paul says that these things are only a "shadow" of what is to come (2:17);
presumably in a future Perousia. Another cause of despair to Paul's resurrection fervour is their "abasement" (ταπεινοφροσύνη) which in (2:23) implies "abasement of the body" (ταπεινοφροσύνη καὶ ἁφεδία σώματος). This teaching was clearly a greater threat to Paul's doctrine of the future resurrection of the body than imply a lack of concern on the part of the Colossians for their bodies. (Ὑπερεκαί τῶν ἀγγέλων, ἀ ἐφακας ἐμφατικῶν, 2:18), appears in the King James Version as: "worshipping of angels, intruding into those things which he hath not seen". But clearly this was not originally a negative statement and should read "things which he hath seen".534 RSV has at least preserved the positive quality of the clause, "taking his stand on visions", but that also can hardly be called a translation. However, visions are clearly indicated. (Ὑπερεκαί) also implies "observance" and need not require that "angels" were an object of worship. The passage rather suggests an Enoch-type vision of the Son of Man coming with his myriads of angels. Visions, simply as visions, were objectionable to the Pharisees and were considered worthy of a death punishment, as we have observed. Because such a "vision" was associated with Stephen's death, it is natural that they were at one time totally abhorrent to Paul.535

Paul's implied reference to the requirements of circumcision (2:11-14) again appears to be an allusion to the controversies in which Paul was involved over the matter of circumcision which gave rise to the Apostolic conference (Acts 15:5). The Hymenean indeed relaxed the requirements of circumcision at that time, but Paul (as with the Pharisaic Christians) by no means simply discarded his concern for the requirements of circumcision. He soon came to speak in terms of a "spiritual circumcision" which he associated with baptism. His reasoning with the Colossians followed this line: (If)
"you were buried with him in baptism, in which you were also raised with him through faith in the working of God, who raised him from the dead" (2:12), which premise Paul knew that the Colossians already accepted, as they understood baptism to be the instrument by which the resurrection becomes a present reality; (Then) "In him also you were circumcised with a circumcision made without hands, by putting off the body of flesh in the circumcision of Christ" (2:11). The conclusion to Paul's syllogism is, (Therefore) "you who were dead in trespasses and the uncircumcision of your flesh, God made alive together with him, having forgiven us all our trespasses" (2:13). The "bond which stood against us" (τὸ κατ' ἔριμον κειρόγραφον, 2:14) which Christ "wiped out" by nailing it to the cross, may in later Greek have become a common term for a promissory note as it is usually exegeted, but its "written", moreover, its "hand written" nature is of singular significance in this context. Paul could not have stated more directly, because of the controversy over written and oral traditions, who they were—what he feared most, namely the Urgemeinde. Yet what Paul agreed with and conceded to the Urgemeinde must not be minimised. What he did not yield, willingly, was his Kerygma.

Another distinction between Paul's Kerygma and that of his opponents which emerges in the Colossian letter, is Paul's use of the expression "fullness of God" in Christ. Once Paul says, (τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος σωματικῶς, 1:19), i.e. that in Christ the fullness of the God-head dwells bodily and on another occasion simply, (πάν τὸ πλήρωμα κατακυκλώσατ, 1:19). Both of these statements appear to be in direct contradiction to (3:1) where he states that Christ is "seated at the right hand of God". And they would be a contradiction if all three
passages purported to be original Pauline teachings. But in the latter passage Paul does not claim to put forth his own view as seen by the words: "If you died with Christ (εἰ ἀπέθανεν σὺν Χριστῷ) and "If you were raised with Christ (συνηφανείτε). But along with (2:20) he quotes a doctrine presupposed by the Colossian church already, namely,

"If then you have been raised with Christ (εἰ ἐγερθέντες αὐτῷ), see the things that are above where Christ is, seated at the right hand of God (ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ Θεοῦ καθήμενος). Set your minds on things that are above; not on things that are on earth. For you have died (ἀπέθανεν γάρ), and your life is hid with Christ in God. When Christ who is our life appears, then you also will appear (ὑμεῖς ὑπὸ αὐτοῦ φανερωθήσεσθε) with him in glory." (3:1-4)

One could not wish for a more concise statement of the Urgemeinde Kerygma, with its belief that the resurrection has already occurred and expectation of a particular return for individual believers, than this. It is significant that Paul presupposed this teaching to be already held by the Colossians. It strongly suggests that they had already been influenced by teachers of the Urgemeinde and that Epaphras was by no means the only one who worked to establish the church at Colossae.

It is clear from the Urgemeinde formulary, quoted by Paul above, that the Urgemeinde held Jesus to "participate" in the Godhead as implied by the words, "seated at the right hand of God". However, to Paul's later Kerygma, this was hardly adequate. He has consequently asserted that in Christ dwelled the "fullness of God" and this way well be the point of Paul's jibe at the Urgemeinde for its "worshipping of angels" (2:18). Paul would have no lesser God than this, but he was not intractable. Though his view of Christ was poles apart from that of the Urgemeinde, Paul was not adverse to reconciling it to
that of the Urgeneinde. At least so it appears in what W. N. Davies has called the most disputed Christological passage in the Pauline Epistles.537 Such a conflation or "reconciliation" may be seen at (1:13ff).

"He has delivered us from the dominion of darkness and transferred us to the kingdom of his beloved son (μετέσχησεν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ υἱοῦ τῆς ἀγαπης αὐτοῦ), in whom we have redemption and forgiveness of sins. He is the image of the invisible God (ὁς ἐστίν εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ·· τοῦ ἀεράτου) the firstborn of all creation (πρωτότοκος πάσης καταλεύσεως): for in him all things were created, in heaven and on earth, visible and invisible, whether thrones or dominions or principalities or authorities—all things were created through him and for him. He is before all things (αὐτός ἐστιν πρὸ πάντων), and in him all hold together (καὶ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ συνεστηκέν)·· 1:12-17)

The text of Colossians is not defective at this point and thus does not provide grounds for the surgical treatment rendered by the Religionsgeschichtliche critics who found this passage a hindrance to their gaastic influence theory. Nor is it necessary to remove this passage to understand Paul's intention. This formulary with its complements of antithetical and synonymous parallelism strongly suggests a liturgical hymn used by the Urgeneinde Christians at Colossae. Indeed, Paul mentions this practice directly: "as you teach and admonish one another in all wisdom and as you sing psalms and hymns (πανίον ὑμνον ὤδής πνευματικάς ἐν τῇ χαρίτι ὄντες, 3:16) and spiritual songs with thankfulness". Moreover the formulary starts with a thanksgiving to the "Father" (1:12). Both the form and content and historical setting of this liturgical fragment from Colossae strongly resemble Sirach (Sir.50:18), the Dead Sea Thanksgiving Hymns, particularly IQH iii.21-23, and Enoch, particularly I En.48. The conspicuous dearth of hymns and liturgical formulary from the Pharisaic tradition, is perhaps
of significance for its bearing on the true nature of the Colossian religious setting. This particular liturgical fragment betrays its Urgemeinde origin by its central theme of the pre-existent Christ and its similarity to the Enoch Son of Man cycles which depict his power over kings (En. 46:5ff, 48:8f) mighty ones and authorities. It conspicuously avoids mention of the Resurrection, but says instead (μετέστησαν) that believers are "transferred" to the Kingdom of the "Son" (1:13). Its link with Enoch (48:1-7) is particularly important because of Enoch's specific designation of the "Son of Man" as a pre-existent being: "And at that hour that the Son of Man was named...yes before the Sun and the signs were created, before the stars of heaven were made...before the creation of the world and for evermore" (48:2-3,6). We have already observed the prominent part which I Enoch played in Urgemeinde literature, particularly in its doctrine of the pre-existence of the soul and its doctrine of Translation, here again suggested by the terms (μετέστησαν εις την βασιλείαν). However, C.F.Burney saw Colossians (1:15-18) as an elaborate exposition of the Bereshith in Gen.1:1 in the Rabbinic manner. This view has been supported by W.D.Davies who holds this to be an original piece of Pauline exposition in the Rabbinic fashion: "It becomes probable therefore that Paul has pictured Christ on the image of Wisdom of the Old Testament and contemporary Judaism". It is nonetheless difficult to imagine Paul announcing Jesus of Nazareth as the pre-cosmic and creative "Wisdom of God". But he might well have thought of him as the Son of Man on the basis of the numerous Son of Man sayings attributed to Jesus. The Rabbinic parallels as adduced by Burney and Davies, are late (3rd century) and thus there is no need to hold that the passage in its entirety originated from the rabbinic tendencies of Paul. On the other hand, if it was a Kerygmatic hymn which Paul has presupposed as the basis upon which to present his own
Kerygmatic modifications, it would explain its radical difference from the rest of Paul's eschatological views. It would also explain why Paul has not developed further the idea of Christ as "Wisdom" elsewhere in his theology. Although there are weaknesses in this liturgical fragment argument, it explains the presence of this contrary Kerygma in the text, which Paul sought to reconcile to his own point of view. The conflation begins at verse 17. What follows is purely Pauline in character; there are his "resurrection-body" theme and his "fullness of the Godhead dwelling in Christ", theme. Paul has reconciled both of these teachings to the Kerygma of the liturgical fragment which precedes them:

"He is the head (κεφαλή) of the body (σώματος), the church; he is the beginning, the first-born from the dead (πρωτόκολος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν), that in everything he might be pre-eminent. For in him all the fullness (of God) was pleased to dwell (ἐν αὐτῷ ἐδοκιμήσαν πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα κατοικίσαται) and through him to reconcile to himself all things."

(1:18-20)

What Paul has amended by no means agrees with the "beloved son" "first born of all creation" in the liturgical fragment if (πλήρωμα) in 1:19 implies "fullness of God", as a multitude of commentators have held, on the basis of 2:9, and as RSV has interpreted. But Paul's metaphor of head and body clearly designates that Christ is the Godhead himself, as many have interpreted Paul's statement to imply, or simply, that the fullness of God dwells in Christ. The Apostle thus has again started with a premise which he knew the Colossians would accept. This premise also appears to have been part of a liturgical fragment, which had its origin among the "hymns and spiritual songs", well known to the Colossians (3:16). From here he has proceeded to his own conclusions regarding the Godhead in Christ, the body and the firstborn from the
dead. By this means he sought to reconcile his own Kerygma with that of the Colossians.

The eschatological beliefs contained in the Kerygma of the Urgemeinde constituted a particular threat to the foothold Paul had gained in the Colossian Church. But were it not for the tension created by the presence of this "other Gospel", Paul might never have committed to writing some of his most important views. W. D. Davies states: "Had it not been for the heresy at Colossae, it is possible that we should never have had from the Apostle a fully articulated theory of Christ's agency in creation". As few Pauline statements on Christ's pre-existent role in creation are to be found elsewhere in Paul's epistles, we are thus indebted to the Urgemeinde Christians and the controversy at Colossae for this access to the mind of Paul.

In addition to his intentional effort to interpret, or reconcile, the eschatological views of the Colossians to bring them into harmony with his own Kerygma (and the literary problems thus created are immense) Paul has not failed to reveal a great deal about the Kerygma, immortality beliefs and practices of the Urgemeinde. Thus the evidence which this Pauline letter provides, regarding the earliest Christians at Colossae, points to an essentially hellenised Jewish church, rather than one consisting of gentile converts; one which remained close to the liturgical traditions and practices of the Urgemeinde, as distinct from a community which might have been influenced by late Ebionitism or Gnosticism. They held an earlier view of Christ as the "Son of God" who participates in the Godhead (like Stephen who saw Christ at the right hand of God) and thus differed from the Pauline teaching
of the "fullness of God dwelling in Christ". Moreover,
they share with the Hasmoneans the view that the Parousia
had occurred in Jesus Christ and according to their calcula-
tions (perhaps employing astronomy as well of Mt.2:10) maint-
ained that the Judgment, the Resurrection and the salvation
of mankind had also taken place in his birth and Passion as
foretold by the prophets. There can be little doubt that
the Christians at Colossae believed that they were already
participating in a post-resurrection life of immortality, as
may be seen in these basic views to which Paul addressed
himself and his Kerygma:

a) They clearly believed themselves to have been
already transferred (μετεστάσεως) from the "kingdom of darkness"
to the kingdom of the "beloved Son" (1:12). The ambiguity of
(τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ), might imply "Kingdom of the Son of Man"
to the Colossians, but "Son of God" is probably what was inten-
ded (although not stated) by what follows in (1:15).
b) They are said to have "put off the body of flesh" (ἀπεκδύσει
τοῦ σώματος τῆς σαρκός), but in the spiritual circumcision of
Christ. They were already, "buried with him in baptism"
(συνταφέντες αὐτῷ ἐν τῷ βαπτισματί) "in which you were also raised
with him (ἐν ὧ καὶ συνεκτένετε) through faith in the working of
God, who raised him from the dead" (2:12). c) Paul has
modified their view of death and resurrection to imply a moral
death, "And you, who were dead (in trespasses) and the uncir-
cumcision of your flesh, God made alive (συνεζωοποίησεν) together with him" (2:13). But nonetheless, it is a past
event (σὺν αὐτῷ), presently in force. Paul has attempted
to reconcile his own Kerygma to this "present reality" of
resurrection by saying, "These are only a shadow of what is to
come" (2:17) and that Christ's is but the beginning, "the first
born from the dead" (1:18).

Paul has made no attempt to repudiate the
Coossians' acceptance of the Urgemeinde Kerygma, but seems
determined to reconcile it with his futuristic Resurrection-
Judgment Kerygma.  

a) "If with Christ you died to the
"elements" (στοιχείων τοῦ κόσμου—were transformed to a
new order", cf. Wis.19:12) why do you live as if you still
belonged to the world?" (2:20).  Paul presupposes this view
on the part of the Coossians and does not put it forth as his
own teaching.  

b) "If then you have been raised with Christ
(Εἴ ἐσθε συνάγεσθε τῷ Χριστῷ), seek: the things that are above,
where Christ is, seated at the right hand of God" (3:1).

Again presupposing this view to be held by the Coossians,
Paul has added: "Set your mind on things that are above, not
on things that are on earth" (3:2).  

c) Paul could not better
articulate the Urgemeinde view of baptism than he does in the
words: "For you have died, and your life is (hid) with Christ
in God" (ἀπεβαίνετε γὰρ, καὶ η ὑπὸ ζωῆς κέρασσαι σῶν τῷ Χριστῷ ἐν τῷ Θεῷ
3:3).  To the Urgemeinde, this was the present state of the
believer, indeed a state of immortality.  They looked forward
only to the "particular" coming of the Son of God to translate
then into this heavenly kingdom.  Paul does not appear to deny
this latter proposition: "When Christ who is our life appears,
then you also will appear with him in glory" (2:11).  Rather
than repudiate or reject the Coossians as heretics one gains
the strong impression that Paul worked very hard to reconcile
his own views with those of the Coossians.  Within the frame-
work of his own view of a future Judgment and Pannusia Paul
says: "Put to death therefore what is earthly in you:
immorality, immorality, etc..." and "put on the new nature"
(3:5ff).  Without denying the immortality which the Coossians
and the Urgemeinde fervently held to be a present gift, he has reconciled it to his futuristic Resurrection-Judgment Kerygma by making of it a moral death: "due to what is earthly". That, in essence, was Paul's solution to a difficult theological dilemma.

**Ephesians:**

Two sources of varying usefulness, which are sometimes held to provide glimpses of the pre-Pauline Christian community at Ephesus, and Paul's later relationship to it are Acts 13:19-19:20 and the Pauline letter, commonly called "Ephesians".

The "Ephesian Problem" has, traditionally, been approached as either a documentary problem or a historical problem. Recently it has been treated as a "problem of historical psychology of authorship".\(^5\) But it is usually presented as a documentary dilemma associated with the question of authorship, written sources and destination.\(^5\) Here, Ephesians will be examined in terms of the kerygmatic controversy for the light it sheds on the Urgemeinde Kerygma as it was preserved at Ephesus in relationship to the Pauline Kerygma and thus attempt to touch on some of the neglected theological aspects of the Ephesian problem.

It has been widely recognized for some time, that this Pauline letter now designated as "To the Ephesians" originally had no title or geographical designation. (ἐπὶ τοῖς εὐφράσιοι)\(^5\) was probably added at a later date in much the same way that (ἐπὶ τοῖς Ῥωμαίοις) was added to Romans, if the Claromontanus copy is taken seriously. It should be remembered that "Hebrews" circulated for several centuries with no
designation whatsoever. H. J. Cadbury has pointed out that
the Chester Beatty Papyrus supports the contemporary testimony
of Origen and the original manuscripts of A* and B*, which
omit the designation altogether. Thus the omission cannot be
regarded as a 4th century deletion. N. A. Dahl has also
held that the a priori possibility of the pseudonymous charac-
ter of the Epistle to the Ephesians must be admitted.
However, the wide currency of this Epistle in early Christian
circles is an important fact to be reckoned with. Ephesians
is quoted as extensively as the other Pauline letters by
Ignatius and Polycarp and thus was known as early as any of
the Pauline documents. Pseudonymous writings can appear soon
after an author's death and in this case may have quite possi-
ably appeared during Paul's own lifetime (II Thes. 3:17). Prof.
Cadbury has held that because of its striking similarity to
Colossians, both in point of view, content and frequency of
unusual terms, one must either accept Ephesians and Colossians
as Pauline or reject both Epistles. But these hardly need
be the only alternatives if it is pseudonymous. He argues
that if Paul wrote it, "It was written like Colossians from
prison and sent by Tychicus in the same direction perhaps at
the same time". By no means are these necessary conclu-
sions if, as he suggests, the Epistle might well have been
written by a close follower of Paul who modelled the work
after Colossians about which there is less dispute. Regarding
the stylistic and linguistic differences between the two, one
might agree that arguments for differences in language are
neither great enough to prove a difference in authorship nor
slight enough to prove an identity of authorship.

One of the serious defects of Cadbury's position
is that he has failed to deal with the point of view and
Kenyon expressed by this epistle. While it is good to
realise the literary difficulties and that one should be
circumspect regarding the authorship and destination of
"Ephesians", these analytical questions are not the only
important questions which the Epistle evokes. Whether it
was written by Onesimus, the slave of Philemon and companion
of Paul, as P. N. Harrison has maintained, who wrote the
"inspired summary of St. Paul's teaching which we call
Ephesians but he called Laodiceans", 549 or "a masterly summary
of Paul's theology by a disciple who was capable of thinking
Paul's thoughts after him", as asserted by C. B. Caird,550 we
should not be too much influenced by that type of critic who
insists, unlike early church Fathers, that we cannot discuss
the thought and content of the Epistle until we have establi-
shed precisely who its author might have been.

Some who have held the letter to the Ephesians to
be "pseudonymous" also insist that it should thereby be
considered "spurious". Fortunately this is not the consensus
of serious criticism regarding Ephesians. Despite the ques-
tion of the puzzling circumstances of its authorship, it is
generally held that the epistle is "Pauline" in character and
outlook, to which we might add, in Kerygmatic point of view as
well. Few have been able to avoid the fact that it bears
the stamp of his genius. However, the same cannot be said
for the "quotations" in Acts (13:18-19; 20) where it is clear
that Luke is the author of the words addressed by Paul to the
Ephesians. It is generally acknowledged that these speeches,
in Acts, do not attempt to imitate the style of Paul. But in
view of their existence, it is perhaps inaccurate of Cadbury
to state that there are not any examples of spurious and
genuine Pauline material which can be compared.551 However,
a comparison between these sources is not without its rewards.

Acts (13:19) states that when Paul arrived in
Ephesus for the first time, he held forth in the synagogue and had concourse with Jews and not Gentiles (ἐἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν διεξήγαγο τοῖς Ἰουδαῖοις, 18:19). These are eventually called disciples (καὶ μαθητᾶς, 19:1). Moreover, they are said to have spoken in tongues and prophesied (19:6). Although Luke has placed Paul's first visit and the resultant church in a cause and effect relationship, it is apparent that Paul had very little to do with the founding of the church at Ephesus as is seen from his abrupt departure. The "disciples" whom Paul "found" (ἐὗρείν πώς, 19:1) upon his return, and "disciples" can only imply "Christians", may well have been part of the Jewish-Christian synagogue where Paul spoke boldly for three months on the subject of the "Kingdom of God" (διαλεγόμενος καὶ πείθωντος τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Ισχοῦ, 19:8), that is, until what may have been his second difference of opinion with the Ephesians took place. We have already seen that the most controversial issue of the day was "when" the Kingdom was to come. It may be assumed that Paul wasted no time in putting forth his own version of the Kerygma. Such a picture of Paul at Ephesus emerges from Luke's account. However, the letter to the Ephesians, which most agree was written after Paul's imprisonment in Rome (Acts 28), seems to address itself to Christians of whom Paul only has second hand knowledge. "I also have heard (καγὼ, ἀκούς) of your faith in the Lord Jesus" (Eph.1:15). There is no indication, in the letter itself, that Paul has ever visited them, but it does clearly state that Tychicus was sent to them (Eph.6:21). Either it was not sent after his imprisonment, which would contradict 3:1 and 4:1, or it was a general epistle without any specific destination, which contradicts 1:15, or Luke's account of the Ephesian situation is more editorial in character, than has been previously supposed. A strong indication that a choice must be made between these two descriptions of the Ephesian church is that, unlike Luke, the epistle refers to them as gentiles or at least those called "uncircumcision" (οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, 19:18). So they were called by those
"being called (the) circumcision" (i.e. the Circumcision Party or Hillelites who were Pharisees, 2:11). There were many Jews which the Circumcision Party called "uncircumcision", particularly among the Sadducees and Shammites. This must also be considered Paul's attitude toward the Ephesians because he goes on to say: "I, Paul, a prisoner for Christ Jesus on behalf of yougentiles" (ἐγὼ Παῦλος ὁ δεσμὸς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἡσαῦ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν τῶν ἕβρων, 3:1). This basic attitude may well be the point of Paul's reference to those who are "separated", "alienated" and now "brought near in the blood of Christ" (2:12).

Another discrepancy in the two accounts is the suggested attitude of the Ephesians attitude toward the Holy Spirit. Luke claims that some whom Paul found in Ephesus had never heard of the Holy Spirit (ἀλλ' οὐδʼ εἰ πνεῦμα ἄγιον ἐστιν ἡκοσάμεν, Acts 19:2). It is inconceivable that any Jews, as Luke describes them to be, with their many traditions about the (ὁ ἅγιος θεὸς ) "Spirit of God", should never have heard of the "Spirit of the Lord", "Spirit of God" or "Holy Spirit", particularly if they were hellenised Jews. It cannot be held that all of the Ephesians were new converts, made by Paul, who were completely ignorant in these matters. Ephesians, at no point explains the Holy Spirit or treats it as a subject of which its addressees had never heard or needed even the slightest instruction.

In the first occurrence of this term in the text, it is described as the "promised Holy Spirit" of which many of the Ephesians already had knowledge and looked forward to receiving for a long time (τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἐπαγγελίας τοῦ ἄγιον, 1:13).

He discloses the "Spirit" as the means by which revelation came to the "sons of men" (υἱοὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ) in other generations, but the agent of a particular "mystery of Christ" to the prophets and apostles of this one (3:5). Moreover, for
Paul to appeal to the authority of the Holy Spirit as the basis for his own commission to them (3:5-7) does not presuppose ignorance of the Holy Spirit on the part of those to whom Paul writes.

Luke provides another important clue, regarding the nature of the Christian Jews at Ephesus, in his brief statement: "Into what therefore you baptised?, They asked. "Into John's baptism (ἐκ τοῦ Ἰωάννου βάπτισμα, 19:3)". Whereupon, Paul is then reported to baptise the Ephesians with the Holy Spirit. On other occasions, Paul has described baptism and the Holy Spirit as a new type of Christian circumcision (Col. 2:11-15, cf. Eph. 2:11-22). D. Daube has called attention to the possibility that Paul was far more stringent than the Pharisees (who to the Sadducees), who held that Proselyte Baptism was sufficient for a Gentile to become an heir to the promises of God. The Hillelites required circumcision as well as baptism. Indeed, it is natural to suppose that Paul, the student of Gamaliel who would thus be classed as a Hillelite, also considered the additional requirement necessary. Daube states: "Joshua ben Hananiah claimed that baptism alone was sufficient to make even a male Gentile Jewish. They did not go quite so far as Paul. They did not deny that it was the duty of a male convert to be circumcised. But they did consider him fully Jewish as soon as he was baptised. It is interesting that their argument was that baptism was the decisive rite in the case of a woman, so it should be the same in that of men. It thus does not seem improbable that Paul thought of the gift of the Holy Spirit as an absolute requirement in addition to baptism, as a type of "spiritual circumcision". No first century evidence has ever been discovered for a liturgical formula or baptismal rite "into the name of
John" either in Christian or Jewish literature. Moreover, Luke merely calls it "the baptism of John" (19:3), presumably the same type of baptism which Jesus himself received. Likewise, there is no evidence that Jesus (or the Urgemeinde) baptised converts "into the name of Jesus". Because of the strong Jewish or Jewish-Christian element at Ephesus which did not agree with Paul, indeed after only three months, Paul had to withdraw from the synagogue and its congregation to a place called the "Hall of Tyrannus" where he taught for the remaining two years of his stay in Ephesus (19:8-10).

One might easily assume that Luke simply has reference, here, to a strictly Jewish baptismal controversy, which at Ephesus has become a Christian controversy. But this has become much more than a dispute between Pharisees and Sadducees, when one group of Christians (the Urgemeinde) maintained that in baptism the Christian participates in the Resurrection itself, and the others (Paul and his followers) maintained that something more was required in the form of a "spiritual circumcision" or "baptism of the Holy Spirit" in order that the believer might participate in that which was yet to come, in the coming of the Holy Spirit. This does not contradict Luke's statement that Paul's argument with the church at Ephesus had to do with the Kingdom of God. The question still remained, When does one enter into this Kingdom? At baptism, as a Resurrection from the dead? Or in the future, to which the Holy Spirit is a sign? This controversy in which Paul seems to have fully involved himself at Ephesus thus had its roots in the differences between the Hillelites and the Shammaites over the matter of baptism. The traditional view of scholarship has often held that the controversy over proselyte baptism had not yet occurred in Christ's time, but was a later development of the 1st century AD. The
Mishna (Passachim viii.8 - 'Eduyoth v.2) states that the school of Shammai (with whom may be associated the Zadokites and Sadducees) were far more lenient on this issue than the Hillelites (with whom were associated Gamaliel and the Apostle Paul):

"If a Gentile should happen to be circumcised on the day previous to the Passover, then, says the school of Shammai, he is at liberty (on that same day) to wash and, in the evening, partake of the Passover lamb: but the school of Hillel says: whoever comes from being circumcised is like one who comes from the grave".

(Passachim viii.8)

The Babylonian Talmud (Yebamoth 16a) states that the Rabbis Eliezer and Joshua, who both lived toward the end of the 1st century AD, disagreed widely in their views regarding the conditions under which a proselyte should be received. Rabbi Eliezer (the Hillelites) said "circumcision without immersion", Rabbi Joshua (the Shammaites) said "immersion without circumcision is sufficient". The fourth book of the Sibylline Oracles, for which a hellenised Jewish origin is at least probable and, without relevance to the Christian context, does not require circumcision but insists on converted Gentiles being baptised as an outward token of their conversion (Oraes. Sibyll.iv.164). It is not without bearing on this question that Epictetus, who was alive during Paul's lifetime and from Hierapolis (next to Colossae), should state about baptism:

"While if he takes upon himself the arduous life of the baptised and the elect, then he both really is, and is called, a Jew" (ἐταν δ' ἀναλάβων τὸ πάθος τὸ τῆς ἤπαθενου καὶ ἡγεμόνου, τότε καὶ ἔστι τῷ ἑντι καὶ καλεῖται Ἰουδαῖος).

(Disc. Epict.ii.9).

Although Epictetus says of those who take upon themselves the serious responsibilities of baptism that they really are "Jews", it is quite possible that he may have had in mind,
Urgeneinde Christians, who did not distinguish themselves from Jews in the Sadducean sense.

It should be stated here, that our purpose is not to establish, on the basis of this evidence, that proselyte baptism was an early practice from which Christian Baptism has emerged in a direct line of connection. That approach to the question is misleading because it leads to the false question, "Is Christian baptism the same as proselyte baptism?"

We are more concerned with the question, At what stage was the ( α β ι ) baptism, or levitical bath, by itself, sufficient to make a gentile into a Jew? And, can this controversy be separated from the Christian Kerygma controversy in which one party held the sufficiency of a "baptism into the resurrection which has already occurred in Christ" and the other added the requirement of a "spiritual circumcision" which was only a "shadow of things yet to come". Some have argued that proselyte baptism was a post-Christian phenomenon among the Jews and therefore is unrelated to Christian baptism, but this is a good argument for associating it with the Christian controversy. The proposition should rather be stated: The controversy over proselyte baptism (apart from circumcision) was a post-Urgeneinde, but not a post-Pauline phenomenon and thus Christian baptism, as a practice and in the interpretation of that practice, developed as a parallel phenomenon alongside that controversy.

The later Pharminical side of the argument is officially reflected in Rabbimides who has asserted that since the time of "our fathers" three things are necessary for the acceptance of proselytes: (baptism), (circumcision) and (sacrifice).* Schürer has maintained that in the case of women, only baptism and a sacrifice were required.
It must be assumed that after the destruction of the Temple, the requirement of sacrifice was discontinued as well. Thus the Hillel-Shammaite baptism controversy has all the appearances of a most 70 AD dispute directly related to, and a development of the Kerygmata Controversy. It is also apparent that the controversy, irrespective of the date of its flowering, had its roots in the rejection of circumcision by the hellenised Jews of the Sadducee tradition as early as Jason and Onias III and the emergence of their views on immortality, as we have already noticed in some detail.

Ernst Käsemann, in his important essay presented to Walter Bauer, has analysed the phrase "baptised into John's Baptism" of Acts 19:3 in relation to this question. He has accepted the traditional view that these words imply "disciples of John the Baptist", and the explanation of Dibelius that these were "former disciples of the Baptist who later became Christians", but finds this to be a circular argument if Christians were subject to rebaptism by Paul. He concludes: "Either we have here historical fact of so remarkable a nature that we shall be bound in the light of it to revise drastically the version of early Church history current among us; or else the real history of primitive Christianity has in this passage been painted over by Luke (or rather, by his source) in the pursuit of some apologetic interest." Käsemann chooses the latter alternative and by means of a complicated procedure attempts to separate the historical from what he calls Luke's "later tenacious rewriting". It is wise to pause before one goes too deeply into such investigations to ask whether such complex explanations, evoked by the Religionsgeschichtliche theories about the "disciples of John the Baptist", are in fact relevant? They are neither called "disciples of..."
John" nor are they even said to be baptised "into the name of John", as some have postulated. The expression (eis τὸ ἔνωσιν ἐν ἑαυτῷ - 19:3) seems rightly to be interpreted by Küsemann as "descriptive of the rite as such, and not of the obligation entered upon", i.e. without therefore binding themselves to the Baptist. It does not follow from this that Luke has purposely falsified his account to suggest that the Ephesian Christians were "immature" or without "Apostolic authority" or in any way less than Christian, but he does make some rather remarkable statements about the mysterious "disciples". What he says about the mysterious disciples is often wrongly applied to the Ephesian church as a whole, as we have seen above regarding those "who did not know there is a Holy Spirit".

In the picture which Luke gives of the Ephesian community, Paul has not by any means been artificially cast in the role of a hero. While Apollos, who has already been identified with the Urgemeinde and is described as the leading teacher and preacher in Ephesus (18:25), was away in Corinth, Paul (Luke presents him as the initiator of the action) did two things: a) he "came to Ephesus" (ἐλθεὶς εἰς Ἐφέσους, 19:1) and b) "found some disciples" (ἐὗρεν ὑπάρχουσα μαθητὰς, 19:1). With Priscilla and Aquila already at Ephesus and the preaching and teaching of Apollos already widely known, it is impossible that Paul could have been ignorant of the existence of Christians in Ephesus. The words "found some disciples", need not imply that Paul "discovered" a community of disciples. But that he "made" some disciples of his own. Luke repeats the verb (ἐὗρεν ὑπάρχοντας μαθητὰς) with the precise meaning of "find" or "procure", in Lk.1:30 and 9:12 (cp. 18:28; 11:29,12:43). It is stated that Apollos was "making" disciples in Corinth while Paul was "finding" disciples in Ephesus. Luke tells us
that through this means Paul was able to win only about twelve disciples ( ὅσεὶ δώδεκα , 19:7). In the light of I Corinthians (1:12): "I belong to Paul," or 'I belong to Apollos' or 'I belong to Christ', the number "twelve disciples" need not have significance here. Nonetheless, it is as reasonable to assume that they were "disciples of Paul" as it is to assume that they were disciples of John the Baptist.

Luke informs us that Paul's teaching activities lasted only three months in the midst of the congregation of Ephesus (19:8). Moreover, Paul's first contact with the Ephesians may have been the argument (18:19), most likely ending over his teachings relevant to the future nature of the "Kingdom of God" (19:3). After this second dispute, we are told that Paul "withdrew" from the congregation (ἀποστράψα 'ἀπ' ἀνών ἀπορίαν τὸς μαθητάς ) taking his disciples with him (19:9) and established his own group "in the Hall of Tyrannus", quite possibly a school of the ancient grammarian Tyrannus, where he "argued daily" (19:9) for approximately two years both to "Jews and Greeks".

On the other hand, the original synagogue with its Christian members at Ephesus was not necessarily of mixed races, but probably hellenised Jews; they are simply called Ἰουδαῖοι . 18:19, as is Apollos (Ἰουδαῖος δὲ τὸς Ἀπολλὼν Ἰουδαῖον ἢ 18:24. Because Apollos was a "Jew", that did not imply that he was any less a Christian. To the contrary he is said to "have been instructed in the way of the Lord" and one who "taught accurately the things concerning Jesus" (18:25). Moreover, he is said to be one "burning in spirit" ( γεννῶν τὸ πνεύματι ) 18:25. These seem to be well-known facts which Luke was constrained to include in his narrative because of their public nature. But again, they are events which would have taken place among the hellenised Jewish Christians, known here as
the Urgemeinde at Ephesus. That which was private, and consequently may be challenged as the slightly dubious portion of Luke’s narrative, was Priscilla and Aquila’s private instruction to Apollos. Apollos is described as a Hellenised Jew of considerable learning and prestige held in high regard by the Church along with Peter (1 Cor. 3:22), "an eloquent man, well versed in the scriptures" (18:24). Moreover, when Apollos travelled over into Achaia, he took with him letters of commendation from the "brethren" (οἱ ἀδελφοί) to the "disciples" (τῶν μαθητῶν) to welcome him (18:27). This was not the case with Paul, who had no such letters of commendation from the Urgemeinde and, moreover, was rejected by them and even forced by them to withdraw with his "twelve disciples" to the Hall of Tyrannus.

Luke's statement that Apollos knew only the "baptism of John" (ἐπιστάμενος μόνον τῷ βαπτίσματι Ἰωάννου) 18:25, has often been used as an argument that Apollos must not have been a Christian, but rather a disciple of John. If this were the case with those who knew only the baptism of John, then it would have been the case with Jesus as well. An interesting parallel situation is that of the Samaritan Christians, who also had "only been baptised in the name of the Lord Jesus" (μόνον δὲ βαπτισμένοι ὑπερχοῦν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ) Acts 8:16.) The (μόνον) in both cases refers not to the name, "only John's" or "only Jesus" baptism, but to the condition of its being only a water baptism, without circumcision and yet without the laying on of hands.

As we have seen, one of the bitterest issues between Sadducee and Pharisee, Shammaite and Hillelite, in Paul's time was the question of baptism. The Shammaites, with whom the Urgemeinde had much in common, held that water baptism was sufficient to make a non-Jew an heir of the Kingdom of God and a true Israelite; the Hillelites, with whom Paul had most in
common, held that baptism and circumcision were an absolute requirement. Thus, clearly, the church at Ephesus was not "unchristian" because of its views on baptism or "unauthorised", as Küsemann has suggested. It was a Jewish-Christian Urgemeinde community, which rejected Paul on two counts:
a) his eschatological views relevant to the Kingdom of God (19:8) and, b) because of his "false" and Pharisaic views on baptism, which required more than water baptism. As an Urgemeinde community they must be considered to have had far more authority than Paul did for his activities in Ephesus, at this stage of development in the church. This is unmistakably evident from the treatment Paul received from them. He was later to say that he "fought with wild beasts at Ephesus" (I Cor. 15:32). But that they were adequately in harmony with the Urgemeinde in their position on baptism (i.e., that baptism is sufficient for a gentile believer to obtain eternal life) is abundantly clear from the decision of the Apostolic Conference in Jerusalem that baptism is sufficient.

We have already seen the basic cause for the Apostolic Conference to be those persons within the church who maintained: "Unless you are circumcised to the custom of Moses, you cannot be saved" (Acts 15:1). The focal point of this argument seemed to centre mainly on Paul and Barnabas. Indeed, this controversy was so wide-spread that it included Antioch as well as Jerusalem where Luke states that some "believers" (φαρισαίων πεπιστευκότες) "who belonged to the party of the Pharisees" rose up and said, "It is necessary to circumcise them, and to charge them to keep the law of Moses" (15:5). The important decision reached, when Peter spoke on the matter, was in favour of the Shammaite position of leniency toward the gentiles because God gave them the "Holy Spirit just as he did to us" and made no distinction between us and them" (15:9). To this decision James agreed: "Therefore my
judgment is that we should not trouble those of the Gentiles who turn to God" (15:19). It is significant that Luke is equivocal about Paul's position in this matter. We have already observed that both Paul and Barnabas were very much involved in the debates with those who insisted on circumcision in Antioch (15:2), probably because of Paul's unusual position as a former Hillelite. There is not enough evidence to know whether this issue led any bearing on the bitter disagreement which later separated Paul and Barnabas (15:30). Curiously, Luke records none of Paul's remarks on this question, but he does manage to include two relatively long speeches of Peter and James. Nonetheless, one may infer Paul's position from his Hillelite-Pharisaic background and those of his letters which we have examined. In addition to his numerous statements regarding "spiritual circumcision" there is some evidence that Paul openly insisted on physical circumcision, but these are presented as unusual cases like Timothy (16:3). It is nonetheless clear that Paul was in continuous dispute with other Christians over his interpretation of the Apostolic decision and in conflict with the rest of Judaism because of his former Hillelite position. It is thus not surprising that his views on circumcision at times appear equivocal.

It may be recalled that the definitive situation upon which the Apostolic decision was based, was an event in Caesarea in which Peter baptized Cornelius and his household. When the Holy Spirit fell on all who heard Peter's preaching of the word of God, some "believers from among the circumcised" (ἐκ περιτομῆς πιστῶν ὀ.ο. of the circumcision party or Hillelites) were amazed, because the gift of the Holy Spirit had been poured out even on the Gentiles" (Acts 10:14-45). When Peter heard them speaking in tongues and praising God he said, "Can any one forbid water for baptizing these people who have received the Holy Spirit just as we have?" and he commanded
then to be "baptised in (ἐν) the name of Jesus Christ" (10:48). The decision of the Apostolic Council appears to have been that because the Holy Spirit has been bestowed on gentiles as well as Jews; circumcision shall not be required of them. Paul’s interpretation of this decision, however, appears to have been, unless gentiles received a "spiritual circumcision" their baptism was by no means efficacious. To the mind of Paul, former Hillelite now turned Christian, the gift of the Holy Spirit had now come to take the place of circumcision as a necessary requirement for gentiles to be saved. But more importantly, it fits with his futurist Kerygma. As John’s baptism was only of water (rather than participation in the Resurrection as the Urgemeinde taught), the baptism of the Holy Spirit was the sign of the mightier one yet to come, in Paul’s view. A favourite theme of Paul is the new circumcision (περιτομὴ περιτομῆς ἀχειροποιητοῦ) "not made with hands" (Col.2:11). Here he states that the believer is both circumcised and baptised in (ἐν) the circumcision of Christ and in (ἐν) baptism raised with him through faith from the dead (2:11). Again, Paul has linked circumcision directly with the "Spirit of God" when he says: "For we are the circumcision, ἡ περιτομὴ περιτομῆς ἀχειροποιητοῦ Θεοῦ ἀπερεπανωτέες . . . and boast—in Christ Jesus and not in the flesh" (Phil., 3:2). Again of the Ephesians, who are now called by Paul as "dwelling place of God in the Spirit" (κατοικητήριον τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν πνεύματι 2:22), Paul says they were once called "the uncircumcision" (ἄκροβηστία) by the "Circumcision" (ἡ Ἰουδαϊκὴ περιτομὴ) i.e. the Circumcision party (2:11). There is some indication that Paul did continue to preach the requirement of circumcision in his words to the Galatians: "But if I, brethren, still preach circumcision, why am I still persecuted" (Εἰπὸ δὲ, ἀδελφοί ἐί . . .
...περιτομὴν ἐν κηρύσσω'), Gal. 5:11. It may be surmised that circumcision was part of Paul's Kerygma, as the word... (κηρύσσω) implies. Perhaps as Epicurus said that a true Jew was one who was more than "baptised", so Paul states that a true Jew is one who is more than "circumcised" in his words to the Romans: "He is not a real Jew who is one outwardly, nor is true circumcision something external and physical. He is a Jew who is one inwardly (ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ ...) circumcision is of the heart in the spirit not the letter"... (περιτομὴ καρδίας ἐν πνεύματι ὧν γράμματι Ro. 2:29). Because of the direct manner in which Paul links the Holy Spirit with circumcision, we might conclude that Paul added a "spiritual circumcision" to the baptism of the Urgenseinde and not merely apostolic authority (of which he had less than the contemporary Apostles), in order to persuade those who believed they already participated in the resurrection through baptism that these were only a shadow of things in the Parousia yet to come.

Whether or not (ἐφρήκω) is taken strictly to mean "procure" or "make" disciples, the context of Acts (19:1-7) makes it clear that this is precisely what Paul did. He preached to them, they believed, Paul baptised them and laid hands on them, they received the gift of the Holy Spirit and they were about twelve in number in all. Luke has given enough information to know that this group of twelve which gathered around Paul was distinct from the larger group of the Urgenseinde at Ephesus who held forth in the Synagogue. This latter group was the one to whom Apollos preached, and perhaps, added greatly to their numbers, some of whom were undoubtedly Christians already in that they encouraged him (rather than Paul) to go over to the disciples in Achaia by writing letters on his behalf (12:27). It is from this group that Paul withdrew with his following of twelve over the issue
which Luke calls the "Kingdom of God" (19:8). But this we have seen, has all the marks of the Kerygma Controversy which had its roots in a deeper issue which divided the Jews long before Paul and Ananias opposed each other on the question of the "Kingdom of God". As the "Kingdom of God" was the deeper issue which goes back to the differences between the Pharisees and Sadducees, we cannot assume that it was a unique and unrelated controversy which emerged in Ephesus for the first time. We have already seen numerous examples of it elsewhere.

The particular "offence" which Paul created among the Ungemeinde of Ephesus was his teaching of a future resurrection (as opposed to a present resurrection) of the body (or "flesh") to a future judgment or "second death". Luke includes another tradition in (19:18-20) which describes the nature of Paul's splinter group and their activities at the Hall of Tyrannus during the following two years. It appears that some followers of Paul, whom Luke also has discredited, did not fare as well as he. They are reported by Luke to have attempted exorcism "In the name of Jesus whom Paul preaches" (Ἰησοῦν ὑπὸ Παύλου κηρύσσεις), 19:11—perhaps one of the most unusual uses of the Pauline Kerygma, but by no means successful. The evil spirit which they were trying to exorcise overpowered them: "so that they fled out of that house naked and wounded" (19:16). This was not the first time that such treatment befell Paul and his followers. In Philippi, the magistrates "tore the garments off them (Paul and his followers) and gave orders to beat them with rods" (14:22). So also they had their garments torn and were stoned at Lystra (14:19). Apparently Luke has intended to imply that these followers in Ephesus were impostors, at least to make it clear that Paul was not responsible for all that happened there, but their appeal to Paul's Kerygma and attempts to imitate his deeds strongly
suggests that they considered themselves disciples of Paul despite the treatment they received (cf. I Cor.15:32).

Despite the questionable light which is shed on his followers, Luke has spared no pains to portray Paul in the best possible way. "Extraordinary miracles" (Δυνάμεις τε οὐ τὰς τοῦκοσάς) were performed by Paul. His "handkerchiefs" (σουμάρια) and "aprons" (σιμύκινθα) were soon valued so highly that they were thought to have curative powers in healing diseases and exorcising "evil spirits" (10:12). These unusual powers attributed to Paul may reflect Luke's high regard for Paul which may, to some extent, have been influenced by the answer given in Matthew to the question: "Are you he who is to come, or shall we look for another"?, namely: that "the blind receive their sight and the lame walk, lepers are cleansed and the deaf hear and the dead are raised up, and the poor have good news preached to them" (Mat.11:3-5). At least he has sought to demonstrate the efficaciousness of Paul's Resurrection Kerygma. The form of the narrative is strangely similar to the Jesus tradition in which John records that many of the disciples drew back from Jesus and he was left with the twelve (Jn.6:66). The reason, according to John's account, that Jesus was left with a minority of twelve was his teaching on the ascension (i.e. the Urgemeinde Kerygma): "Then what if you were to see the Son of Man ascending (ιηθ υἱον άνθρώπου ανάβαντα) where he was before? It is the spirit that gives life, the flesh is of no avail" (νησ αρχ ούκ ωρελεί αύδεν) (Jn.6:63). The form of the Pauline narrative suggests that the two Keryngae were held in close juxtaposition, in Luke's mind, at least close enough to present the Resurrection Kerygma (and its reception) in a similar garb to that of the Ascension Kerygma in Matthew.

It is nevertheless evident that there were two
important groups of Christians at Ephesus, one which derived its authority from the Urgemeinde, of whom Apollon was a representative, and one which derived its authority from Paul and the miraculous deeds which he performed. As in matters of baptism, the Ephesian Christians rejected the Pauline point of view but that does not imply that they were any less Christian. They were, objectively speaking, closer to the position of the Sadducees; and the Pauline Christians closer to the Hillelites in their requirement of a new circumcision of the Spirit. So also, the non-Pauline Christians at Ephesus may be seen to be closer to the Sadducee and Urgemeinde view of the Kingdom of God which was firmly believed to be already "in effect"; and the Pauline Christians closer to the Pharisaic view of a future Kingdom of God.

The ostensible cause which Luke has given for Paul's withdrawal to establish his own splinter group at the Hall of Tyrannus was, therefore, not the issue of baptism and circumcision alone, but the question of the Kingdom of God. Luke presents this as the central issue over which Paul argued and pleaded and ultimately divided the congregation at Ephesus after three months of preaching (διαλέγομενος καὶ πείθων περὶ τής βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ, 19:8). That it was primarily this eschatological issue which finally caused the congregation to become stubborn and speak evil of the way in which Paul presented his Kerygma, is evident in Paul's later farewell to the Ephesian Elders where the matter is recalled: "I know that all you among whom I have gone about preaching the Kingdom (κηρύσσων τὴν βασιλείαν) will see my face no more" (20:25). The particularly objectionable point presupposed by Paul's eschatology, would have been his insistence on a "spiritual circumcision" or baptism of the Spirit as a prerequisite in order to receive the coming更帝者 one and future Kingdom of God. But to Paul,
even the gift of the Holy Spirit was only the seal and promise of a future inheritance; a down payment of that which was yet to come. Luke has included two important facts which are enough to indicate what the congregation's own presuppositions were regarding the Kingdom of God. Before Paul was even in the neighbourhood of Ephesus to preach on this subject, Ephesus had already enjoyed the ministry of Apollos, who "spoke and taught accurately the things concerning Jesus" (εἴλαλεν καὶ ἐθέμασεν ἀκριβῶς τὰ περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, 13:25) and did have an "understanding" (ἐπισταμένος) of John's Baptism as baptism into the resurrection of Christ. All of the Gospels associate John's baptism of repentance with the imminent Kingdom of God which was already at hand. Mark has placed the origination of this announcement in the mouth of Jesus: "The time is fulfilled, and the Kingdom of God is at hand: repent", (Mt.1:15), Matthew, in the mouth of both Jesus and John: "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand" (Mt.3:2). Even Luke quotes John: "Even now the axe is laid to the root of the trees; every tree therefore that does not bear good fruit is cut down and thrown into the fire" (Lk.2:9). He makes it abundantly clear that the Parousia itself shall occur in the coming of Christ: "All men questioned in their hearts concerning John, whether perhaps he were the Christ, John answered them all, 'I baptise you with water - but he who is mightier than I is coming...his winnowing fork is in his hand...the chaff he will burn with unquenchable fire" (Lk.3:15-17). The Fourth Evangelist also relates John's baptism to the imminent coming of Kingdom of God, "I baptise with water; but among you stands one whom you do not know"..."Make straight the way of the Lord", etc. (Lk.1:17-26).

If Apollos understood the baptism of John, as Luke reports, then it is also true that Apollos understood and
taught its relation to the imminent Kingdom of God, Parousia and Judgment, which were now fulfilled in the resurrection of Christ, and baptism as participation in that resurrection. Indeed, Luke admits this to be the case when he states that Apollos had made a powerful and convincing case to the Ephesian congregation that the Christ was Jesus (ἐπίδεικνύει διὰ τῶν ὕπαρξεως εἶναι τὸν Χριστὸν Ιησούν, 16:25). These two facts taken together lead to only one conclusion, namely that Apollos already taught and the congregation at Ephesus already believed that John was the forerunner, and in Jesus was the Parousia and the resurrection foretold by the Prophets of old. It must follow that the Ephesians firmly believed that the Kingdom of God had already come upon them.

Luke states that Paul argued on two occasions with the Ephesians, briefly before Apollos came to Ephesus and at greater length after Apollos had been there. If the point of contention in each case was the Kingdom of God, and that was the general issue which included all of these points of contention, about which they were the most stubborn and ultimately caused them to split, it is likely that they held many of these views (perhaps both as Sadducees and Christians) even before the coming of Apollos, as Paul’s first argument with them was before the coming of Apollos (Acts 18:19). To Paul, both the Parousia and future resurrection to Judgment were yet to come. Thus he opposed both the eschatology of the Sadducees and the Christian teaching that a resurrection takes place in the baptism of a believer. On one occasion Paul went so far as to disassociate himself from baptism altogether by asserting that he was "not sent to baptize" (1 Cor.1:17). Paul’s complaint was probably that Apollos did not place enough emphasis on the coming of the Holy Spirit. For Paul the seal of the Holy Spirit had the significance of circumcision itself.
as we have noticed in some detail, and circumcision was the
seal of a future inheritance. Thus to Paul, the Holy Spirit
was not the sign of the Kingdom which had already come as the
Urgemeinde believed (cf. Rom. 14) but like circumcision a promise,
a guarantee of an inheritance yet to come. Although recog-
nising Christ (the mightier than John) as the means by which
this greater promise, forgiveness and seal of spiritual
Circumcision has come, he still speaks of Christ as the "first
fruits" or forerunner of either the "coming of the Lord" or
his own greater return, "But each in his own order: Christ the
first fruits, then at his coming those who belong to Christ"
(I Cor. 15:22). This teaching must be seen to have been at
one stage in direct opposition to the views of the Urgemeinde
which maintained that the Parousia had already occurred in
Christ who was judged for all mankind.

There is thus a significant difference between
hoping for the reign of God in the future, and believing in a
Messiah who has already come; so also, there is a significant
difference between a view of the Holy Spirit as a promise, or
Spiritual Circumcision and seal of a future Kingdom, and a
view of the Holy Spirit held by the Urgemeinde that it was a
sign of the Parousia which has already occurred. This latter
Urgemeinde there may be seen in Peter's interpretation of the
Pentecost event in Jerusalem in terms of prophecy regarding
the Parousia described by Joel (Jl.2:28-32): "And in the last
days it shall be, God declares, that I will pour out my Spirit
upon all flesh...and on my menservants and my maidservants in
those days I will pour out my Spirit: and they shall prophesy"
(Acts 2:17-18). The Urgemeinde position was indeed a far
cry from the later Pauline view: "(You) were sealed with the
promised Holy Spirit, which is the guarantee of our inheri-
rance until we acquire possession of it" (Eph. 1:13-14). These
two widely differing views of the Holy Spirit necessitated two widely differing Kerygmae with regard to the role of Christ as forerunner of the Kingdom yet to come, or Christ as the resurrection through whom the Kingdom of God has already come.
D. The "Enigma" of the Fourth Gospel and the Urgemeinde Kerygma

The Fourth Gospel and the Kerygmata Controversy:

The outstanding theologian and historian of the ancient church, Adolf von Harnack, said more than a generation ago that the origin of the Fourth Gospel is the "greatest riddle of the primitive church". More recently, Prof. Oscar Cullmann has said regarding the "enigma" of the Fourth Gospel:

This enigma comes from the fact that we are confronted with a type of Christianity different from that which is known through the Synoptic Gospels and at the same time different from the missionary Churches reconstructed from the Pauline Epistles. The scheme: Palestine Jewish Christianity against Pagan Christianity of the Hellenistic world, does not make it easy to resolve this enigma. As a matter of fact, the Fourth Gospel proves that this scheme is too narrow, because the Fourth Gospel incontestably contains Hellenistic elements, yet it is also just precisely within these currents of Jewish Christianity of Palestine which we know so well, thanks to recent discoveries.

Strangely enough, a number of modern critics have held that the distinguishing characteristic of Johannine Christianity is not its late hellenistic influence, but what they call its anti-sacerdotal and anti-Temple motif. This has recently been the theme of several, in addition to Prof. Cullmann who has suggested that Johannine Christianity, with its anti-Temple bias may have co-existed with the better known Christianity of the Synoptic Gospels.

There is much of serious importance in Prof. Cullmann's other New Testament writings, which touch on the subject of the Fourth Gospel apart from the unusual suggestion in this essay that the Fourth Evangelist considered himself
part of an "anti-Temple movement" which sought to repudiate and replace the "cult of the Jerusalem Temple," and therefore wrote a "spiritualised Gospel". We will see that several difficulties arise when one attempts to interpret the few seemingly anti-Temple remarks, which occur in the Gospel, as a central theme and intention of the whole Gospel.

W. F. Howard, in his definitive survey of Fourth Gospel criticism, revised and brought up to date by C. K. Barrett, has said of the Fourth Gospel: "It has come to be regarded as the work of a writer who has at the same time one eye fixed on the opponents or perverters of Christian truth at Ephesus at the close of the century, and the other fastened upon the historical Jesus who lived and died and rose again in Palestine two generations before. For the last twenty-five years every important study of this Gospel has given prominence to this apologetic or polemic purpose that is never for long out of sight". This longstanding trend of criticism has not necessarily been contradicted by what this investigation has brought to light in terms of the Kerygmata Controversy described in some detail above. In the light of these new data, we must now consider the possibility that the Fourth Evangelist was one who had one eye fixed on the theological issues of his own day, as well as the historical Jesus, but we must now ask if those so-called "opponents" of Christian truth at Ephesus were not in fact Christians. Firstly, if they were Christians, which proposition has been presented above and shall be examined here, in reference to the evidence of the Fourth Gospel, it must now be asked if they were not Christians who merely presented a different Kerygma contrary to the Pauline point of view and thus should not be considered Gnostics, Ebionites or "perverters" of the truth. Secondly, was not the "other eye" of the Evangelist, which is presupposed by recent trends of criticism to be focused on
the "historical Jesus", focused there because the Evangelist saw in Jesus the occurrence of the resurrection and Judgment itself according to the beliefs of the Urgemeinde Kerygma?

It may thus be seen to be only a partial solution to the Fourth Gospel "enigma", to suppose that the Evangelist's main purpose was to present a "historical Jesus" or simply to inveigh against the so-called "perverters of the truth". A deeper Kerygmatic purpose seems to be evident in the Evangelist's own statement of his intention: "These are written that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God (ὅτι ήσώκ εἶστιν ὁ χριστός ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ) and that believing you may have life in his name" (.gamma ἔχετε ἐν τῷ ὄνοματι αὐτοῦ, 20:31). When John's Kerygmatic point of view is contrasted with the Pauline announcement of a Christ who is yet to come and judge the world (even though it is the same Jesus), the Fourth Evangelist's intention and point of view appears much closer to earliest Urgemeinde teaching than formerly supposed. This is particularly so in view of all which is presupposed by the Evangelist's use of the terms (γινη) as "eternal life" and "ever-lasting life"; "He who believes in the Son has eternal life" (γινην αἰώνιον , 3:36); "He who hears my word and believes him who sent me, has eternal life (γινην αἰώνιον ); he does not come into judgment, but has passed from death to life" (εἰς κρίσιν οὐκ ἔχεται ἀλλὰ μεταβαίνειν ἐκ τοῦ θανάτου εἰς τὴν γινην , 5:24); and many other similar passages which will be touched on below. Speaking the words of Christ, the Evangelist, indeed, presents them in terms of a Parousia which has already occurred in Jesus' resurrection: "The hour is coming, and now is (καὶ νῦν ἐστίν ), when the dead will hear the voice of the Son of God (γενομένης τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ ), and those who hear will live... all who are in the tombs will hear his voice and come forth, those who have done good, to the resurrection of life, and
those who have done evil, to the resurrection of Judgment" (5:25-29). In terms of a present Parousia, and a resurrection which "now is" in Jesus Christ, the Evangelist quotes the words of Christ: "I am the resurrection (ἐγώ εἰμι η ἀνάστασις) and the life" (11:25). And those seeing, and yet not seeing, who looked beyond Jesus for a future coming of the Christ and future Parousia and Judgment, are negated by the Evangelist from the same source: "You search the scriptures, because you think that in them you have eternal life; and it is they that bear witness to me" (καὶ ἔκειναι εἴσιν αἱ μαρτυρίεις περὶ ἐμοῦ, 5:39 and 6:36). These are all statements which may be seen to be highly characteristic of the Urgemeinde Kerygma.

In his paper presented to the International Congress of the Four Gospels (Oxford, 1957), W. C. van Unnik criticised the lack of attention given to 20:30-31, as the Fourth Evangelist's most important statement of intention for writing his Gospel. He noted that when John says that "Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God" it is immediately followed in contemporary writing by the remark that this term "Christ" does not need to be taken seriously, for which he gives numerous examples. Although St. John employs both the uniquely eschatological term "Christ" and the term "Son of God", frequently employed by both Enoch and the Urgemeinde, as may be seen in Hebrews (1:5-2:9) van Unnik has, perhaps, underestimated the influence of the hellenised Jews within early Christianity and the important position of the Urgemeinde churches, when he says of the term (ὁ Χριστός) "the Anointed One": "Both Vincent Taylor and Cullmann have rightly drawn attention to the fact that this word was meaningless to the hellenistic churches and that there it prolonged its life as a proper name, that is to say, as a fossil". To the contrary, the strong Jewish loyalties and priestly perspective of the hellenised Jews within the Urgemeinde has indeed become apparent and is reflected in numerous of their writings, apart
from the Fourth Gospel as we have seen. They are rightly
criticised who minimise the fact that John is the only New
Testament writer who used the original term "Messiah" and
dared to speak of Jesus as "King of the Jews" (1:49, 12:13,
19:19 and 1:46, 5:39). But one might ask why, if the
Gospel was directed against hellenisers and Gnostics, does
it not contain any sign of a reaction against such pagan
practices as idolatry, polytheism or vain philosophies? And
why are the misconceptions criticised by the Gospel, Jewish
(often liturgical) misconceptions rather than pagan miscon-
ceptions? W. C. van Unnik's paper contains many weighty and
important arguments, but it is difficult to accept that his
conclusion is the only possible conclusion which may be drawn
from the valuable evidence he has presented. He states:
"the purpose of the Fourth Gospel was to bring the visitors
of a synagogue in the Diaspora (Jews and Godfearers) to belief
in Jesus as the Messiah of Israel". He adopts the unusual
position that the Fourth Gospel was "A missionary book for the
Jews". Whereas, one might accept the premise that the
Evangelist does not appear to address pagan readers, it is far
more difficult to accept the conclusion that because "John did
not write for Christians in the first place", the Gospel there-
fore was a "mission-book which sought to win". In addi-
tion to the lack of support for this conclusion in the Gospel
itself, the latter position becomes particularly untenable in
view of the specific nature of address in the Gospel: "I have
manifested thy name to the men whom thou gavest me" (17:6);
"I am not praying for the world but for those whom thou hast
given me" (17:9); His disciples said, 'Ah now you are speaking
plainly',...Jesus answered them, 'Do you now believe?' The
hour is coming, indeed it has come (ἐρχέται ἡ ζωὴ καὶ ἐμφανιζόμεν )
when you will be scattered, every man to his home" (16:31);
"They will put you out of the synagogues; indeed, the hour is
coming when whoever kills you will think he is offering
service to God" (16:2); and so also in many other passages where those addressed are both Christians and Jews. Thus, it is this conclusion which requires further thought, a task which has been undertaken here by relating the question of those to whom the Gospel is addressed, to the place of the Fourth Gospel in the Kerygmata Controversy.

In view of the numerous indications of a firm belief in immortality throughout the Fourth Gospel, the Evangelist's sympathy rather than hostility toward his opponents, and his implied correction, rather than his open defiance to them, become intelligible. These opponents were Christians, but Christians of a different Kerygmatic bent. Jesus' opponents are always classed under the simple heading of "Jews", but at the same time no greater loyalty to the Jews could be expressed than that Messianic loyalty which is expressed in this Gospel. In the Fourth Gospel, Jesus says to the Samaritan woman, "You worship what you do not know; we worship what we know, for salvation is from the Jews" (4:22). Thus they are a particular kind of Jew who are "enemies" of the Gospel, and indeed a certain kind of Christian, namely those who denied that in Jesus had occurred the coming of the resurrection and Judgment, as well as the Messianic Son of God, foretold by the prophets. It is from this Kerygmatic point of view that the Fourth Gospel says "Truly, truly, I say to you, we speak of what we know, and bear witness to what we have seen (καὶ ὁ ἐφαρμακευμένος μαρτυροῦμεν), 3:11. The direct opposite to this teaching is found in the Kerygmatic point of view of Paul: "For in this hope we are saved. Now hope that is seen is not hope. For who hopes for what he sees" (ὁ γὰρ ἀποκάλυπτε τὸ καὶ ἔλαβε τὸ εἰ , Rom.8:24). The Johannine Kerygma looks to that which has already become a reality in Jesus Christ as the saving Parousia event; the Pauline Kerygma continues to look for a future Parousia, Judgment and salvation. Thus one
speaks in terms of that which has been seen and the other in terms of that which is hoped to be seen.

Another significant occurrence in the Fourth Gospel is the Evangelist's statement that Jesus himself did not baptise, which is hardly explicable apart from the Urgemeinde Kerygma. The statement occurs almost as an editorial parenthesis on the part of the Evangelist, "although Jesus himself did not baptise, but only his disciples (καὶ τοῦ γε Ιησοῦς ἀυτῶς οὐκ ἔβαπτισεν ἀλλ' ὁ μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ)", 4:2. In those circles where baptism came to signify participation in the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, as was the case with the Urgemeinde, it would indeed be redundant, moreover, impossible for Jesus himself to baptise. Nor, for that matter, is there any actual instance of a baptism with the Holy Spirit, previous to the resurrection of Christ in the Fourth Gospel. This particular view of baptism, which was part and parcel of the Urgemeinde Kerygma, is expressed even more clearly in the special Johannine account of Jesus' conversation with Nicodemus: "Truly, truly, I say to you, unless one is born of water and the Spirit (ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος) he cannot enter the kingdom of God" (3:5). John's words clearly disclose that after Christ's Resurrection, baptism was indeed held sacred as a passing from death to life, being "born again" as a present participation in the resurrection, as over against a future resurrection and Judgment. These are but a few of the "problems" created by the enigmatic differences between the Fourth and the Synoptic Gospels. These difficulties are nevertheless illuminated by an analysis of its teachings in relation to the Kerygmata Controversy. However, the main problem which this investigation has sought to pursue in detail is the unique character of the Fourth Evangelist's presentation of the doctrine of immortality in relation to his stated purpose, Kerygmatic point of view and immediate need for writing.
In the whole perspective of the religious situation at Ephesus, for which this investigation has found an abundance of evidence, we have noticed, so far, a Pauline splinter group which found itself at odds with a larger body of Jewish Christians who were loyal to the Urgemeinde. In the light of this situation the probable locus, here, of John the Apostle in his later years and the similar historical setting of the theology and Kerygma of the Fourth Gospel all take on a special significance. Relevant to this setting, it may be noticed that John the Apostle is reported to have had a particular animosity toward exorcists who were not of the Urgemeinde. Mark's Gospel describes him as slightly less than enlightened in this respect:

John said to him, 'Teacher, we saw a man casting out demons in your name, and we forbade him, because he was not following us.' But Jesus said, 'Do not forbid him; for no one who does a mighty work in my name will be able soon after to speak evil of me.

(Mk.9:38-9).

It is perhaps not coincidental that Luke placed the beating of the exorcist who was casting out demons in the name of "Jesus whom Paul preaches", at Ephesus (Acts 19:13). Indeed, Paul himself is reported to cast out demons (πνεύματα τα πονηρα ἐκπορευεσθαι) at Ephesus at the Hall of Tyrannus (Acts 19:12). By contrast, the Fourth Gospel does not once mention Jesus exorcising or casting out demons. The only mention of this is on the lips of Jesus' enemies who accuse him of being possessed by a demon and would like to see him exorcised. This may in part explain the strained relations between the Urgemeinde in Ephesus and the would-be disciple of Paul who was overpowered (by an un-named person who also must have
"had a demon") and fled naked and wounded (Acts 19:16).
It also sheds light on Paul's assertion that he fought with
beasts at Ephesus (I Cor.15:32), if the above passage is
descriptive of the same religious climate.

Nonetheless, if the Fourth Evangelist did write
his Gospel at Ephesus, this fact alone would illuminate both
its intention and purpose, as a piece of New Testament writing,
which shows knowledge of the other Gospels. The traditional view is that the Fourth Gospel did, in fact, originate
in Ephesus. Although this tradition has frequently been
rejected in past generations, it is nonetheless based on the
witness of Irenaeus (Adv.Haer II.22.5). In this connection, it has more recently been argued that the earliest
Patristic evidence need not be taken seriously because the
Fourth Gospel, itself, does not substantiate the point which
some, apparently, are trying to prove in their presentation of
the "John at Ephesus" tradition; namely, whether the fast of
Lent ended on the Jewish Paschal day or on the Christian
Sunday corresponding to it. The Ephesian and Urgemeinde
setting of the Fourth Gospel is supported by the fact that its
dating of the Crucifixion on the 14th Nisan, follows the
Sadducaic calendar, rather than the Pharisaic calendar.
The old Sadducaic calendar consisted of a year made up of
364 days (four seasons of 2 months of 30 days each, plus 1
month of 31 days at the end of each). Feast days were thus
fixed by the number of month and day (since the year had 52
weeks, they always fell on the same day of the week). It is
no mere coincidence that this calendrical system was held in
common both by the Enoch literature, Urgemeinde Christians,
which the Fourth Gospel reflects, and the Asian Bishops, by
continuous tradition, of which the Bishop of Ephesus was the
head and spokesman.

Although the Fourth Gospel does not refer to
either the celebration of Lent or Easter, it most definitely
refers to the celebration of the Passover on the 14th of Nisan according to the Sadducaic calendar. It might well be asked if the succession of bishops at Ephesus, mentioned by Polycrates (eighth bishop in his family at Ephesus) in fact, celebrated a Jewish festival (albeit a Jewish-Christian festival) or whether they celebrated Easter as it is known today. Eusebius, in commenting on Bishop Victor of Rome's excommunication of all the Asian bishops for holding to the old feast and the old calendar, quotes Polycrates' letter (c.190AD) in extenso. The letter cites as his authority, John the Beloved Disciple:

Again there is John, who leant back on the Lord's breast, and who became a priest wearing the mitre, a martyr, and a teacher; he too sleeps in Ephesus.

The word "martyr", need not imply that John was put to death. However, because that is the usual meaning of the term it probably implies more than the fact that his witness was costly. In addition to John, Polycrates lists Polycarp, Thraseas, Sagaris, Papirius and Melito as among the other bishops who "kept the fourteenth day of the month as the beginning of the Paschal festival, in accordance with the Gospel, (Jh. 11:1,12) not deviating in the least but following the rule of the Faith". Because Eusebius had access to this official letter to the Bishop of Rome, and there is no doubt that it would have been preserved by the latter, if it was evidence for the excommunication of so many Asian bishops, we may be certain that neither Eusebius nor Polycrates had any need to invent the information it contained. He says of himself, "Last of all I too, Polycrates, the least of you all, act according to the tradition of my family, some members of which I have actually followed; for seven of them were bishops and I am the eighth, and my family have always kept the day when the people put away the leaven". To all intents and purposes,
Polycrates was a Christian bishop in a direct line of Christian bishops at Ephesus, who as late as 190 AD, celebrated the Jewish feast of unleavened bread according to the older non-Pharisaic calendar.

This controversy in which Polycrates was excom- municated by the Bishop of Rome for his adherence to the Sadduceaic calendar developed into what was later called the Quarto-deciman controversy. W. F. Howard, has challenged the historicity of Polycrates' account, which states that it was John "who leant back on the Lord's breast" became a "priest wearing the (πέταλον) mitre", on the grounds that the earliest disciples could not have been associated with the Jewish priests, let alone, one of their number become a high priest. However, the term (μίτρα) occurs with considerable frequency in the Septuagint, especially in Exodus in conjunction with (πέταλον) but (πέταλον το ἅγιασμα) "plate", "holiness" was the designation for the gold plate fastened in front of a high priest's mitre or turban (Ex. 28:32,36, 29:6ff, 36:10,38, 39:3,30). Polycrates' statement may not be so unusual as first supposed in view of the fact that James, the brother of the Lord, was also inferred to wear the Jewish priestly mitre, as we have already seen. This was by no means inconsistent with either the priestliness or the Jewishness of the Urgemeinde. W. F. Howard has said: "The curious remark of Polycrates seems therefore to mean that this John was at some time high priest. The absurdity of such an idea need hardly be pointed out. We may say with confidence that no ex-high priest was present at the Last Supper. It is equally certain that no disciple of Jesus, who leaned on His breast at that supper, ever afterwards became high priest." Dr. Howard's view, along with much New Testament criticism in the past fifty years, has perhaps mistakenly pre-supposed that there was only one kind of Christianity at Ephesus and obviously has underestimated the essentially Sadducaic and priestly character of the Urgemeinde
from the days of Jesus and James. It is by no means unnatu­ral to suppose that John became a disciple when he heard John the Baptist's preaching about the imminent Kingdom of God. When Jesus was arrested, John did not go into hiding but went directly to the high priests court with confidence because he was known to the others. Where Peter fell, John remained steadfast because of his priestly associations. "Simon Peter followed Jesus", and so did another disciple (καὶ ἄλλος μαθητὴς). As this mysterious "disciple" was known to the high priest (ὁ δὲ μαθητὴς ἐκεῖνος ἦν γνωστὸς τῷ ἄρχιερεῖ) he entered the "court of the high priest along with Jesus" (Jh. 18:15). It is likely that this unnamed disciple, whom Polycrates (in his letter to Victor, Bishop of Rome) also calls a "teacher", or Rabbi, was the author of the traditions contained in this Gospel, elsewhere referred to anonymously as the "Beloved Disciple". It is by no means preposterous that either he or James should eventually become "high priests" during this chaotic time when the high priesthood changed so often and multitudes of the priests joined the ranks of the Christians (Acts 6:7). Indeed, only one high priest officiated at a time in the Temple during their short tenure of office. But there were simultaneously many high priests in Jerusalem whose duty was to adjudicate in the Council. The title was for life. Thus Polycrates might well have seen the term (ἄρχιερεύς) associated with the name of John from which he has inferred, "priest wearing the (ἐπίταλον)".

The silence of Ignatius about John the Apostle, in the letter which he wrote to the church at Ephesus (115AD), has occasionally been felt to be a serious objection to the tradition that the aged John spent his last years in Ephesus. However, the tradition of Irenaeus, who strongly maintained John the Apostle to be the author of the Fourth Gospel, cannot be dismissed lightly. Irenaeus, who defended the Quartodec-
imans, does not use Polycrates as a source, but refers to Polycarp (c. 69-155). Polycarp, who also was a strong supporter of the Quartodecimans and upheld the Urgemeinde calendar said, as is seen in the letter to Florinus written by Irenaeus, that he had "intercourse with John and the others who had seen the Lord". Irenaeus adds: "And as he remem­bered their words, and what he heard from them concerning the Lord, and concerning his miracles and his teaching, having received from eye-witnesses of the 'Word of Life'. Polycarp related all things in harmony with the scriptures". C.K. Barrett, in his commentary on the Fourth Gospel, has cautioned regarding this epistle: "Irenaeus does nothing to suggest that Polycarp possessed a gospel written by the John he men­tions. This may mean that Polycarp was speaking of John the Elder...or it may mean that he was speaking of John the Apostle without asserting that John the Apostle had written a gospel".

Regarding Ephesus, Prof. Barrett has held: "The case for Ephesus as the place of origin of the gospel is not strong, though perhaps a little stronger than has recently been allow­ed." More recently, W. C. van Unnik has affirmed this basic position: "The place where John had his disputes with the synagogues was somewhere in Asia Minor and the old tradit­ion of Irenaeus, saying that the Fourth Gospel originated in Ephesus may be completely right. Led back to this tradition­al view I may say - to avoid misunderstanding - that until quite recently I held the view that John was written in Syria and I had no inclination to become a defender of the tradition­al standpoint, but a fresh investigation...has clearly pointed in the direction of Ephesus".

With the weight of these fathers, both ancient and modern, leaning toward Ephesus, if not tipping the balance in that direction, we shall feel justified in considering Ephesus, as a strong working hypothesis, for the setting of the Kerygmatic views expressed in the Fourth Gospel.
The Fourth Gospel and the Urgemeinde Traditions:

In the past when the background of the Fourth Gospel was commonly thought to be rooted outside of Palestine in Mandaean or Alexandrine Gnostic literature, it was also assumed to have sprung from a type of Christianity which was inimical toward John the Baptist and his disciples. This was either because the Baptiser supposedly represented a type of Jewish "Gnosticism", against which the Fourth Gospel asserted a kind of "Jewish Christianity"; or because the Fourth Gospel represented a type of Christian "Gnosticism" against the "Jewishness" of John the Baptist and his followers.

Whichever side is taken in the discussion, the so-called "polemic" of the Fourth Evangelist against Gnosticism fails on three counts: a) Its presuppositions are based on what the Fourth Gospel does not say regarding the Jesus-John infancy narratives and Jesus baptism (or anointing) by John the Baptist, b) This view ignores the basic continuity in the Immortality Kerygma and Parousia teachings of the Fourth Evangelist, John the Baptist and the Urgemeinde, in which current of thought the Fourth Gospel should be placed in the Kerygmata Controversy, c) It fails to take cognizance of the actual historical relationship which existed between the disciples of John and the Urgemeinde, as singularly portrayed by the Fourth Evangelist with first-hand information about events in which he himself appears to have participated.

Although it cannot be denied that various polemical situations occurred at this early stage in Christian development, the issues are only confused by the suggestion that these polemics arose over the question of "Gnosticism". We have found adequate grounds for a polemical relationship between the pre-Pauline believers in the Urgemeinde and
Pauline Christians over the question of immortality and the Immortality Kerygma, but the term "Gnosticism" is totally inadequate to describe the issues which divided Christians at this stage. Moreover, the evidence contained in the Fourth Gospel itself, demonstrates the improbability of such a view. It is easily demonstrated that the Kerygma of the Fourth Evangelist is very much in harmony with the earlier Immortality Kerygma of the Urgemeinde.

From S. G. F. Brandon's research into the state of the Christian Church immediately after the fall of Jerusalem in 68-70 AD, it may be inferred, if his work is treated with the seriousness it deserves, that there was an almost complete discontinuation of Urgemeinde Christianity, in Jerusalem, from 70 AD until the second century AD. Although this remarkable strand of Jewish Christianity did flourish in other important Christian centres, it should not be confused with the Jewish Christianity described by the Aramaic, Pseudepigraphic, and Ebionite literature of the second century. It is only in this latter named literature, after the break in the continuity of Urgemeinde Christianity had occurred, that the first clear indications of a so-called polemic against "Gnosticism" appear. Previous to this break, the controversy takes an altogether different form and appears within the ranks of Judaism and Christianity as what has here been called the Jewish-Christian Kerygmata Controversy. This may also be noticed in the marked difference between the Kerygma of the Fourth Gospel and that of the Synoptic Gospels. Nonetheless, it is in this early stratum of Jewish-Christian history that the polemics and intentions of the Fourth Gospel have their greatest relevance.
The Omitted Infancy Narratives and the Pre-Existent Christ:

In the Gospel of Luke the parallel annunciations and miraculous births of John the Baptist and Jesus are described in the language and typology of the Old Testament prophets. This typological parallelism has even extended to the baptism of Jesus by John. It was at the Jordan that the mantle of Elijah was passed on to Elisha, with a double portion of the Spirit; so also, it was at the Jordan that Jesus received baptism at the hand of John, "and the Holy Spirit descended on him in bodily form" (Lk.3:22). If Luke has preserved a tradition which interpreted the coming of John and Jesus in terms of the Elijah and Elisha redivivi, it is certainly true of the other Synoptic Gospels that they disclose a widely held interpretation of Jesus as the promised Messianic Prophet who was to precede the coming of the Parousia and the Kingdom of God. Although it is possible that the Evangelists have presented these as popular traditions relevant to Jesus in a mechanical or reporting fashion, the Synoptic Gospels, nonetheless, clearly reveal themselves to have a prophetic orientation upon which they have built their case regarding the expected Kingdom and the expected Messiah. This prophetic orientation is conspicuously absent from John.

In sharp contrast to the Prologue of the Fourth Gospel, which describes a pre-existent Christ who was "in the beginning with God" (1:2); the very instrument of creation as the Son of God, who has "dwelt among us" (1:14), the Lucan Prologue presents two infancy cycles relevant to a future Messianic Prophet based on the prediction and authority of prophecy itself. In one breath, the tradition edited by Luke speaks of "salvation" as coming from the "house of his servant David" (1:69) and the "child" who will be called "prophet of
the Most High" (1:76), one who is synonymous with the bringer of "forgiveness of their sins, through the tender mercy of our God" (1:77). A consistently prophetic and futuristic orientation characterises the Lucan material, in contrast to that of John. In Luke, he is only potentially the Son of God, the one who "will be great (οὗτος ἔσται μέγας) and will be called the Son of the Most High" (υἱὸς υἱότου κληθήσεται, Lk.1:32). Unlike John, who says (καὶ θεὸς ἐστὶν ὁ λόγος, Jh.1:1) Luke's tradition is prophetically orientated to a future Messianic King: "and the Lord God will give to him the throne of his father David" (Lk.1:32). The Pharisaic origin of Luke's tradition is evident when it is compared with Mark (12:35): "How do the scribes say that the Christ is the Son of David?" Another Lucan tradition states that the one who will prepare "for the Lord a people", is not the Elijah, but the one who goes in the spirit and power of Elijah. Now, it was Elisha who went forth with twice the spirit and power of Elijah; Elisha, who performed the miracle of the oil with the empty jugs; Elisha, who cleansed lepers and raised the dead; so also in Luke, it was not John the Baptist, but Jesus who changed the water into wine, cleansed lepers and raised the dead (cf.Lk.4:26). In answering the question, Are you the coming one?, the terminology of Luke's reply implies that Jesus is not the coming Lord but the long expected Prophet, akin to Elisha (7:22), nonetheless with twice the power and spirit of Elijah who would bring to bear the power of the Holy Spirit. Despite Luke's editing and conflation of these traditions, which has already been discussed above in some detail, his eschatology clearly looked to the coming of a Messianic Prophet and forerunner, who at one stage became identified with Jesus rather than John the Baptist.

Omitting any proofs and prophecies such as those
found in Luke's prologue, which anticipate the coming of a Messianic Prophet and forerunner of the Day of the Lord, John's prologue states in unequivocal terms that Jesus was the Christ, moreover the pre-existing Christ (1:2), that in the coming of Jesus has occurred the Parousia. Neither the Baptist's significance nor that of Jesus rests on their prophetic authority or succession as a prophet, thus the infancy narratives are omitted altogether. This singular and significant fact is underscored by John's rejection of the suggestion that the John the Baptist is either the Christ, the Elijah or the Prophet (1:20-21), but one who was preparing the "way of the Lord" (ο ὁδός τοῦ Κυρίου, 1:23), which Lord is already present (1:27). By contrast, Jesus is the one who must answer to these prophetic expectations in the Synoptic Gospels (Mt.16:14, Mk.8:28, Lk.9:19). Although the Lucan prologue discloses more interpretation, to the extent that John the Baptist's intentions are expanded to their fullest possible scriptural extensions and demonstrate that their author has indeed "traced everything to their sources", the author of the Fourth Gospel, in the detail he presents, shows himself to be in much closer touch with the Urgemeinde than any of the Synoptic sources. But more importantly, the Fourth Evangelist's Kerygma of a pre-existent Christ and his firm belief that the Parousia has occurred in the Passion and death of Jesus in which all mankind has been judged discloses his deep continuity with the Urgemeinde. There is by no means any need to conclude with the Pseudo-Clementine and Gnostic source critics, that because the prologue of the Fourth Gospel omits the infancy narratives and numerous prophetic epithets, traditions and allusions that therefore the Gospel reflects a polemic against the followers of John the Baptist or the Urgemeinde. John's special office is that of "witness"
I (μαρτυρίαν) and his intention is identical with that of
the author of the Gospel, "to bear witness" (κύρια
μαρτυρίαν, 1:7). Both presuppose the occurrence of a
decisive historical event which has already taken place and
not merely hoped for in the future. The authority of this
event shall be examined here as the determining and disting­
ishing element of the Kerygma in the Fourth Gospel.

The Immortality Kerygma of the Fourth Gospel and the
Urgemeinde Immortality Kerygma:

The unique characteristic of the Fourth Evangel­
ist's presentation of the relationship between Jesus and John
the Baptist, as well as his eschatological teaching, may be
easily discerned by the manner and use to which he has employ­
ed his "Baptist" and "Special" source material to communicate a
Kerygmatic point of view. One of the unique features of the
gospel is thus its placement of the "Cleansing of the Temple"
at the beginning of Jesus' ministry, as a decisive act of
"Judgment" (Jh.2:13-17) by the Son of God (τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ
πατρὸς μου, 2:16), rather than at its end. In the Synoptic
Gospels, however, the Cleansing of the Temple is substituted
for the resurrection of Lazarus from the dead, as the cause of
Jesus' arrest, (as it is in the Fourth Gospel) and placed near
the end of Jesus' ministry (Mk.11:15-18; Lk.19:45-48; Mt.21:
12-13). Moreover, the authority for this event in the
Synoptic Gospels is here said to rest on the prophets (γενέθαι
καὶ ἔσται ὁ θεοῦ μου θεὸς προσευχῆς, Lk.19:46). The difference
is that the Synoptic accounts show the authority of Jesus'
deed to depend on John the Baptist (as Prophet): "By what
authority do you do these things", to which Jesus is shown to
respond: "Was the baptism of John from heaven or from men?"
This argument temporarily reduced the chief priests and scribes (and presumably Luke's source) because the people were "convinced that John was a prophet" (Lk.2:2-7). The Fourth Gospel, by contrast, employs no such stratagems, and although it contains occasional allusions to the prophets, it nowhere rests its case on the authority of the prophets. To the contrary, it is here the deeds of Jesus which give authority to John the Baptist: "He was not the light, but came to bear witness to the light" (Jh.1:8). Here, John gives no authority to Jesus by his Messianic anointing, (thus the baptism of Jesus is conspicuously omitted) but simply says, "I am not the Christ" (1:20). The Synoptic order of prophetic authority is intentionally reversed in John: "He must increase, I must decrease". John's authority is thus reduced to that of a "friend of the bridegroom", "He who has the bride is the bridegroom" (Jh.3:28-30). The Fourth Evangelist's treatment of the "Cleansing of the Temple" thus discloses an entirely different relationship between John and Jesus springing from an entirely different Kerygmatic point of view. Thus even the Cleansing of the Temple event, as a sign of the Parousia, gives significance to John the Baptist rather than vice versa. In the Synoptic Gospels, Jesus does exactly what the framework of Judaism seems to require; with the Fourth Gospel, however, one begins with Jesus, who acts with decisive authority regarding the Temple. Indeed "that great and terrible day" of which Zechariah speaks is the Day of the Lord, or Parousia: "And there shall no longer be a trader in the house of the Lord of hosts on that day" (Zech.14:21). It is reasonable to assume that the Evangelist knew this sign of the Parousia and placed the cleansing of the Temple first for its specific eschatological implications. "Behold, I send my messenger to prepare the way before me, and the Lord whom you seek will suddenly come
to his Temple" (Mal. 3:1). To John, the events speak for themselves without the need of prophetic undergirding. It is this event which gives significance to the messenger and not vice versa. Thus not only the Kerygma, but also the relationship of John to Jesus, in the Fourth Gospel, is precisely the opposite to that found in the Synoptic Gospels. Rather than a prophetic succession in which Jesus was the greater (as Elisha had twice the power and Spirit of Elijah), but still only the forerunner of the Parousia yet to come, the Fourth Gospel avoids all talk of lineage and prophetic succession. From the very first verses, Jesus is described personally as the very occurrence of the Parousia itself, and indeed in Enoch's language regarding the pre-existent Son of Man. His relationship to John is thus as the fulfilment of John's words. John's importance as a witness is given to him by the importance of the event to which he bears witness.

Thus, in the Fourth Gospel the "Raising of Lazarus" is placed at a significant and decisive place at the very end of Jesus' Ministry as the main cause for his final arrest and close to his resurrection. Its placement here heightens its eschatological importance, as a provocative cause of enmity among the (Pharisaic) leaders in Jerusalem, and one which ultimately led to his crucifixion. Although the Synoptic Gospels admit that Jesus raised the dead, in answer to John's question from prison (Mt. 11:2-19, Lk. 7:18-25) and contain the tradition of the Widow of Nain's Son (Lk. 7:11-17) and Jairus' daughter (Mk. 5:22, Lk. 8:41), which material Luke has employed and harmonised in order to reconcile the differences in Kerygmata in his time (see above, pp. 208ff, 212ff, 251ff), they conspicuously omit the raising of Lazarus at this decisive point in Jesus ministry. The Synoptic Gospels hold that it was the cleansing of the Temple (nonetheless with an appeal to the authority
of John the Baptist) which outraged the Jewish leaders and ended in Jesus' crucifixion. The Fourth Evangelist, however, has cited a far more explosive eschatological issue in the raising of Lazarus as the final cause for his arrest. To the Pharisaic Jews who thought of the resurrection only in terms of a future event, Jesus' deed was an outrage and embarrassment. John has indeed placed this particular resurrection directly before Jesus' entry into Jerusalem, heralded as the Messiah (12:13), but it is nonetheless the raising of Lazarus which clearly caused the first complaints to the "Pharisees", followed by the "Pharisees and chief priests" prompt decision about Jesus' death (11:46). If premature resurrections, were an explosive enough issue to end in Jesus' crucifixion, it can be assumed that those Pharisees who later became Christians had strong opinions in the matter. This is evident from their effort to establish their Resurrection Kerygma in terms of future Judgment, once again, in harmony with this basic Pharisaic doctrine of universal resurrection and Judgment at the end of time.

Our purpose is not to establish the rightness or wrongness of the Johannine chronology of Jesus' ministry as over against the Synoptic chronology, but to examine the Kerygmatic and eschatological presuppositions behind each. Nonetheless, it is difficult to keep from being forced to choose between the Johannine and Synoptic arrangement. In this respect, it should be recognised that one of the positive results of Form Criticism, in the past generation, has been to firmly shake the tacit assumption that the Marcan account provides a reliable chronological framework for the ministry of Jesus. If the Cleansing of the Temple was a tradition which in later times was circulated without specific time connotations, it would seem that Luke was the one who appended it to the sequence of things which Jesus did. It is likely that the Cleansing of the Temple did not appear in the earliest
version of Luke at all, if we follow V. Taylor's suggestion, but was inserted with the other material in its second re-writing. However, Taylor's hypothesis seems needlessly complicated, particularly if one should attempt to reconstruct the "first draft" of Luke's unredacted "original" manuscript. It seems more likely that the writers of the Synoptic Gospels were faced with the dilemma of where to place the Cleansing of the Temple. Because they have recorded only one visit of Jesus to Jerusalem, previous to the crucifixion, they may well have had no choice but to place the event at the end of his ministry.

Rather than a mere choice between two chronologies, it is apparent that the Fourth Evangelist had a far more serious purpose in mind and that was to require his reader to choose between two Kerygmata. When the Lazarus miracle is kept within the context of John the Baptist and his announcement of the Parousia, it not only discloses the Kerygmatic intention of the Gospel, but clearly illuminates the historical context of these events as well. Would such excitement actually have been caused by Jesus' entry into Jerusalem, if John the Baptist had not already announced to a great following the immediacy of the Kingdom of God with an imminent Parousia, and if the raising of Lazarus were not seen by all to be proof of its present reality? Such a wide-spread public reaction followed by arrests and crucifixion would not be caused by merely throwing traders and money changers out of the Temple, but they might if these incidents had strong eschatological implications which outraged the Pharisaic masses, as John the Evangelist suggests.

The raising of Lazarus thus not only proved that the Kingdom of God was at hand, but a resurrection had already occurred, contrary to the teachings of the Pharisaic doctors.
Indeed, this was an Urgemeinde tradition to which even the authors of the Synoptic Gospels did not necessarily have access, or feel safe in reporting if they did, in view of the beheading of John, the crucifixion of Christ and the stoning of Stephen. The Fourth Evangelist has placed the incident of the raising at the home of Lazarus, which was the same place where John the Baptist was sought out and interrogated by Pharisees from Jerusalem (see p.429). Another curious fact is that the name "Lazarus" is an abbreviated form of "Eleazar", the name of Jason's, Onias' and John the Baptist's priestly, Zadokite ancestor, as (Δαυααρος) is merely a shortening of the name (Ἐλεααρος) or (Ἐλααγαρος) in later form. Although it seems unlikely, there are at least two critics who believe that this same Lazarus was the "Beloved Disciple" himself. It seems more probable that the author of the Fourth Gospel, "the disciple who is bearing witness to these things, and who has written these things" (21:24), was merely an original and strong advocate of the Immortality Kerygma held by the Urgemeinde, rather than one (like Lazarus) who had already received a special resurrection. We have seen in some detail that it was a general teaching of the Urgemeinde that particular Christians already participate in the resurrection by means of baptism. Indeed, the "saying spread abroad among the brethren that this disciple was not to die" (21:23). Thus even the annex of the Gospel discloses the centrality of the Kerygmata Controversy to the Evangelist's writing and participation in it. It would be reasonable to assume that another hand other than his own has added the words, perhaps after his death, "Yet Jesus did not say to him that he was not to die" (21:23). But we have already seen that the Urgemeinde did not think of the "Return" in a universal, judgmental sense, but in terms of a particular
return for the elect, which may well be simultaneous with
death as a particular Parousia. Ignoring others, Jesus is
reported to say: "If it is my will that he remain until I
come, what is that to you?" (ἐὰν αὐτὸν θέλω μένειν ἕως ἐρχόμας,
τῇ πρός σέ; 21:23). It has been evident that the
earliest stratum of Urgemeinde Christians considered them­selves to live a "post-resurrection" life, which they believed
would continue until the Lord came for them individually to
translate them, or "take them up", as we have seen.

Whoever made the correction to the annex of the
Gospel, and it is likely that it was by the hand of an
Urgemeinde Christian, it is clear that the author himself,
whether the Apostle John or another, firmly believed in such
an immunity to death, as held by the Urgemeinde. Thus he
often speaks of believers already "having eternal life" and
not "coming into Judgment" but already having "passed from
death to life" (5:24): "Truly, truly, I say to you, he who
believes has eternal life (ὁ πιστεύων ἔχει ζωὴν αἰώνιον , 6:47);
"If any one eats of this bread, he will live forever" (6:51)
and "He who eats my flesh and drinks my blood has eternal
life" (. ἔχει ζωὴν αἰώνιον , 6:54). Immunity to death itself
is clearly implied by the words: "Truly, truly, I say to you,
if any one keeps my word, he will never see death" (Θάνατον οὐ μὴ
θεωρήσῃ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα , 8:51) and "If any one keeps my word,
he will never taste death" (οὐ μὴ γευσται θανάτου εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα 8:52).
Thus regardless of whether Jesus said to the Beloved Disciple,
"you shall not taste death" (which the redactor of the annex
seems to have modified), Jesus often communicated this teach­
ing to his disciples as is evident from the above passages.

On the basis of these and numerous other passages seen above,
it may be assumed that this was a belief commonly held in the
Urgemeinde. It is important to notice that the promise does
not only imply everlasting life, but immunity from death itself: "I give them eternal life, and they shall never perish" (καὶ δίδωμι αὐτοῖς ἀϊωνὶς αἰώνιον, καὶ οὐ μὴ αἵωνται ἐ ἐς τὸν αἰῶνα, 10:28). But, surely, one may ask, does not the Evangelist speak of resurrection on the last day? Indeed, but the point at question is, When did the Urgemeinde (and John) consider the "last day" to be? Thus what John says in answer about the resurrection should not be removed from the eschatological setting in which he placed it: "Truly, truly, I say to you, the hour is coming and now is (ἐρχέται ὥρα καὶ νῦν ἐστὶν) when the dead will hear the voice of the Son of God, and those who hear will live...for the hour is coming when all who are in the tombs will hear his voice and come forth (ὠρα ἐν ἡ πάντες οἱ ἐν τοῖς νεκροῖς ἀκούσειν τῆς ἁγίας αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκπορευόνται, 5:25-8). Mere mention of the resurrection does not pre-suppose the Pharisaic futuristic eschatology. We must ask again, when is the "hour" to which the Evangelist refers? His answer seems to imply a present reality, "the hour is coming and now is" because the decisive event had already occurred, by the time John wrote, in the resurrection of Christ.

All of John's teachings (and those of the Urgemeinde) on immortality (or immunity to death, in its strictest sense) come to a focal point in the raising of Lazarus. Here Jesus has answered directly the Pharisaic teaching about death, universal resurrection and Judgment, with a flat denial of death as the experience of the believer and the positive assertion of the availability of an immunity to death. When Martha says "I know that he will rise again in the resurrection at the last day" (11:24), Martha has not related a Christian teaching, because that she was yet to receive from Jesus. She has presented the commonly held Jewish teaching upon which
the Pharisaic legal ethic rested. Jesus does not speak of a future day of resurrection and wrath, in his answer, but of that which in fact he was, the particular Parousia come to Lazarus. He said: "I am the Resurrection" (ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ἀνάστασις, 11:25). Cyprian and Origen along with the Chester Beatty (p45) papyrus perhaps had reasons of their own for omitting (καὶ ἐγώ καὶ πᾶς ὁ ζῶν καὶ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ οὐ μὴ ἀποθάνῃ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα• 11:25-6). Thus in the Lazarus event, the Evangelist has placed before the reader's eyes a supra-chronological event which the Pharisees said could happen only in the future at the end of time, an event and teaching which confirmed in Urgemeinde Christians the belief in their immortality to death. This significant difference appears to be reflected in the difference between the Evangelist and the writer of the annex to the gospel. The Evangelist grasped this revelation which was later obscured by misunderstanding (οὐ μὴ ἀποθάνῃ) "by no means dies", "shall never die" or simply, "you shall not experience death". In other words, death is the experience of the living, of those who remain, such as Martha, but after the occurrence of the resurrection in Christ, in which the Christian now participates, it is no longer the experience of the believer. When the believer is; death is not. Indeed, Lazarus experienced sickness and pain, but not ultimate death. So Jesus has said of those who keep his word (τάνατον οὐ μὴ θωράσῃ, 8:51) "He will never see death" and this quite simply was the faith of the Urgemeinde. John asks, Are these words of Jesus not enough? When one adds to them all of the
qualifications and speculations of the Pharisees, does not one only add misunderstanding? But even though the Fourth Evangelist thought so, and has made this abundantly clear, the teaching seems to have been modified by the writer of the annex: "The saying spread abroad among the brethren that this disciple was not to die; yet Jesus did not say to him that he was not to die, but, 'If it is my will that he remain until I come, what is that to you?'" (21:23). However this appendage may yet fall within the later Urgemeinde teaching about the particular Parousia for the faithful as we will see presently. If Lazarus' resurrection was a particular resurrection, then to the mind of the Urgemeinde, in Jesus own resurrection the universal resurrection has already occurred by which all mankind is judged and each believer is capable of receiving the gift of eternal life. "And I if I am lifted up out of the earth, will draw all men unto myself" (καί ό ἐὰν ὑψωθῇ ἐκ τῆς γῆς, πάντας ἐλκύσω πρὸς ἐμαυτόν 12:32), but the gift of eternal life is a particular post-resurrection event: "Father, the hour has come; glorify thy Son that the Son may glorify thee, since thou has given him power over all flesh, to give eternal life to all whom thou hast given him (ἵνα πᾶς ὁ διδώκας αὐτῷ δόθη αὕτω ὁ ζωής γωνίαν ἀώνιον). And this is eternal life that they know thee, the only true God and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent" (17:1-3).

In what sense does the Fourth Gospel speak of judgment and life in 5:24-29? As we have noticed, considerable injustice is done to this passage if it is removed from its context in order to infer from its terminology a separate or isolated meaning. That context is, on the basis of Verses 25 and 27 an eschatological one which cannot be detached from the first statements of the Gospel relevant to the Parousia of the pre-existent "Son of God" (μονογενὸς παρὰ παρόντας 1:14), cf. 8:58, which has already occurred, (παράγωγον αὐτοῦ
He came to his own home, and his own people received him not" (1:11). Moreover, he
(ἐσκόμνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν, 1:14) as one (πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἁπαθείας, 1:14). This pre-existent Son of God is the one to whom John bore
witness (1:15), whose coming is described in the Synoptic Gospels as the imminent coming of the Kingdom of God and Judgment, but in the Fourth Gospel, particular judgment on behalf of all men (1:29): "And this is the judgment (ἀυτή
de ἐστιν ἡ κρίσις) that the light has come into the world, and man loved darkness rather than light" (3:19).

In 5:24-29 the Son of God is linked directly with the Son of Man for the first time: "For as the Father has life in himself, so he has granted the Son also to have life in himself, and has given him authority to execute judgment, because he is (the) Son of Man" (ὁ γὰρ ὁ ἀνθρώπου ἐστιν, 5:27). Because of the context or setting in which the Evangelist has placed this statement, it is impossible to ignore its relationship to the Enoch prophecies regarding the pre-existent Son of Man (En.48:2-3) who will judge kings and put down the mighty from their seats (En.46:5) during the judgment of the world (En.47:3): "And the sum of judgment was given unto the Son of Man" (En.62:27, cf. Jh.5:22,27), which themes have turned up with some frequency in Urgemeinde literature. The Fourth Gospel is no exception and shows itself to be directly in the centre of this current of thought. This particular (ὁ γὰρ ἀνθρώπου) is the subject of John's statement as the one who will "execute judgment" (5:27).

He does not say, 'At one day in the future', but implies that the Day of the Lord is already at hand when he states: "Do not marvel at this; for the hour is coming when all who are in the tombs will hear his (this particular Son of Man's) voice (φωνῆς αὐτοῦ). As Christ became this "voice" to the dead, so, to the evangelist's mind John the Baptist was the
for the living, 5:28. This, by no means can be
construed to imply the Pharisaic future "Day of the Lord",
because of what precedes this statement. "Truly, truly, I
say to you, the hour is coming, and now is ( καὶ νῦν ἔστι
when the dead will hear the voice ( φωνῆς ) of the Son of God,
and those who hear will live" (5:25). Nonetheless, it may
be argued that to what Jesus said regarding the "hour" which
was coming (in his own death, descent into hell and resurrect-
tion) the Evangelist has added the words "and now is", because
by the time of his writing this promised resurrection had
already been brought about. Nonetheless, there can be no
mistaking that the communication to the dead and resurrection
to which John refers, when he says ( καὶ νῦν ἔστι
has already come about. It seems improbable that he is merely
referring to the resurrection of Lazarus. At least not when
Jesus himself is spoken of as the fulfilment of the resurrect-
tion to which every Pharisee in Israel looked: "I am the
resurrection ( Εγώ εἰμι η ἀνάστασις and the life ); he who
believes in me, though he die, yet shall he live, and whoever
lives and believes in me shall never die" (11:25).

What then does the Fourth Evangelist imply by the
term "at the last day"? In view of the Gospel's whole
presupposition and orientation to the Parousia which has
already come about, in the coming of Jesus Christ, and its
substantiation of the Urgemeinde teaching that the Judgment
has already occurred, in the Passion of Christ who has been
judged on behalf of mankind (1:29, 10:39, 12:31), it is clear
that not all early Christians thought of the "last Day" and
Universal Judgment as identical events. In no instance, in
the Fourth Gospel does the ( ἐσχάτη ἡμέρα ) imply a general
or universal resurrection, except perhaps Martha's notion
which is immediately corrected by the words of Jesus (11:24).
In each instance the "last day" is a particular phenomenon. Every one (πᾶς) "believing in him (πιστεύων εἰς αὐτόν) may have eternal life, and I will raise up him (αὐτόν) in the last day" (6:40). In this instance, the particular one raised is not even dead, but is nonetheless raised or Translated to God's Kingdom. So it is a particular raising in this chapter (6:44): "and I will raise him" (also in 6:54 and 12:48). Even the particular things ("all" πᾶν) which have been given to Jesus, he will raise up "I shall not lose any of it but shall raise it up" (μὴ ἀπολέσω εἰς αὐτὸν, ἀλλὰ ἀναστήσω αὐτὸ, 6:39). However, these particular "things" cannot be construed to mean inanimate objects because he says of these particular (πᾶν) given to him by the Father that they will "come" (κυρίως ἐμοὶ) to him and "him who comes to me (τὸν ἐρχόμενον πρὸς με) I will not cast out" (6:37). Likewise, it is these particular ones (πᾶν ὁ δέσῳ ὅτι Μοῖ) given him by the Father which he says he will not lose, but "raise up" (ἀναστήσω) in verse (6:39). It is likely that the Fourth Evangelist's intention is in harmony with the Urgemeinde teaching at this point, that Jesus (the son of God) returns as a particular parousia to specific believers, as πᾶν is used in 6:37 (who already have the gift of immortality), to Translate or raise them to his Kingdom. A surprising development of the Fourth Gospel is that this may even include the "one coming to me" (τὸν ἐρχόμενον πρὸς με, 6:37) thus in the case of the particular believer this "coming" may be simultaneous with death, as in the case of the Beloved Disciple (21:23). This seems to provide an alternative explanation for the difference of opinion expressed in the annex of the Gospel. But in saying, "If it is my will that he remain until I come, what is that to you?" (21:23), the particularity of this coming or parousia (with a small letter) is underscored. Insofar as
these words about the disciple who would not perish were
addressed directly to the Apostle Peter by Jesus, they
strongly suggest that this coming or parousia is not only not
universal, as far as mankind as a whole is concerned, 
but that when it comes it is also not necessarily even inclus­
ive of all of the Apostles, at least at the same time. We 
may infer its meaning to be that this particular parousia would come differently to each disciple at a different time, 
perhaps at the point of death, as in the case of Stephen. 
It need not imply that any Apostle, nor any believer for that
matter, has ever tasted death, as the writer of the appendix 
has reflected, "What is that to you?", in the words of Jesus' searching question to his hearers.

This evidence has shown that the Fourth Gospel not only agrees with the Immortality Kerygma and the Parousia teaching of the Urgemeinde, and therefore must be placed within the Urgemeinde current of Christian thought, but demonstrates that the Evangelist has developed many of their distinctive themes. Proof that the Evangelist was involved in the Kerygmata Controversy, as such (and not merely aware of it), is his account of the division, which he suggests was caused, as early as Jesus himself among the disciples over the question of immortality. The words which sparked off the dispute were: "he who eats my flesh and drinks my blood has eternal life" and "he who eats this bread will live forever (6:53-58). Indeed, a teaching which stands in sharp contrast to the futurist implications of the "covenant" and "until that day when I drink it new in the Kingdom of God" in the Synoptic Gospels (Mt.14:25, Mt.26:29, cp.Lk.22:20). This, the discip­les said, "is a hard saying; who can listen to it?" (6:60). But aiming directly at the immortality or resurrection of the body controversy, John or, perhaps Jesus himself responded:
"Do you take offence at this? Then what if you were to see the Son of Man ascending where he was before" (€αν σοι δειτε_ 
τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀναβαίνοντα όπου ήν το πρότερον; ). It is the Spirit that gives life, the flesh is of no avail
(τὸ πνεῦμα ἐστίν τὸ ζωοποιοῦν, ἡ χάρι τοῦ οὐδέν, 6:61-63).
The Evangelist indicates that when a few of the disciples
drew back on this question, Jesus challenged Peter if he also
was going to desert him, Peter answered: "Lord to whom shall we go? You have the words of eternal life" (6:68). Thus
we may be certain that if the immortality resurrection dispute
was at its peak in the time of the Fourth Evangelist, it was
a question which had long divided Jews and one which may have
caused the first major division among Jesus' first followers.
It is indeed, not an unrelated issue to which the Fourth
Evangelist refers when he relates: "Some of the people said,
'This is really the prophet', Others said, 'This is the Christ',
But some said, 'Is Christ to come from Galilee?'" (7:40).
John continues: "So there was a division among the people
over him" (7:43). The question again was the basic one of
the Kerygmata Controversy, If Jesus was the expected Prophet,
then the resurrection and Judgment was yet to occur, as a
future possibility; if Jesus was indeed the Christ, then the
resurrection and Judgment of mankind has already occurred in
him and believers already had access to the gift of everlasting
life and immunity to death, as John has quoted the teachings
of Jesus. The question of present immortality or future
resurrection impinged upon the question of Parousia or future
Parousia.

The Fourth Gospel and Urgemeinde History:

The special traditions which the Fourth Gospel
presents relevant to the Urgemeinde and its history seem to
have suffered considerable violence by the polemical theories of the past which have sought to minimize or reinterpret the historical relationship which clearly exists in this gospel between the Urgemeinde and the disciples of John the Baptist. Recent discoveries have shown the Fourth Gospel to be very much within the Urgemeinde tradition and to contain special historical data of its own.

It is common knowledge that the Fourth Gospel goes beyond any of the other Gospels in its presentation of details from the period in the life of Christ when he stood in closest relationship to John the Baptist. On this ground, it can be shown that the Fourth Gospel stands closer to the historical traditions of the Urgemeinde than any of the other Gospels. Unlike the other gospel writers, the Fourth Evangelist has not attempted to conceal Jesus' historical relationship to the disciples of John the Baptist and the uniquely eschatological and Kerygmatic nature of their mission. This is immediately apparent in the Cleansing of the Temple, the command to Nicodemus to be born again of water and Spirit and John's unique announcement of Jesus as the "Lamb of God". Only the Fourth Gospel shows the disciples of Jesus and the disciples of John the Baptist to have baptised and worked side by side (3:22-24). The so-called dispute to which the Tübingen School has often called attention was, when it arose, with an unnamed "Jew" (quite probably a Pharisaic Christian who challenged them regarding the eschatological baptism). Tübingen has, perhaps, rightly pointed out that this may well have been a controversy within the ranks of Christianity, but the significance of this fact and the fact that the Evangelist has presented John as a "friend" of the bridegroom, should not be minimised (3:29); nor should the eschatological implications of the "voice" over which the bridegroom rejoices (3:29). The Evangelist has attributed an Urgemeinde perspect-
ive to the eschatology of John, when he reports him as saying, "He who believes in the Son has eternal life" (3:26); and that already, "the wrath of God rests upon" those who do not (3:36). We have noticed that from the non-Urgemeinde perspective of the other Gospels, the relationship of John and Jesus is seen as a sort of missionary or prophetic succession such as the Elijah-John-Jesus sequence argued recently by C. Kraeling and J. A. T. Robinson and J. Jeremias. With the exception of the various instances in which Luke has sought to reconcile these differing Kerygmata, it might be said, generally, that the Synoptic Gospels have portrayed the relationship of John to Jesus as a prophetic Elijah-Elisha succession, rather than any simultaneous working relationship in which they laboured side by side with similar purposes. This is not the case with the Fourth Gospel. Here, Jesus is unmistakably seen as a contemporary and co-worker with the disciples of John. He not only appears to have preached at the same time that John did but also in the same region (3:22-24). A more intimate relationship seems to be implied by the words: "he who was with you (ὁ δὲ μετὰ σοῦ) beyond the Jordan, to whom you bore witness (ὁ δὲ μεμαρτύρηκας 3:26). The close and supporting relationship of John and his disciples to Jesus (1:35ff), as well as the whole Kerygmatic perspective of the Fourth Gospel, gives less credibility to the "Elijah-John-Jesus" prophetic succession theories, and more credence to a direct historical relationship of John and Jesus. It is a temptation to impose on the Fourth Gospel the view of Jesus found in 2nd Century AD Gnostic, Apocalyptic and Ebionitic literature which tends to portray him as the eschatological Prophet who came to abolish sacrifice as a returning Moses, and new lawgiver, the true forerunner of the new age in stead of John the Baptist. Such a view of
Jesus as the forerunner may be seen in the Pseudo-Clementines, Odes of Solomon, and the Gospel according to the Hebrews. This literature, along with other later Second Century (AD) documents, demonstrates that it was a later Pharisaic, rather than earlier Urgemeinde, tendency to establish a prophetic succession for Jesus in terms of the reincarnation of the Old Testament Prophets from Adam. The Fourth Gospel thus reveals its orientation to the earlier Urgemeinde traditions by its relative freedom from such notions. The use which it makes of Old Testament and Enoch literature thus differs radically from the Synoptic Gospels and shows its close relation to the Urgemeinde whose positive doctrines it openly espouses.

Beyond these Kerygmatic considerations, it might be well to ask a final historical question. To what extent can a direct relationship be established between historical traditions of the Fourth Gospel and the Urgemeinde? Let us review the facts.

a) Only the Fourth Gospel shows with unmistakable clarity that the first disciples of Jesus were, first, disciples of John the Baptist (1:29ff, esp.1:35-37, 3:30). This is a fact which the "foreign influence" and "polemic theories" must either ignore or explain by means of a schism between John and Jesus along the lines of an anti-Gnostic or an anti-Temple movement inaugurated by Jesus.

b) The Fourth Gospel alone has accurate and intimate Urgemeinde information relevant to Bethany, which it mentions by name as the place where John the Baptist was interrogated by the Pharisees who asked whether he was the Prophet or the Christ (1:24ff). It once was assumed that the Bethany, known to John the Baptist, must have been a mysterious
city on the other side of the Jordan, which has since disappeared without a trace, as W.F. Howard and C.H.C. MacGregor once suggested. Although that view is not without precedent in the history of interpretation, neither Origen, in his day, nor archeologists in our day have ever been able to find a trace of it. Therefore, there are only superficial grounds for holding that this reference is to a unique town by the name of (Βηθαρία) as some (L2, syhmg) manuscripts have corrected. The earliest manuscripts of (A B C W N Θ) support (Βηθανία) which strongly suggest the familiar Bethany of Jh.12:1, Mk.11:11 and Lk.10:38. It is clear that the home of Lazarus and the place where John baptised were two distinct places (Jh.10:40, 11:1). The confusion, therefore, appears to hang on the use of (πέραν) to imply "beyond", which is not its only meaning. After verbs of 'going' and 'walking', (πέραν) can signify 'beyond', 'across to or from' or 'to the other side of'. But with other verbs, particularly those with a form of (εἰναι and γίνομαι), as in the case of 1:28, it simply means 'across from', 'opposite', or 'over against'. This strongly suggests that πέραν should not be translated 'beyond'. The Fourth Evangelist tells us quite precisely, by means of this grammatical structure, that Bethany was the Bethany 'opposite to' the place where John Baptised on the Jordan. Such a view would also substantiate the place where John baptised as the Western bank of the Jordan just above the point (in his day) where it empties into the Dead Sea. The well known "Bethany" of John 11 and Mark 11, has been long known, since the Fourth Century, by the name "El 'Azareyeh" or "The Place of Lazarus", a village on the outskirts of Jerusalem which is but twenty minutes walk out into the hills from the Temple of Jerusalem. This village is indeed opposite to (across the hills and not across the river) from the place where John was baptising. Thus the Fourth
Gospel is uniquely and accurately orientated to the original historical setting of the Urgemeinde, particularly to the Place of Lazarus and the sites well known to the disciples of John the Baptist.

c) In view of the special emphasis which the Urgemeinde placed on baptism as a participation in the resurrection of Christ, the Fourth Gospel also reveals a singular pre-occupation with the names of pools and places of baptism. In addition to the scanty reference to such places in the other Gospels John mentions with definite familiarity (ἡ προβαλεισμένη κολυμβησα, 5:2) This pool (called "Bethesda"), has been held by some to be a fictitious place name until it was recently turned to light under the spade of R.de Vaux beneath some thirty-five feet of debris, complete with porticos, near the East gate of Jerusalem. So also, only John mentions the pool of (Σωλών, 9:7), and the (χεμαράρου τοῦ Κεδρών) brook of Kedron (18:1). To Shammaite Christians, to whom baptism was significant and indeed, the means of participation in the resurrection of Christ itself, these pools and rare places of water would be particularly important and long remembered as 'sacred sites. Only the Fourth Gospel gives specific mention of Aenon near Salim (3:23) as a distinct place where John baptised. Some time ago, W.F.Albright repudiated, at least to the satisfaction of most archeologists, the oft mistaken notion of this citation as, "Salumais South of Bethesan", in the Jordan Valley. He did this by establishing by means of archeological proof that the remains of Salem lay Southeast of Nablus and Shechem. Near this Salem is the modern city of Ainun (in Aramaic "Little Fountains") next to the head waters of Wadi Farah, whose many springs confirm the "much water there" of the Fourth Gospel. Again the Fourth Gospel has been borne out for its Urgemeinde setting and accuracy of topographical description. For this reason
Albright has consistently defended the references and early names found in the Fourth Gospel, which the other gospels either avoid or render by vague generalisation. 613 We are interested, here, not only in the familiarity with Urgemeinde traditions which the Fourth Evangelist demonstrates in his presentation, but also with the significant bearing which his special historical data have on the Gospel's kerygmatic point of view.

d) Another piece of special tradition, contained in the Fourth Gospel, is its mention of a "band (of attendants)" interpreted 'manipulus', or 'cohort' which Judas obtained from the Pharisees and chief priests, fully armed, to arrest Jesus (18:3ff). Those who have tended to reject the historicity of the Fourth Gospel, have described this incident as an impossibility. Nonetheless, Mark and Matthew say they were "a great multitude with swords and staves, from the chief priests and elders of the people" (Mt.26:47, Mk. 14:43) although Mark adds "Scribes" to the crowd. Luke simply says "a multitude" (Lk.22:47). John's account may not be as improbable as it first appears. In the preceding chapters we examined the policy of the Pharisaic Party, after its rise to power in the time of Alexandra, to annihilate its Sadducean opposition whenever and wherever occasion presented itself. This procedure was facilitated by the fact that Herod soon replaced Sadducean priests with his own hand picked high priests (Boethusians). Their brutality was entirely consistent in their treatment of John the Baptist, of Jesus and of St. Stephen. From Josephus we have learned that the high priest's mercenary troops included Germans, Thracians and Gauls (Ant. xvii.198, B.J.1.672, ii.364,376-377,iii.4, vi.331). Their connivance with Roman soldiers has become legend in the New Testament (Mt.27:27-31, 28:12). Mark states that they called together a "whole battalion" (τὴν σπείραν), Mk.15:16, for
the purpose of tormenting Jesus. Josephus informs us that Herod Antipas prepared armour for seventy thousand men, just previous to this time, in a plot to overthrow his brother Agrippa (Ant.xviii,17.2). Because the influential Scribes (Pharisees), who once deprived Archelaus of a kingdom, were on the side of Agrippa, it is almost certain that they would have also had an army at their disposal. Beyond the greater accuracy in detail which the Fourth Gospel preserves, is the significant fact that again this gospel has preserved a detail which only Sadducaic Christians would want to remember.

e) The contemporaneousness of the disciples of Jesus and the disciples of John is again underscored by the unique Johannine detail: "For John had not yet (οὔπω γὰρ) been put in prison", (3:24). The statement rather precludes any cause-effect relationship by which Jesus could be thought of as a prophetic replacement for John the Baptist (albeit with a double portion of the Spirit). It is generally said to be a correction of the Synoptic accounts rather than a simple statement of historical fact, which the others have expanded into a "Prison Narrative". Although we are more interested in the fact that the Evangelist wishes to imply a close working relationship between these disciples, interrupted only by John's imprisonment, rather than a polemical difference of opinion, it nonetheless may well be asked, Are there not some grounds for holding that the Johannine statement is original? The context of the remark certainly presupposes greater familiarity with the local geography where the disciples of John worked and the kinds of issues and questions which they discussed in private. The Fourth Gospel is historically more convincing in this respect than Mark's cause and effect generalisation (with its succession implications): "Now after John was arrested, Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the gospel of God, and saying, 'The time is fulfilled, and the Kingdom of God is at hand'" (Mk.1:14-15). In the Synoptic
accounts, Jesus himself is presented in the role of the forerunner. Those who maintain that the Johannine narrative is a correction of the others, have the difficult task of providing an inclusive explanation why, with the Synoptic Gospels in front of him, the Evangelist should omit the institution of the Eucharist with its future Kingdom connotations as over against a present participation in the body and blood of the resurrected Christ. Any solution cannot be considered adequate unless it also explains the Fourth Evangelist's omission of the baptism of Jesus and the infancy narratives. On the other hand a comparison of the two "imprisonment accounts" does appear to disclose two vastly differing Kerygmata. In the Matthean imprisonment account, doubt regarding Jesus' precise role is reflected in John's words from prison: "Are you he who is to come, or shall we look for another?" (Mt.11:2-3). In the evasive answer which follows, Jesus is cast in the role of an Elisha who cleanses lepers, raises the dead, etc. (11:5ff). And so the prophet role is underscored throughout the account (11:9, 12ff). This includes the words of Jesus: "We piped to you, and you did not dance; we wailed, etc." (11:17); "The Son of Man came eating and drinking, and they say, Behold a glutton, etc." (11:19). Matthew's narrative here is identical with that of Luke (Lk.7:18ff). In the Fourth Evangelist's only mention of John's imprisonment, there is no doubt expressed concerning Jesus, nor any hint of speculation about Jesus' possible role as a Messianic Prophet. His identifying remark, "For John had not yet been put in prison" (3:24) is immediately followed by, "No one can receive anything except what is given from heaven. You yourselves bear me witness, that I said, I am not the Christ, but I have been sent before him" (3:27), and, "He who comes from above is above all; he who is of the earth
belongs to the earth, and of the earth he speaks; he who comes from heaven is above all" (3:31). These radically differing imprisonment narratives; one expressing doubt, the other certainty; one a Messianic forerunner, the other a heavenly Son of Man and pre-existent Christ, clearly distinguish the Synoptic Gospels expectation of a future Parousia from the Fourth's conviction that it has already come.

f) Attention has already been called to the discrepancy between the liturgical calendars used by the Fourth Gospel and the Synoptic Gospels. We are not concerned here with the simple fact that the Synoptic Gospels, in their accounts of the Last Supper and Crucifixion, have failed to use the calendar, which was in all probability "authentic" and was most likely to have been used by the original circle of Jerusalem Christians. Space does not permit a presentation of all the arguments for and against the Johannine dating of the Last Supper and Crucifixion which was a Kerygmatic and historical, rather than simply a literary or textual problem, as is manifest in the emergence of the Quartodeciman controversy. Numerous arguments relevant to the different dates of the Last Supper have been collected by others.615 But we are concerned with the relationship of this fact to the Urgemeinde teaching that in the Passion of Jesus, the resurrection, gift of immortality and Judgment on behalf of all mankind has become a reality. In this respect the Fourth Gospel stands alone for its singular use of the expression, (ιδετο άμνος του θεου ο αιρων την άμαρτιαν του κοσμου ) "Behold, the Lamb of God, who takes away the sin of the world" (1:29). John alone stresses the fact that Jesus was crucified on the day of "Preparation for the Passover; it was about the sixth hour" (about noon, the Passover celebration beginning in the evening of that same day, Jh.19:14-18). There can be little
doubt that the Evangelist saw the crucifixion as a Passover and Judgment on behalf of mankind when he adds to Caiaphas' words: "It is expedient for you that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation should not perish". This is followed by the editorial remark: "He did not say this of his own accord, but being high priest that year he prophesied that Jesus should die for the nation, and not for the nation only, but to gather into one the children of God, who are scattered abroad" (11:50-52). On the other hand, Mark merely states: "And the chief priests and the scribes were seeking how to arrest him by stealth, and kill him; for they said, 'Not during the feast, lest there be a tumult of the people'", (Mk.13:1-2). It was clear to Matthew, however, that Jesus himself was no such sacrifice because he ate the feast himself: "Now on the first day of Unleavened Bread the disciples came to Jesus, saying 'Where will you have us prepare for you to eat the Passover?'...When it was evening, he sat at table, etc." (Mt.26:17-20). So Luke says: "I have earnestly desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer" (Lk.22:15). By no means does the Lucan account suggest a decisive sacrifice on behalf of mankind and judgment. It immediately shifts the focus of attention to a future coming of the Son of Man: "For I tell you that from now on, I shall not drink of the fruit of the vine until the Kingdom of God comes" (Lk.22:18). Luke's attention is turned to a future kingdom where the disciples shall rule and, "may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel" (Lk.22:30). Regardless of which differentiation in calendar reckoning was originally employed, the slight difference in dating, nonetheless, implies a vast difference in Kerygmatic perspective between the Fourth and the Synoptic Gospels.
From IQS i.4-15, CD iii.14-15, vi.18-19, xii.3-4, it can also be learned that one of the main objections of the Qumran Covenanters, who observed the ancient (Sadducaic) calendar of Jubilees and Enoch, was the practice of the (Pharisaic) administration in Jerusalem of constantly changing feast days. This they did by the introduction of a moveable calendar (lunar) which altered the fixed days of worship in the old. One of the fruits of the Qumran manuscript discoveries has been the convincing arguments put forth by A. Jaubert and E. Vogt, that the essential difference between the Synoptic and Johannine dating of the Last Supper as Passover meal was caused, among other things by a discrepancy in calendars. However, once the significance of the difference in calendars is acknowledged, it is difficult for textual theories to move much beyond that important point. For example, it is said that it cannot be known with absolute certainty whether a specific date in any of the Gospels corresponds to the Pharisaic or Sadducaic Calendars. Jaubert has maintained that the Last Supper took place on a Tuesday rather than Thursday in Holy Week on the basis of the Jubilees Calendar, which she believes to correspond with the Synoptic Gospels. And indeed, whether the 14th of Nisan fell on a Tuesday in the Jubilees Calendar, or on a Friday, as the Fourth Gospel indicates, cannot be known to any degree of certainty until it is known when the Jubilees Calendar came into existence and how this 364 day calendar reconciled itself with the actual solar year. How the intercalation took place, no one knows. Over a period of several hundred years it would indeed become a formidable problem, if it were supposed that it was not done. Jaubert's thesis has been criticised by Morgenstern, who maintains that it is indeed impossible to assert that the Jubilees Calendar began its first day on a Wednesday, simply because Wednesday was the fourth day in creation when the stars
and moon were made. 619  George Ogg has presented the objection that the author of Jubilees appears to reckon his year from the day when Adam and Eve started to dwell in the Garden of Eden (3:15). "Eve entered the garden on the 18th day after she was made (3:9) and she was made on a Friday. Therefore, the first day of the first year of the Jubilee was on a Tuesday". 620  If critics have failed to see why the Tuesday of Passion week must of necessity have been the 14th of Nisan according to the Jubilees Calendar, it is perhaps not an important fact; at least not as important as the fact that two differing systems of calendation did exist during the time of the Urgemeinde and that there is more than an abundance of evidence for associating the Fourth Gospel with the Urgemeinde and the Sadducaic practises of the Urgemeinde.

The bulk of the historical and Kerygmatic evidence examined here clearly places the Fourth Gospel in the company of Enoch and the Qumran literature which quite naturally includes matters of dates and calendars. It is certainly in this company, along with the other Urgemeinde literature, as far as its teachings on immortality and the Parousia are concerned.

Conclusions Regarding the Urgemeinde Character of the Fourth Gospel's Special Material:

It should now be apparent that one of the unique characteristics of the Fourth Gospel is the Urgemeinde character of the "special" material which it contains; that is, the information and data not included in the Synoptic Gospels. While it is true that the Fourth Gospel omits the infancy cycles, the baptism of Jesus as well as the Eucharistic formularies found elsewhere, we have already observed that it discloses its originality by its larger amount of detail concerning the Urgemeinde, not found elsewhere. We have seen
that the Fourth Gospel has not viewed the first disciples of Jesus from a distance as have the other Gospels. Nor has the Evangelist relied on Old Testament typological analogies and prophecy for his authority, as a substitute for what he presents in the form of first hand eye-witness accounts of what has already taken place as historical event. In his special material, the Fourth Evangelist has uniquely pointed out the origin and close relationship of Jesus' first disciples to John the Baptist, who preached the imminent Kingdom of God.

Unlike the Synoptic Gospels, the Fourth Evangelist has been less intent to prove that Jesus' authority derives from either a prophetic succession via John the Baptist (as the Elijah) or that Jesus is himself the Messianic forerunner, as much as he has been intent on demonstrating that "The Christ is Jesus" (Ἰησοῦς ἔστιν ὁ Χριστός), 20:31, that in him the resurrection and Judgment has occurred, as John has announced. John the Baptist here has no function as a prophetic anointer, but is a witness to an event to which the Evangelist also bears witness (1:19, 32, 3:26). In accord with the Urgemeinde Kerygma, John has been described as one who illuminates that which may be seen, rather than that which is yet to be seen, as a future event, feared or hoped for. He is technically designated as a "voice" (φωνή, 1:23) but Jesus is the "Word" (λόγος, 1:14). The former may include prophecy, but the latter, in John's context, is unmistakably an event. To the Evangelist, Jesus is the occurrence or fulfilment of that which John spake. In no instance, does the Gospel separate "Word" and "deed", (καὶ ὁ λόγος ἐγένετο ἐγένετο), 1:14. To those holding a future Resurrection-Judgment Kerygma the decisive (λόγος) was yet to be revealed; to the Fourth Evangelist, it was already a concrete reality. Thus, to the mind of the Urgemeinde, such a potential "word" as that
envisioned by the Fourth Evangelist would be empty and counterfeit apart from its occurrence. To a hellenised Jew, as well as the Zadokites who considered the word of the Torah sacred, "word" was the highest and noblest function of human existence and thus identical with a man's action. Thus the Fourth Evangelist's view of the "word" as an event which already has occurred is a natural development of the Urgemeinde position.

The main question with which we have been concerned here has not been historical priority or early dating of the Fourth Gospel, as over against the somewhat interpretative and prophetic character of the Synoptic Gospels. The priority of John has recently been defended by several. The abundant factual data and historical character of the Fourth Gospel has been of special interest to us here for the link it establishes between the Fourth Gospel and the main current of Urgemeinde thought, and the light it sheds on its unique Kerygmatic view and distinctive teaching on immortality. The author's obvious intention has been to present an historical account of an event which came to have an even larger significance to the faith of the Urgemeinde, namely, that the Parousia and Judgment of mankind have occurred in the coming of Jesus the Christ and along with his coming, the gift of immortality for all believers (3:16).

In recent times, the special character of the independent material of the Fourth Gospel has often been explained or dismissed in terms of Philonic and Hermetic influences or pan-Hellenistic Gnostic religions. Without admitting any direct borrowing, C. H. Dodd has held that the distinctive character of John (i.e. the special John material) springs from a hellenistic background similar to that of Alexandria. "What has been said here of one (Hermetic)
"libellus" may be said also of the whole body of Hermetic writings. It seems clear that as a whole they represent a type of religious thought akin to one side of Johannine thought without any substantial borrowing on one side or the other."\(^625\) Dodd thus has spoken of "parallels" to Wisdom literature and "similarities" to Philo and the Stoic philosophers, "The opening sentences, then, of the Prologue are clearly intelligible only when we admit that (\(\Upsilon\gammaος\)), though it carries with it the associations of the Old Testament "Word of the Lord", has also a meaning similar to that which it bears in Stoicism as modified by Philo, etc."\(^626\) The uniqueness of the Fourth Gospel has thus most often been held to spring from a necessary apologetic to this Hellenistic "background". Recently Prof. Dodd has defined this apologetic in terms of a type of "rabbinic Judaism" addressing itself to a type of "hellenistic mysticism". He now holds that the Fourth Gospel is "penetrated by two diverse strains of thought, combined in a highly complex unity, the one closely related to rabbinic Judaism, the other equally closely related to the religious philosophy of Hellenism. The Jewish strain is far from being the simple acquaintance with the Old Testament and with the contemporary practice of Judaism which any devout Jew might possess. It implies some degree of Rabbinic learning. Similarly, the Hellenistic strain is no matter of picking up a few clichés from current talk or street-corner propaganda. The mind of the evangelist moves familiarly among the conceptions of "Hellenistic mysticism" and constrains them to his purpose with easy mastery".\(^627\) There is much with which one must agree, regarding the two diverse strains of thought which are evident at various points in the Fourth Gospel, but this investigation has attempted to show that a closer examination is needed of the type of Judaism from which and to which the Fourth Gospel is held to speak.
"Rabbinic Judaism" and "Rabbinic learning" are terms which hardly seem appropriate for a Gospel which is so closely associated with the Kerygma and the type of Jewish Christianity which characterised the Urgemeinde and the church at Ephesus. Not all have agreed on an Ephesian locus for the Gospel. Bultmann's John Commentary, which first came out in 1941, and has since seen many republications, has always placed the Gospel in an Asia Minor stratum of Christianity, but he has generally held that its special traditions have emerged in relation to (and influenced by) the Gnosticism of Mandaeanism and Manicheism of Asia Minor rather than Philonic or Hermetic influences. The position to which this investigation has perhaps had a greater indebtedness than any other; one which in several respects is more cautious than either that of C. H. Dodd or R. Bultmann, is the position maintained by Prof. C. K. Barrett. C.K.Barrett has held that the author (or authors) of the Fourth Gospel was completely familiar with the Old Testament, particularly Apocalyptic and Rabbinic Judaism, but has firmly maintained that its most influential and recognisable background was that of hellenistic Judaism. Nevertheless, C. K. Barrett does not believe that a relationship of literary dependency can be established between Philo or the Mandaean texts and the Fourth Gospel.

It must be concluded that the Religionsgeschichtliche School has not been substantiated in its attempt to portray either the Apostle Paul or John the Baptist as the mediator of Hellenism to Christianity. Nor has it convincingly demonstrated that John the Baptist's "movement" was the syncretising link between the Iranian Mandaean cults or Alexandrine Gnosticism and early Christianity. To the contrary, these suppositions of the School have been shown to be gross exaggerations. Neither can the Fourth Evangelist be
considered the unique mediator of Hellenism or syncretism to Christianity, if the findings of this investigation are taken seriously. It is perfectly understandable why; at a time when the Synoptic Problem first emerged on the New Testament scene, and why; at a time when the historical credibility of the Fourth Gospel was being pushed progressively farther into the background, New Testament research should seek external, far distant and religiously-syncretistic sources behind the Fourth Gospel. Such a view is no longer tenable.

Perhaps one result, which may be expected to follow from this study of Urgemeinde immortality teachings, is an awareness that few background studies and influence theories have taken seriously the Hellenistic character of official Jerusalem Judaism during the last two centuries BC. Fewer yet have utilised to the full the data which are now available relevant to the history of that time as a control for their interpretation of the Fourth Gospel. Fourth Gospel research, until recently, has either ended up with sources and material from a later post-second century AD milieu, or else has ranged far afield from Palestine. In some cases it has done both. One indication that a significant change is about to take place in fourth Gospel criticism is that many such as R. Bultmann, who has shifted his emphasis to a pre-Christian Gnosticism, have modified their theories since the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls. In Bultmann's case it may unfortunately be seen by some as a return to his earlier Gnostic source theory (but with different evidence), in which he held that the prologue of the Fourth Gospel was originally patterned after a Mandaean document. Bultmann, as well as several others, appears to have ignored or overlooked the nature of the Qumran polemic, as an internal struggle with the rest of Judaism, in order that they might claim the Qumran discoveries as evidence for external "Gnostic" influence and syncretism. It is perhaps for this reason that C. H. Dodd has
recently said: "The application of the term "Hellenistic" to the Qumran literature appears to me unilluminating." It is not here intended to minimise the significance of Bultmann's extensive and useful writings on the Fourth Gospel, particularly his general thesis that Johannine Christianity had access to earlier strata of Christian tradition than Synoptic Christianity, despite its later composition and publication. With this there is much to agree.

When the special material and the Immortality Kerygma of the Fourth Gospel are compared and controlled by the perspective of pre-Pauline Christianity in the light of pre-70 AD Palestinian history, we find that it is this Kerygma which is illuminated and the special Johannine material which is substantiated by historical and archeological verification. Within the last decade, it has become more and more common in archeological circles to treat the Fourth Gospel with utmost seriousness for its frequent and accurate use of pre-70 names and place-names which archeology is only just turning to light. It is thus in terms of the light which is thereby shed on the religious climate of pre-70 AD Palestine, that recent archeological finds including the Dead Sea Scrolls have already marked a great turning point which has begun to take place in New Testament criticism. Their greatest contribution is to open up once again questions relevant to the history and spiritual climate of Jerusalem and surrounding areas, immediately preceding the advent of Christianity. But most importantly, they have thrown considerable weight behind the arguments for an earlier dating of the Urgemeinde traditions and immortality beliefs which undergird the Fourth Gospel.
E. Summary and Conclusions

The purpose of this chapter is to summarize briefly some of the main conclusions which have come out of this investigation. No attempt will be made, here, to cite supporting evidence. That will be found in its proper place in the text of the thesis. Here, only the main line and the results of the argument will be stated.

It has not been presumed that the question of immortality and resurrection is the only key to the development of early Christian thought; or that the early Kerygmata Controversy, with its differing eschatological points of view provides the only reason for the diverse and distinctive forms in which Christian tradition has been transmitted. There was undoubtedly a variety of other circumstances and forces which influenced the development of early Christian thought; some of these are well known. But the Kerygmata Controversy and question of Immortality were an important issue which, at least to the mind of this writer, has been sadly neglected and intentionally obscured for several reasons. The history of Christian origins has been dominated too long by the inadequate Religionsgeschichtliche view that the Jerusalem Church sought merely to retain the "new wine" of Christianity within the "old wine-skins" of a Jewish ethnic faith until the fall of Jerusalem in 68-70 A.D. Such a view does not do justice to the advanced teachings of the Urgemeinde or the extent of the pre-Christian immortality-resurrection controversy.

From the manuscript sources which are well known and others which only recently have come to light, it has become increasingly clear that the picture of primitive Christianity, which has prevailed since the Religionsgeschichte
debates, has been built largely on the basis of inference. F. C. Baur's view of Christian origins as a conflict between Gnosticising elements in Stephen and Paul against Jewish legalism, has provoked a great deal of discussion to this day, but has not met with universal acceptance. Nor has there been universal agreement on the views of primitive Christianity presented after Baur, Reitzenstein and Holtzmann by Gunkel, Adolf von Harnack and Bultmann, Loisy and Cullmann, all of whom treat what is unique in the Christian phenomenon as its element of "syncretism" or "Gnosticism" in relation to a non-syncretised Judaism. New evidence discloses that such theories both ignore the complicated pre-history of hellenised Judaism, which continued up to the very advent of the Christian Church, and that they seem to have stepped off on the wrong foot in their delineation of the movement which gave rise to Christianity as a type of "Gnosticism" or "anti-Temple" movement among pre-Christian Jews.

We have here examined that complicated pre-history in detail and have found it to shed considerable light on the essentially Jewish, but nonetheless hellenised, nature of pre-Christian official, or normative, Judaism. In paying special attention to the cleavage in pre-Christian Jewish eschatological thought, we have observed two corresponding types of Jewish Christianity which are reflected in the divergent views of immortality and resurrection held by the Urgemeinde and the Pauline Christians. The enigma of Christian origins, or more precisely, the uniqueness of Christian Judaism, was not its "Gnosticism" or even a Christian syncretism versus a Jewish anti-syncretism, but the significant part its proclamations played in the immortality-resurrection controversies which extend from the Kerygmata Controversy of the Early Church back to the Pharisaic-Sadducaic schism, which in turn reached well back to the issues and events of pre-Maccabean times. The main types
of Judaism, which were absorbed and soon began to exert their influence within the ranks of the Early Church, differed widely on several issues, including written and oral tradition, the Temple, its priesthood, baptism, circumcision, but most importantly, conflicting Kerygmata with respect to immortality and resurrection.

Part One: Pre-Christian Jewish Beliefs in Immortality and Resurrection.

In this investigation into the belief in immortality among the pre-Pauline Christians, it has become evident that the basis for the Christian teachings on the afterlife, and the forms of their expression, have come out of the cradle of Judaism during the centuries immediately before Christ. That the view that belief in a general resurrection at the end of time was "essentially Jewish" and thus the original Christian point of view, is an assumption widely held today. Another suggests that immortality was a singularly "Greek" teaching, which was later imposed on Christian thought. Both of these presuppositions have appeared, in the light of evidence, to be gross oversimplifications.

1. Because the "futuristic" eschatology of the Pharisees, with its emphasis on reward and Judgment, appears to have the most in common with present day Christian eschatological teaching, a great deal of attention has been given to the Pharisees. The views of other pre-Christian Jews, particularly the Sadducees, have been most often overlooked and frequently misinterpreted for a variety of reasons. This is in part because first century (A.D.) accounts seem to imply that the Sadducees denied the notion of a future general resurrection, but fail to state what the Sadducees did believe in a positive manner. Much of this misunderstanding springs from Josephus' oversimplifications and comparison with the "three philosophies", 

in which the Sadducees are placed in a class with the Sceptics, and thus thought to have no teachings on the afterlife. The Sadducees, as well as the Essenes, Zadokites and Hasidim have doctrinal as well as historical roots in the priestly Sons of Zadok, and thus should not be considered "another party" or a Jewish "sect". Contemporary documents show that they not only represented authoritative and normative Judaism in the first three centuries (B.C.), but they were traditionally and functionally priests. The dominant position which the Pharisees, including their eschatology, soon gained in the first century (A.D.) and the active censorship which they imposed on Sadducaic literature and tradition, after the Councils of Jamnia (90 A.D.), provides the second main cause of misunderstanding about the Sadducees. This same influence and censorship was also brought to bear on the Urgemeinde, or pre-Pauline Christians. Not only were their literature and traditions systematically obliterated, but by the first century (A.D.), most of the original Sons of Zadok and Sadducaic leaders were either annihilated by various persecutions, or absorbed into other communities, including the Urgemeinde. The Aboth R. Nathan tradition discloses that a sharp division arose (c.25 B.C.) between the Sadducees and Boethusians over questions of eschatology. These latter, who were neither priestly descendants of Zadok nor doctrinally Sadducees, but appointees of Herod the Great, were the so-called "Sadducees" who perfunctorily held offices in Christian times.

2. Documents from the first centuries before Christ, disclose that the Sadducees did in fact have a positive theological position, despite their censorship and lack of influence or representation after 37 B.C. Their positive teachings which can be inferred from the remarks of their enemies, from Josephus, I and II Maccabees and the small number of Sadducaic and Zadokite writings which have survived, disclose that: a) in rejecting the Pharisaic notion of a future universal resurrection
of mankind to Judgment, the Sadducees did not reject particular resurrections of the Prophets and the elect to this life for specific purposes, b) in denying any distinction between body and soul, the Sadducees did believe in the immortality of the Spirit, its pre-existence and return to God, c) instead of a universal resurrection to reward or punishment (for which they found no basis in scripture) the Sadducees held a positive doctrine of "Translation" as a particular "return" of the elect to God.

3. "Polis immortality" differs greatly from the type of immortality which poetry gives to the name of a man, the immortality one has through one's children, or even the notion of immortality which is based on individual genius or creativity. It is the "meaning which a society, or Polis, gives by perpetuating the memory and fame of those who have sacrificed for the sake of that society. Consequently, this "meaning" differed greatly in proportion to the virtues and permanence of the Polis. The memory of such heroes and gods was thus thought to be eternal by virtue of the permanence of such Poleis as a defence, not only against external enemies, but against time. The Jewish Polis was the first to think of immortality in terms of the "meaning" man has in the mind, or memory, of God, as it was God who gave permanence to Jerusalem rather than the heroism or sacrifice of man. Indeed, the Jews were dubious of the permanence of cities built by man. To this extent the immortality of the Jewish "Saints" differed radically from the heroes and immortality cults of other hellenistic Poleis. Third century (B.C.) non-Jewish sources agree that the true notion of immortality originated with the Jews, rather than the Greeks and that it was the Jews who gave to the Greeks their view of the afterlife, rather than vice versa. In the 113 years of Ptolemaic rule of Palestine, there arose a unique type of "Jewish immortality cult" in Jerusalem, which differed greatly from the heroes of the hellenistic Poleis. This consisted of the elect and "Saints" of the Most High and was a
transformation of the idea of immortality beyond anything envisaged by the Greeks.

4. The singular attempt to impose a truly "foreign" immortality cult on Jerusalem by force, during the rule of Antiochus Epiphanes met with failure and tragedy. This brief attempt, characterized by persecutions and the "Abomination of Desolation", provides a sharp contrast to the long-standing Jewish "school of immortality" established by Onias, Jason and the priestly Sons of Zadok. The Zadokite Document, Hodayot, some of the Psalms, Daniel, Enoch and various other sources describe the persecutions of this time against the Sons of Zadok and the martyrdom of the priestly Council of Jerusalem. Some of these documents refer to this martyred Council as a "heavenly Council". Others depict Onias III in a Translated and immortal state alongside the Prophet Jeremiah. The frequent references to this "heavenly Council" in the Qumran Scrolls places them in the historical context of the Sons of Zadok and the martyred Hasidim.

5. The belief in immortality was by no means exclusive of a belief in resurrection in pre-Christian times. There is considerable evidence for belief in immortality and resurrection in Qumran and Maccabean sources, but it cannot be established that resurrection implied anything more than resurrection to this life as was the case with the Prophets. The Qumran documents as a whole shed considerable light on the advanced state of pre-Pauline belief in immortality, particularly their teachings on the "Eternal Council" and the immortality of the "Sons of Heaven" as a present reality.

6. The Book of Ecclesiasticus, which has been classified with Sadducaic writings by the Talmud and placed among the earliest books of Christian instruction (from whence it derives its name) by the Church Fathers, contains indications of a clear belief in the doctrine of "Translation", with all the immortality
connotations that implies. In this connection, it contains a long list of Jewish immortals and Saints, many of whom were translated directly to heaven. It concludes with a hymn of praise to Onias, the Zadokite high priest. This list of Jewish immortals establishes a direct link with the later teachings of the Urgemeinde as seen in Hebrews and Stephen's speech in Acts.

7. The Enoch literature is particularly significant because of the numerous fragments of I Enoch recently found among the Dead Sea Scrolls. It is one of the most important sources for Jewish and early Christian teachings on immortality. Throughout the whole of this work runs a thematic thread of Translation Theology. This literature refers to the Translation of Enoch and the Translated state of the righteous who appear to already enjoy the blessings of immortality (presumably before any general or universal resurrection to Judgment). An older work embedded in the text of I Enoch, called the "Book of Noah", also describes the Translation of Noah.

8. By the time of Christ, there were several views of resurrection or immortality and the afterlife which prevailed among the Jews. These exerted a cumulative, rather than an individual influence on the eschatological teachings of the Early Church. Although the Pharisees became the dominant party in Jerusalem, their greatest influence on Christianity did not occur until after Paul. The Pharisees eventually expanded the Sadducaic belief in the particular resurrection of the elect into a doctrine of future universal resurrection of all mankind at the end of time for the purpose of reward or punishment. The Sadducees held that the body-soul (as a unit) is a death-ridden phenomenon from which the Spirit departs. The Translation of the elect was believed to be a particular and present, rather than a future possibility. In Christian times the Sadducees were a scattered minority, but many Sadducaic priests
were absorbed into the earliest stratum of the Urgemeinde. The Essenes, who appear to have also been banned from Jerusalem, constituted a levitical wing of the large Zadokite priesthood, which was forced into seclusion first in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes and again when the Pharisees came into power. Their view of immortality and the afterlife thus differed little from that of the Sadducees and vice versa. Other groups such as the Herodians, Sicarii, etc., who had no literature of their own, reflected the eschatological outlook of the Pharisees.

Part Two: Sadducaic Immortality Traditions and the Urgemeinde.

1. The relationship of the Urgemeinde teachings on the afterlife to the older Sadducaic and Zadokite immortality traditions is in need of a much closer examination, particularly in view of the fact that the descriptions of the Urgemeinde in Acts were written at a time when the Pharisees were conducting an intensive campaign to obliterate all evidence of the Sadducees and their teachings. The comparative scarcity of evidence which has survived in the New Testament regarding the Urgemeinde is not surprising. The data which have survived indicate that the Urgemeinde did have a great deal in common with the original Sadducees and Sons of Zadok in their reverence for the written Law, their orientation to the Temple, positive priestly outlook, which may be related to the fact that large numbers of priests were absorbed into the Urgemeinde, and the possibility that James, himself, once held the office of high priest. The earliest members of the Urgemeinde not only frequented the Temple but clearly considered themselves to be Orthodox Jews. This does not contradict the fact that they were not actually called Christians until after Paul went to Antioch. Just as there were various types of Pharisees, there were also several different levels and kinds of Sadducees, the last phase of which may well have been reflected in the
"Christian Sadducees". There are thus good reasons for disregarding the old view of Paul as the "helleniser" of Christianity who was always in tension with the "anti-hellenistic" Church in Jerusalem. Little can be said to have been actually anti-Jewish in Paul's mission to the Gentiles and the Jerusalem Church not only included large numbers of hellenised Jews, but strongly resembled the Sadducees in its teachings on immortality, Translation and the afterlife.

2. The position of the Urgemeinde in the pre-Christian Jewish immortality-resurrection controversy is illuminated by the trial of Peter and John in Acts (4:2ff).

The Urgemeinde Apostles were censured because of their eschatology rather than their being Christians. In their proclamation that the resurrection had already taken place, in the case of Jesus, they contradicted the popular Pharisaic belief that the resurrection was both a future and a universal phenomenon. The position of the Urgemeinde thus was close to the Sadducean view of resurrection as an earthly and particular phenomenon which was entirely compatible with belief in immortality and the doctrine of Translation. In view of the side which the Urgemeinde seems to have taken in this controversy, newer exponents of Religionsgeschichte, even Professor Cullmann himself, perhaps are somewhat one-sided in their assumption that resurrection was the sum and substance of the Christian Kerygma. That this problem became an internal "Christian" controversy is seen in Paul's conflict with Urgemeinde Christians at Corinth, who firmly believed Paul to be "misrepresenting God", the Colossians, the Ephesians as well as Paul's strained relations with the Jerusalem Church.

3. Stephen's vision of the Translated Christ points to a controversy earlier than the interrogation of Peter and John. It comes from a time when visions, as such, (including the Shekinah in the Temple) were considered by the Pharisees to be punishable by death. Peter's speech, by contrast, depicts Christ as the resurrected Messianic Prophet which, apart from
its timing, is not out of harmony with the Pharisaic view of a resurrection at the end of time. Stephen, on the other hand, saw a "vision" of the Translated and exalted Christ at the right hand of God as the Messianic Son of Man. Stephen's vision cannot be called "deviation Judaism" nor did it have anything in common with the Pharisaic view of Fate or "divine plan" of history. It was nothing less than the Urgemeinde Kerygma with its belief in a present immortality and the particularity of the Parousia.

4. Luke's handling of the Stephen and other Urgemeinde traditions does not fail to disclose his own theological position as a reconciliation of these differing Christian Kerygmata. His task was thus not simply that of a historian piecing together documentary and historical traditions, but that of a theologian who set about to solve a difficult theological dilemma and has, in effect, reconciled two Kerygmata. The two Kerygmata which confronted him were: a) the Urgemeinde Son of Man Kerygma, which announced the imminent coming of the Kingdom of God, believed in present immortality, and interpreted John the Baptist to be the coming Messianic Prophet, and, b) the Pauline Kerygma, which announced a future Parousia and resurrection at the end of time and transferred the role of Messianic Prophet from John the Baptist to Jesus, who was yet to return as the Son of Man with the power of God. Luke's own theological solution was to particularise both of these teachings. Death for the Christian is both a particular Eschaton and a private Parousia which is both accomplished and imminently future in nature. Luke has described this as both a particular and subjective phenomenon. However, Luke's reconciliation is not always complete, as is seen in his two Ascension (Translation) narratives in the Gospel and Acts. The Gospel Ascension, which reflects a Temple milieu, is greatly toned down in Acts perhaps because of the present feeling
against visions, Sadducaic eschatology and the fact that the
Pharisaic purges of Jamnia were already in progress by the time
of its writing.

5. The Epistle to the Hebrews has not only retained a
traditional list of Jewish immortals, but has applied the
doctrine of Translation, articulated by Enoch and Ecclesiasticus,
directly to Jesus. Thus, in the tradition of the Urgemeinde,
it has applied the expectations of the Prophets to present events
and speaks of Judgment as an accomplished fact, the Kingdom of
God as a present reality and Jesus as the pre-existent Christ
who was more than the coming Son of Man, but the Son of God and
thus the promised Parousia event. In announcing that the
Judgment has already occurred, Hebrews does not deny resurrec-
tion, as such, but thinks of it in the particular Urgemeinde
sense. Thus its author must explain that the heroes of faith
have "not chosen to return to this life". It does not deny
the "return" of Christ, but because the Judgment is accomplished,
the pre-existent Son of Man-Jesus will not return for Judgment,
but for the particular faithful, which should not be construed
as a universal Eschaton in the Pharisaic sense. A comparison
of the Son of Man traditions discloses that the Urgemeinde did
not view the "return" of Jesus as a "vindication" or another
"Judgment" or atonement, but a "visitation" or coming for the
particular faithful. This Urgemeinde Kerygma reflected in
Hebrews, with its announcement that the resurrection to Judgment
has already occurred, is shared also by the Gospel of John and
the Book of Revelation which teaches that for "those who share
in the first resurrection" a "second death" has no power.

6. The Synoptic Gospels differ greatly in their presen-
tation of Kerygma and use of eschatological imagery, but Matthew
reflects a position closest to that of the Urgemeinde point of
view. This is seen in his vivid interpretation of the resur-
rection of Christ as the resurrection foretold by the Prophets:
"The tombs also were opened, and many bodies of the Saints who had fallen asleep were raised, and coming forth out of the tombs after his resurrection they went into the holy city and appeared to many" (Mt.27:51). This theme occurs throughout the Gospel but is particularly evident in Matthew's emphasis on the Judgment as occurring "in this generation" and the afterlife as a selection from this life in a particular manner rather than a general resurrection to this life. To the "visitation" of the Son of Man traditions, Matthew has added a great deal of the imagery of the ancient Book of Noah, with its myriads of angels, etc., which Luke has omitted, and has applied the expectations of Enoch, of which it shows considerable knowledge, to the present events brought about by Christ.

7. Mark, also, has disclosed an awareness of the Son of Man prophecies, reflected in Enoch and widely circulated in the Urgemeinde, and has interpreted these to have been fulfilled in the coming of Jesus. In addition to the fact that Mark speaks of the "vindication" as having occurred, and retains the significant conversations after the appearance of Moses and Elijah on the Mount of Transfiguration in which Jesus himself is identified as the Son of Man (omitted by Luke), Mark (and "Q") have preserved one strand of Urgemeinde tradition which viewed the coming of the Son of Man as a Parousia event.

8. Thus two distinct traditions regarding Jesus as Son of Man appear in the Synoptic Gospels. They have been seen to bear a direct relationship to the Immortality Kerygma of the Urgemeinde and Resurrection Kerygma of the Pauline Christians. The Urgemeinde Kerygma has emerged in these sources accompanied by a firm belief that the resurrection, vindication and Parousia have occurred in the Passion of Christ. It looked forward to a "visitation" on behalf of the particular faithful which was yet to occur and was characterised by its firm belief in immortality as a present reality. Thus the Urgemeinde, clearly, did
not deny the resurrection, indeed it held this event to have already occurred (Mt.27:51), but it did deny the notion of a future universal resurrection to Judgment. Because most of Jesus' Son of Man sayings were pre-resurrection announcements, the Urgemeinde appears to have "validated" them in the form and imagery of the Enoch prophecies. In the process, these traditions were expanded by the Urgemeinde itself into the present form of the "Son of God" traditions befitting a Parousia and consistent with their scriptural position in the long-standing Jewish resurrection-immortality controversies.

Traces of the Resurrection Kerygma are also evident in the Synoptic Gospels, but it is most apparent in Luke where it is placed side by side with the Urgemeinde Kerygma. Luke's intention differs to the extent that he has consciously sought to reconcile the present, particular Urgemeinde Kerygma with the future and general Resurrection Kerygma of the later Pauline Christians. This has resulted in Luke's curious duplications in which he has presented both traditions side by side. These "doublets" differ both in their eschatology and their interpretation of the role of Christ. Luke has included the traditions of both those who thought John the Baptist was the Messianic Prophet and those who viewed Jesus as the Messianic Prophet, or forerunner of the Parousia. Whereas Matthew clearly announced Jesus as the "Son of the Living God", Luke is strangely mute. Luke has counterbalanced the Son of Man Kerygma, in Stephen's speech (in Acts), with Peter's speech, in which Jesus is described as the Messianic Prophet, i.e. the "Christ appointed for you". While Matthew and Mark seem to agree on their Son of Man Kerygma and that "Elijah has come" in John the Baptist, Luke has omitted the Mount of Transfiguration conversations completely and has placed the whole discussion in a different setting - Herod has "heard" that Jesus himself was the "Elijah" or Messianic Prophet. Luke's most obvious effort to reconcile
these two Kerygmatic points of view is his double infancy narratives. But it is also seen in Luke's solution to the dilemma of Christ's identity in the "two careers of Christ". This is evident in Luke's special handling of the "Sign of Jonah" material. To Luke, the "sign" was neither a resurrection nor the preaching of repentance, both of which had been achieved by other Prophets in the past. The unique sign lay in the two careers of Jonah (before and after his "resurrection" to this life) by which Luke particularised the two careers of Christ as Messianic Prophet and the Son of Man (before and after his resurrection) and thus reconciled the two traditions of his sources.

It may be concluded: a) that Luke did not reject the Resurrection Kerygma, but held that John the Baptist was the Messianic Prophet, whose career was taken over by Jesus when John's life was cut short, b) that Luke thus affirmed the Urgemeinde Kerygmic view that Christ's first function was that of the eternal Son of Man, whose purpose was to bring about the Parousia, c) and finally that Luke, by this means, reconciled these two Kerygmata in the two careers of Christ.

9. The Apostle Paul's strained relations with the leaders of the Jerusalem Urgemeinde, in view of the eschatological issues which divided the Church at this time, were not so much rooted in two differing missionary policies as they were in the eschatological and Kerygmic war in which Paul found himself embroiled. His Kerygma, although distinctively Christian, had as its framework a Pharisaic orientation to a future general resurrection and Judgment. Nevertheless, when this eschatological expectation was applied to Christ, it became the distinctive Resurrection Kerygma of the Pauline Christians. It is apparent from I and II Corinthians that this Kerygma in relation to the "other Gospel" was at the bottom of Paul's differences with the Corinthian Church and not simply the moral
issues suggested by Paul's references to Corinth's corruption. Paul's critical modifications of their manner of living to greater freedom and reasonableness, rather than a stricter or alternative "way" suggests that this latter was not the case. The evidence indicates that the Corinthians included large numbers of Urgemeinde Christians who were particularly strict in their manner of living and deeply (if not intensely) spiritual because of their particular views of immortality, Translation and general eschatological outlook.

In his various confrontations with the Urgemeinde Kerygma, Paul has at several significant points reconciled his own point of view to that of the Urgemeinde. Such a case is I Cor.15: "If Christ is preached as raised from the dead, how can some of you say that there is no resurrection of the dead?" Examination of the Corinthian position shows that they by no means denied Christ's resurrection, but clearly abhorred the Pharisaic notion of a general resurrection to Judgment. Paul has reversed the Corinthians' argument: "If there is no resurrection of the dead, then Christ has not been raised", but Paul and the Corinthian Urgemeinde meant two different things by "resurrection of the dead". The Urgemeinde practice of baptism on behalf of the dead (15:29), which is consistent with Hebrews (11:35), does not imply that the Urgemeinde had no hope, but rather that they believed that the decisive resurrection, foretold by the Prophets, had already taken place in the resurrection of Christ. Thus participation in this resurrection by Baptism was participation in a state of immortality. More than any other group, the Corinthian Urgemeinde lived according to their belief in a present state of immortality. While Paul was willing to concede several of his views to the Urgemeinde Kerygma, he refused to agree on the point of the Parousia. While he has referred to him as the "anointed one", in no instance has Paul referred to the earthly Jesus as the "Son of Man" or "Son of God".
Christ's resurrection is not the resurrection, but only the "first fruits" of a universal resurrection which has not yet come. Paul's main argument was that this could not be considered a Parousia because God must "first put down every rule" and that, in his opinion, had not yet happened. All of this was directly opposed to the Urgemeinde teaching which held that "He appeared once for all at the end of the age" (Heb. 9:26). While the Urgemeinde made its deductions on the basis of what had already happened, Paul seems to have consistently used the inductive method to place the resurrection and the Parousia in the future. In reconciling his own position to that of the Urgemeinde, Paul tends both to generalise, what was once particular, and project into the future, what was once considered present. Such is the case in I Corinthians (15:51-52). Here the Urgemeinde doctrine of particular Translation has been rendered into a future universal proposition. To Corinthian ears, Paul's Kerygma would imply that the Ascension of Christ had not yet occurred. In II Corinthians, Paul makes several more concessions to the Urgemeinde Kerygma: "One has died for all, therefore all have died" (5:14) and "From now on, therefore, we regard no one from a human point of view" (5:16). It was thus in reconciling his position to that of the Urgemeinde Kerygma that Paul has given expression to his most significant views on the afterlife.

10. Colossians discloses another situation in which Paul came into conflict with the immortality teachings of the Urgemeinde. The evidence suggests that the Colossians were hellenised Jews and Christians (rather than pagans with strange cults) whose beliefs and practices again strongly resemble the Urgemeinde. The Colossians thought of themselves as already participating in a post-resurrection life of immortality. They believed that by putting off the body of the flesh (in baptism) they were already transferred to the Kingdom of the "Beloved
Son", and "buried with him in baptism" and also "resurrected with him" and consequently already living in a state of immortality. Paul attacked their particular eschatological beliefs by rendering this death into a "moral death". He also criticised their denial of the "fullness of God" in Christ, as over against their belief in the pre-existent Son of God who "participated" in the God-head, as well as their strict allegiance to the written Law. Paul's main concern was the preaching, or Kerygma, at Colossae. His position was that salvation itself is contingent upon faithfulness to the Kerygma as he proclaimed it. That it was again the Urgemeinde arguments with which Paul was dealing is indicated by his words: "If you died with Christ" and "If you were raised with Christ". These were the basic presuppositions of the Colossians as well as the Urgemeinde. Were it not for the tension of this "other Gospel", Paul might never have committed to writing this important letter.

11. The "Ephesian Problem" has usually been analysed as a documentary problem or a historical problem. Thus critics have most often neglected the Epistle's Kerygmatic point of view for these other considerations. It is its Kerygmatic point of view which sheds the most light on its purpose and destination. The Ephesian synagogue consisted mainly of hellenised Jews, who probably were not as some have thought of mixed races, and already included a large number of believers before Paul came on the scene. Luke calls them "Jews" and "disciples" and says that they spoke in tongues and prophesied. One of the bitterest issues between Pharisees (Hillelites) and Sadducees (Shammaites) was the question of baptism. This question, which became an important issue in Ephesus, is inseparable from the Kerygmata Controversy and the questions of immortality and future resurrection. It became more than a dispute between Pharisees and Sadducees in Ephesus when the
Urgemeinde held that in baptism, the believer participates in the resurrection. When Paul and his followers argued that something more than baptism was required for salvation, namely, a type of "spiritual circumcision", this was much more than the old Hillelite position of the Pharisees. The Christians in Ephesus thus disagreed with Paul for two reasons: a) his Hillelite and Pharisaic stance in insisting on the requirement of circumcision (although now a "spiritual circumcision") as the necessary accompaniment of baptism for salvation and, b) his eschatological views regarding the Kingdom of God. As a result of these differences, Paul was forced to withdraw from the larger body of Christians at Ephesus to form a splinter group, beginning with twelve disciples of his own. To the mind of Paul, the former Hillelite now turned Christian, the gift of the Holy Spirit adequately took the place of circumcision, but the requirement of circumcision (spiritual or otherwise) remained the same. As baptism held a central place in the Urgemeinde Kerygma, so "circumcision" as the gift of the Holy Spirit, held a central place in Paul's Kerygma.

Apollos played an important part in the Urgemeinde at Ephesus, but Luke has preserved only Paul's side of the differences between them. However, it can be inferred that if Apollos understood the baptism of John, and Luke says that he did, he understood its important relationship to the imminent Kingdom of God, Parousia and Judgment, which were now fulfilled in the resurrection of Christ. Luke discloses an awareness of this when he says that Apollos powerfully convinced large numbers of Ephesians that the Christ was Jesus. Thus Apollos, as well as the Urgemeinde, knew that John the Baptist was the Messianic Prophet (forerunner) and that in the coming of Jesus was the coming of the Parousia foretold by the Prophets. It follows that the Christians at Ephesus believed that the Kingdom of God had already come upon them with its corresponding promise
12. The Fourth Gospel occupies a unique place in the immortality discussions. An examination of its data discloses that its author both agrees with the Immortality Kerygma and the Parousia teachings of the Urgemeinde and has developed both of them in a significant manner. Consequently this Gospel must be placed at the centre of the Urgemeinde current of Christian thought despite its later writing. Its deeper Kerygmatic purpose is disclosed by its author's statement of purpose: "That you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God and that believing you may have life in his name" (20:31).

Its general Urgemeinde view of immortality is a clearly expressed theme: "He who believes in the Son has eternal life" (3:36) and occurs in numerous passages throughout the Gospel.

Beginning with the very first verse, the Evangelist has described the coming of Jesus as a Parousia event and thus has expressed it in terms of the Urgemeinde and Enoch belief in the pre-existent Son of Man. He views the resurrection of Christ as the resurrection foretold by the Prophets: "The hour is coming and now is when the dead will hear the voice of the Son of God and those who hear will live (5:25). This is the Parousia and the resurrection which "now is" in Jesus Christ (11:25). Thus in contrast to the Pauline Kerygma which continued to look for a future Parousia, Judgment and Salvation, which it hoped one day to see, the Johannine Kerygma looks to that which it has already seen to have become a reality in Christ as the Parousia event. To this it has born witness.

An explanation of the distinctive immortality teachings of the Fourth Gospel in terms of a so-called "polemic" of the Fourth Evangelist against "Gnosticism" or the "syncretising" followers of John the Baptist seems to break down on three main points: a) such a polemical view of the Gospel is
based on what the Evangelist does not say regarding the Jesus-John infancy narratives rather than what he does say, b) it ignores the basic continuity, in Immortality Kerygma and Parousia teachings, between the historical John the Baptist, the Urgemeinde and the Fourth Gospel, c) it fails to take cognizance of the close and friendly relationship between the disciples of John the Baptist and the Urgemeinde about whom the Fourth Gospel has preserved a considerable amount of first-hand data.

The Synoptic Gospels conspicuously omit the Raising of Lazarus and the Parousia saying in which Jesus is said to announce: "I am the Resurrection". The Fourth Evangelist, however, has placed the Cleansing of the Temple at the beginning of Jesus' ministry as a decisive act of Judgment and the Raising of Lazarus at the end of his ministry, as the provocative cause for his arrest, and thus has heightened its eschatological significance. Without attempting to prove or discredit the Johannine chronology of Jesus' ministry, it has been observed that to the Evangelist's mind, the Raising of Lazarus not only demonstrated the nearness of the Kingdom of God, but by the time that he wrote, the resurrection had already occurred. To the Pharisaic doctors, who thought of the resurrection as a future event, Jesus' words and deeds were an outrage and an embarrassment. It is thus concluded that the Fourth Evangelist, and the Urgemeinde Christians whose piety and belief he reflects, firmly believed that all mankind was judged in the Passion of Christ and that through baptism believers now participated in a post-resurrection life of immortality. This unmistakable doctrine of immortality is evident at various levels of the Gospel tradition, with few exceptions, and may be seen in the Evangelist's use of the words: "by no means die", "shall never die", "shall not taste death", "
etc. with their straightforward implication that those belonging to God simply will not "experience death". It follows that to the Evangelist, death is the experience of the living: those who remain such as Martha. If the words of Jesus, as preserved by the Urgemeinde, are taken seriously it is by no means the experience of the post-resurrection believer. Lazarus experienced sickness and suffering, but even his death was not final. As Lazarus passed through death and resurrection, so to the Urgemeinde every Christian believer has experienced the same by participation in the death and resurrection of Christ. Over these the "second death" has no power and it was in this sense that Jesus' teaching, "I am the Resurrection", was taken. However, Jesus' words: "He will never see death" (8:51) were soon distorted by the non-Urgemeinde author of the "Annex" to the Fourth Gospel. In spite of this, and all the forces which sought to censor or modify the thought of the Urgemeinde after the Fall of Jerusalem, the faith of the Fourth Evangelist and the Urgemeinde has yet managed to survive and challenge modern Christians with the implications of Jesus' words. When one adds to them all the qualifications and speculation of the Pharisees, does not one only add misunderstanding?

It is by no means presumed that the conclusions reached by this investigation are final or that they have provided solutions to all the problems which accompany the study of belief in immortality among the pre-Pauline Christians and the resulting Kerygma in which it has been given expression. They are offered here as a contribution to a continuing debate.

315. Schürer, op cit, I.ii.p.273-280, The greatest opponent responsible for much of the censorship of the Sadducees was the Pharisaic scholar, Jochanan ben Zakkai; Jadajim iv.6 describes his campaign against the Sadducees; cf. v.3,6; his actions against Sadducaic traditions are also seen in Sukka iii.12, Rosh Hashana iv.1,3,5; Menachoth x.5, Sota ix.9; the activities at Jamnia are described in Shekalim i.4, Rosh Hashana ii.8-9, iv.1-2, Kethuboth iv.6, Sanhedrin xi.4, Edujoth ii.4, Aboth iv.4, Bekoroth iv.5, vi.8, Kelim v.4, Para vii.6.

316. Matt. 23:2-3, Josephus Ant.xiii.298, the term "Urgemeinde" is used here for the sake of brevity, as in recent discussions, for the "Original Primitive Community of Christians, residing in Jerusalem before the Fall of 70 AD."


318. After the execution of the Sadducaic leaders by Pompey, in 67 BC, and Herod the Great, in 37 BC, the Pharisees rose to almost absolute power in Jerusalem. Danziger states that after Hillel was called by the Pharisees from Babylon to rule in Jerusalem, the succession of Patriarchs ran as follows: Hillel I (30 BC - 10 AD), Simon I (10 AD - 30 AD), Gamaliel I (30 - 50 AD), Simon II (50 - 70 AD), Gamaliel II (80 - 116 AD), Simon III (140 - 163 AD), Juda I (168 - 193 AD), such is the list of Pharisaic "princes" not to be confused with high priests, Danziger, Jewish Forerunners of Christianity, London 1904, p.315, p.271 says: "Rabbi Juda made himself practically master of the national council. He claimed the sole right of selecting its members. He decreed its decisions, and when near his end he named not only his own successor, but also the Judge and Lector. He forbade, in the name of the Law itself, anyone to set up a Messiah henceforth". Midrash Rabba

319. Lk. 18:9-14; Luke only mentions the Sadducees by name once, in 20:27.

320. Zacchaeus may well have been a Sadducee, as well, Lk. 19:1-10; cp. also the many references to Jesus' associations, Lk. 3:12, 5:27, 29, 30, 7:29, 7:34, 15:1, 18:13.


322. Acts 16:3, 22:3, etc.

323. Matt. 23:16, "who say, 'If anyone swears by the Temple, it is nothing; but if anyone swears by the gold of the Temple, he is bound by his oath' "; "Which is greater?", "If anyone swears by the Altar", etc. to the contrary reflects an earlier reverence for the Temple:
Mk.11:17, Jesus' casting out of the money changers cannot be interpreted as irreverence for the Temple, but a deep concern, "My house shall be called a house of prayer" (Mk.21:13, Lk.19:46). The recurring statement: "it is written" discloses a Sadducaic rather than a Pharisaeic orientation to the Written Law.

R. Bultmann, Glauben Und Verstehen, I (1933), p.200 distinguishes between Paul and Jesus in this manner, "Jesus looks into the future, toward the coming reign of God...but Paul looks back. The shift of aeons has already taken place". It would appear that Bultmann has ascribed a Pharisaic position to Jesus and a Sadducaic position to Paul, perhaps because of his view of Paul as a Gentilizer. However, Bultmann has changed his position in "Der Mensch zwischen den Zeiten" p.44, where he quotes Lk.10:18, to the effect that Satan's power is already at an end, and Matt.12:28, Lk.11:20, that by God's power demons are already being cast out, and on the basis of Mk.3:27, sees Jesus as an "interim" figure; C. Bornkamm, has reversed Bultmann's position above, but seems to be in a stronger position when he says, "Unmediated presence is always characteristic of Jesus' words appearance and action, within a world which...had lost the present, since it lived...between past and future, between traditions and promises or threats", Bornkamm, Jesus von Nazareth, p.68 (ET, Jesus of Nazareth. London 1960).

325. Segal, art. in E. B. IV, p.4239 ff; Hölscher, Der Sadduzäismus, p.13.


327. Sextus Empiricus, Outlines of Pyrrhonism I.3 (Loeb) Vol.I.; also, the same theme occurs in his, Against the Dogmatists: "The main types of philosophy are three, dogmatic, academic, and skeptic".


329. See II Aboth de R. Nathan, 37 ed. Schechter; and S. Liebermann's article in JBL, lxxi (1952) 199-202.


340. John 4:2, It is significant that the Pharisees became agitated when it was rumoured that Jesus' disciples were baptising more disciples than John the Baptist. This verse denies that Jesus Himself baptised.

341. Loisy, La Naissance du Christianisme (Paris 1933) Le Origini del Cristianesimo (Turin 1942) p.165, suggests that Apollos was, perhaps, the founder of the Christian Community at Ephesus, a fact which Luke seems eager to suppress; J. Klausner, From Jesus to Paul, p.387, on Apollos, and Brandon, op cit, p.25; H. Lietzmann, The Beginnings of the Christian Church, p.81, says that although Apollos also had received only the baptism of John, he came forth as a Christian Missionary "impelled by the Spirit", p.78ff.

343. This name also occurs in Amos 1: 9-12 "Covenant of Brothers" (μὴν γίνη), a synonym might have been "Brothers of Jesus", cf. J. Priest in J.B.L. lxxxiv (1965) pp. 400ff.

344. Jos. Ant. xviii.1.4, xviii.10.6, xvii.2.4, but this does not imply that there were no Pharisaic priests, or that the Pharisees did not make concessions for the priests.

345. Brandon, op cit, p. 51 ff, holds that Luke supported Peter as the head of the Jerusalem Church and not James and for this reason should be considered pro-Pharisaic in his sympathies. However Peter does not give evidence of being particularly Pharisaic, he is perhaps the only alternative to the now officiating high priest James. Peter seems to have changed his position if Acts 10 is taken seriously.

346. Ant. xviii.17, xiii.297, "The Pharisees have passed on to the People certain regulations not recorded in the Laws of Moses, for which reason they are rejected by the Sadducean group, who hold that only those regulations should be considered valid which were written down (in Scripture) λέγον ἑκεῖνα δεῖν ἡγεῖσθαι νόμιμα τὰ γεγραμμένα, τὰ δ’ ἐκ παραδόσεως τῶν πατέρων μὴ τηρεῖν and that those which have been handed down by former generations (the fathers) need not be observed."

347. Jos. Vita, i.

348. Ezek. 40:46, 43:19, 44:15, 48:11. cp. I Chr. 15:11, 16:39, etc.


351. Eusebius, Eccl. Hist., ed. K. Lake (Loeb 1911-13),
II.i.2-5, xxiii.17; Epiphanius, Haer xxix, ed. K. Holl, in Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhundert (Leipzig 1915-33) or Pat. Gr. t.41, p.396; see also Haer. lxxviii.6-7, Pat. Gr. t.42, p.721; also Ezek. 40:46, states that the "Sons of Zadok" alone among the sons of Levi may come to the Lord and minister to Him.

352. Ibid.

353. J. B. Lightfoot, Epistle to the Galatians (London 1887) p.366, n.1; J. Klausner, From Jesus to Paul, p.279; S. G. F. Brandon, The Fall of Jerusalem, p.52, rejects as false because he believes it to be part of the 4th and 5th century propaganda for Jerusalem as the centre of Christianity; this follows R. Eisler, Messiah Jesus, p.36, 540 and his theory regarding nationalist propaganda.

354. See footnote 318.


356. Ibid, Eusebius reveals that he has read this account of Josephus, Eccl. Hist. ii.23.21-24.


358. Mishna Sanhedrin, vi.4, indicates that casting down from a height before stoning, was a regular injunction of Jewish Law.

359. A. Schlatter, op cit, p.266, points out that as the sanctuary of the Temple court prevented the murder of Paul when he was attacked there, so James was not actually killed within the sanctuary, but thrown down from the high wall of the Temple.

360. Thackw., Josephus, the Man and the Historian, (New York, 1929), p.135; see Hegesippus, as quoted by Eusebius, H. E., II xxii.18, (καὶ ἐνθ' ὑπερασπισμός, πάλιν ὑπερ κεί αὐτούς).

361. Ibid.

363. As was held by R. Eisler, Messiah Jesus, op cit, p.61-2.

364. Ant. xiii.298, xvii.17.

365. Jos. Ant. xv.320, xvii.78, 339, xviii.3; see page 86 above where this is discussed in detail.

366. G. Hölscher, Der Sadduzäismus (Monograph, Oslo 1906) p.7; in Ant.xx.199 Ananus is not said to be a Sadducee, but to "follow the school of the Sadducees"; see also his Vita.39,44: Aboth ii.10, iii.2

367. Schürer, op cit, II.i.197ff.


370. Oesterley, also maintains, "So far as questions of the law are concerned, Christ upholds the Sadducean point of view", p.141, op cit.


373. (יאתמה תונע) cf. CD. i.12, viii.13, which also refers to the adversaries of the community with this term; Brownlee, in the Dead Sea Manual of Discipline, BASOR, Studies Supp. No. 132 (1953), loc cit, holds that this is a reference to the Sanhedrin and that the enemies of the community are Pharisees. This seems reasonable on the grounds of their strong stand.
on the written Torah, and absence of any refer-
ences to the "traditions of the Fathers" or "oral
teachings of the Fathers". 

The word (םֹמ) is used in Ex.16:1,2,- (םֹמ) which the LXX translates (συναγωγή); it is also used as a "crowd of wicked men", Ps. 22:17, Num.16:5, and "swarm of bees" Jud.14:8.


375. See above pp.18-24; Aboth de-Rabbi Nathan, C.5 (a contemporary of Gamaliel II). It is unlikely that this Tosephta was actually written by Rabbi Nathan, see H. L. Strack, Intro. to the Talmud and Mishna, (New York 1959) p.73, Z. Frankel, in Darke ha-Mishna, Hodegetica, in Mischnam librosque cum ea conjunctor, I. Introductio in Mishnam (leipzig 1859) pp.188-189.


377. Acts 1:13ff, with Peter at the head as in synoptics, Mk. 1:19,20, 3:17, Lk.9:51-55; see Brandon, op cit. p.48-49.

378. Although too much weight should not be attached to this unique choice of terms by Luke because Mk.12:18 and Nat.22:23 both make the same generalisation contained in Acts 23:8, without distinguishing between the various types of Sadducees. It is perhaps remarkable that none of the New Testament sources claim that the Sadducees deny Immortality. Their theological position which has been rightly qualified as "in opposition", clearly has been defined in Christian tradition by negation, or in terms of what they opposed.


380. Christ and Time, Ibid.

382. I Cor. 1:12.


384. Ph. H. Menoud, Le sort des trépassés (1945) p.45, quoted by Cullmann, holds that Jesus did not answer the Thief's question, but rather implied that he (the thief) would be with Jesus before the coming of His kingdom. Cullmann has expressed his theory regarding the "possession of the power of resurrection by the Spirit", of which the dead are capable as well as the living, in Christ and Time, op cit. p.239; and his Auferstehungsglaube und Auferstehungshoffnung im Neuen Testament (art.also in Grundriss, 1942) p.66 ff; W. G. Kümmel, Verheissung und Erfüllung (1953) p.67, discusses these words in relation to Lk. 16:22, and does not think that a view of Parousia is supplanted by Jesus saying; also P. Volz, Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde im neu...test. Zeitalter (1934) p.265.

385. Acts 8:1-2, Ernst Haenchen, Die Apostelgeschichte (Göttingen 1956), has seriously challenged the historicity of this persecution which he calls, in effect, the literary creation of Luke (pp.90 ff). In favour of Haenchen's argument, we have seen that Luke had a number of reasons for wanting to begin his history of the Church - or its important history as "Heilsgeschichte" somewhere other than Jerusalem. The question of Luke's use of sources and literary method will be discussed below. Because so much has recently been written on this subject of Luke's literary devices and methods as a historian, it is best to refer the reader to the recent work of C. K. Barrett, Luke the Historian in Recent Study (London 1960), who has brought the whole discussion up to date; see also Robert Morgenthaler, Die Lukanische Geschichtsschreibung als Zeugnis, Gestalt der Kunst des Lukas, Zürich 1948, an excellent study of Luke's style with good statistics, but not very critical; also a good discussion of Luke's sources in Hans Conzelmann, Die Mitte der Zeit: Studien zur Theologie des Lukas, (Beiträge zur historischen Theologie), Tübingen 1957, now tr. by Geoffrey Buswell, The Theology of St. Luke (London 1961).
386. Sifra Ahare Mot, 3; Yoma 19b, 53a; Yer. Yoma 1.39a,b.

387. Convincingly argued by C. K. Barrett, Luke the Historian, op. cit. 26ff, 60; and his article, Stephen and the Son of Man, in the Festschrift for Ernst Haenchen, Apophoreta (Berlin 1964) p. 35; see also Dibelius, From Tradition to Gospel (London 1936); Bertil Gärtner, The Areopagus Speech and Natural Revelation (Uppsala 1955) argues a strong case for Jewish historiography.


389. (ὁ ὅ τιον) This term is generally used by Jewish scholars as a designation for Judeo-Christians, says Herford, Christianity in the Talmud, p. 231-4, who places this tradition at 95 AD. However, the term might refer to Christians in general; see Epiphanius, Haer. xxix. 9, and Jerome, ad Jesai, v. 18-19 as well as other early fathers, who have applied the term to "Jewish Christians" (τῶν πιστεύοντας Ἰτανόν τῶν Χριστῶν), Justin Dialog. c. Tryph. c. 16.


392. Cited by Dr. Barrett, Ibid, p. 140, n. 5; it should be noted that "Birkat ha-Minim", the Benediction against Christian informers and Gnostics, is also called "Birkat ha-Zaddukim", (Ber. 28b, 29a).

393. Barrett, Ibid, p. 140

394. B. T., Pesachim (ג' פ' ה = "Passover") 50a.

395. Aboth 4.16, R. Jacob, a Pharisee in the latter half of the Second Century AD.


400. Ibid.

401. O. Bauernfeind, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (Leipzig 1939) p.120.


409. C. K. Barrett, op cit., p.35.

410. Ibid, p.36

411. Robert Morgenthaler, *Die Lukanische Geschichtsschreibung als Zeugnis, Gestalt und Gehalt der Kunst des Lukas*, (Zürich 1948) p.1, 97, makes a complete list of "double sections" which he holds exist because of Luke's "rule of two" (i.e. witnesses) "Zweiheitsgesetz"; W. L. Knox, has argued in "Sources of the Synoptic Gospels" (Vol.II, St.Lk. and St.Mt., ed.
H. Chadwick) p.39, that these double sections are a conflation of Mark and Q; because of the obvious duality of these passages it seems unlikely that Luke is trying to "conflate" manuscripts. It is more evident that he has attempted to do justice to two Kerygmata as we have reasoned here.


413. T. W. Manson, John the Baptist, BJRL 36 (1953-4) 395-413, has held that John's preaching and baptism were the starting point for Jesus work (p.395); see also Cullmann's article in the Festschrift für A. Fridrichsen, Coniectanea Neptestamentica (Upsala, 1947); J. A. T. Robinson, The Baptism of John and the Quimran Community, H.T.R. 50 (1957) pp.175-91; and his Elijah, John and Jesus, N.T.S. iv (1958) p.266. However, in the light of the two Kerygmatic traditions with which we have found Luke to be dealing, or the "double traditions" as others, such as Morgenthaler (Die Lukanische Geschichtsschreibung als Zeugnis, Gestalt und Gehalt der Kunst des Lukas, (Zürich, 1948, p.97ff) have called them, such a treatment of John the Baptist does not seem to be adequate.

414. Other examples of this teaching originating essentially from Jesus are: 9:60, 10:9,11, 11:2,20, 13:24, 14:15, 21:31, 22:16.18, 21:31, 22:30. Although Luke has gone out of his way to include sources which portray John as the Messianic Prophet, he unlike the others, has conspicuously avoided any suggestion of a direct relationship between John and Jesus (3:16, 7:18) and distinguishes clearly between their ministries (16:16), Acts(1:5, 11:16). However John the Baptist's indispensable place in the Kerygmata controversy, is seen from his placement at the beginning of the Gospel tradition (Mk.1:1) the beginning of the Apostolic

415. (ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ ...) is supported by X A C K W X Δ Ε Π Ψ and numerous uncial, (εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν ...) mainly by p27 B and L, and (ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς ἐλευθερίας) by D.


419. Ernst Haenchen, Die Apostelgeschichte, in Meyer's Kritischexegetischer Kommentar über das N.T. (Göttingen 1956) says that Acts is pre-Irenaeus (c.130-200 AD) on the basis of Justin Martyr; W. L. Knox, The Acts of the Apostles (Cambridge 1948) p.65, holds that its writing is not contemporaneous with the Apostle Paul, but later, nonetheless, pre-Irenaeus because of the many phrases and expressions picked up by Irenaeus. E. Käsemann holds it to be the first "Catholic theology", in his article "Frühkatholizismus" in Z. Theol.u.Kirche, liv (1957) 20.

421. H. J. Schoeps, Theologie und Geschichte des Judenchristentums (Tübingen 1949) pp. 236-7, 441-46; Urgemeinde, Judenchristentum, Gnosis, (Tübingen 1956) pp. 23, 61ff, if not an outright denial, a strong suspicion that Stephen is a Lucan fabrication; T. W. Manson, The Problem of the Epistle to the Hebrews, BJRL xxxii (1951) 1-17, begins the expansion of the church itself from the persecution of Stephen.


423. "Tabneh" (תבניה) c. 90 AD at which council the canon of Jewish literature was established.


426. P. A. van Stembvoort, The Interpretation of the Ascension in Luke and Acts, NTS v (1958-9) 30-42, builds a strong case for the Temple orientation of the narrative, which, he states, Conzelmann has dismissed without due consideration for the evidence. Conzelmann has dismissed the whole Lucan ascension narrative on the grounds that 24:50-3, is an "unlukanische lokalisierung in Bethanien" (Conzelmann, Die Mitarbeiter der Zeit, p. 178. That, Stembvoort holds, is a misunderstanding of Luke who actually says ἐγώ προς (24:50) and he underlines the essential relationship of this passage to the whole Gospel. p. 34, n. 4.


428. van Stembvoort, op. cit. p. 35.

429. Many other examples could be cited. Luke's genealogy of Jesus (Lk. 3: 29) states that Jesus is in direct priestly succession from "Jesus the Son of Eleazer" (cf. Sirach 50:27, "Jesus the Son of Sirach", cf. I Mac. Jason Jesus the son of Eleazar, (delegate to Rome, denounced in II Mac. 4: 19). This dynastic priestly succession included, "Jannai" (: 24), "Amos" (: 25), "Nehum" (: 26), "Joanan" (: 27), "Levi son of Symeon"
(30), and "Enoch" (37), etc. It is perhaps asking too much that Luke would have an accurate knowledge of Jesus' genealogy all the way back to Adam, but it does serve to prove Jesus' Sadducean dynastic succession; (cf. Mt. 1:1-16) Matthew's appears to be a kingly rather than priestly list, despite the fact that he makes Jesus a "Zadokite" (son of Zadok, 14). When he comes to the name Eleazer, no mention is made of the fact that he was the father of Jason. He is rather said to be the father of "Matthan" thus Luke has included the name "Jason" for a special purpose. However, Matthew's list is as Sadducean as Luke's.

430. (7) God's visible Presence, after Lev. 16:2.

431. Sifra, Ahave Mot. 3; Yoma 196, 53a; Yer. Yoma 1,39a, 6; cf. Lev. R. xxi.11.


433. J. Jeremias, Die Abendsmahlnworte Jesu (Göttingen 1949) pp.74-5, argues for the longer recension; W. Michaelis, Die Erscheinungen des Auferstandenen (1944) p.89; R. Morgenthaler, op cit., p.67, provides stylistic grounds for the recension; it should be noted that Augustine more often quotes the longer form of this verse, as does Tatian and Cyril.

434. P. A. van Stempvoort, op cit., p.36.

435. cf. Sirach 24:19, "Come to me, you who desire me, and eat your fill of my produce", 24:21, "Those who eat me will hunger for more, and those who drink me will thirst for more", 21:9 "From eternity in the beginning he created me, and for eternity I shall not cease to exist", 24:10 "the eternal and wise is a priest".


437. T.W. Manson, The Problem of the Epistle to the Hebrews, BJRL, xxxii (1950) 1-17; William Manson, The Epistle
to the Hebrews (Baird Lecture for 1949) pub. 1957
London; also B. F. Westcott, The Epistle to the
Hebrews (London, 1889) holds an earlier dating of
Hebrews; N. Montefiore, however, exaggerates what he
calls "a large overlap with the theology of Paul",
as well as the futuristic eschatology of Hebrews; A
Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews (London,
1964) p. 5.

438. These include: \( ^75 \Xi A B C \Xi \Lambda W \Xi \Delta \Theta W \) and numerous
lesser uncial; it is singularly omitted by D.

439. Mk. 16:19, (omitted by \( \Xi B \), included by A C D K \( \Xi \Delta \Theta \) T, etc); Lk.
24:51, Acts 1:9; and implicit ref. Eph. 4:8-10; Heb.

He has also suggested that Peter's speech might contain
an early Christology. J. A. T. Robinson, The Most
Primitive Christology of all? J.T.S. vii (1956) 177-89,
in which he compares Peter's speech in Acts with I
Thes. 2:15, which associates Jesus with the prophets.
Robinson perhaps errs when he says: "What is entirely
unprecedented is the notion of two separate comings
of the Christ. Nowhere in Judaism is there any such
conception and it is this that cries for explanation".
It is perhaps unintelligible if one looks for a single
Kerygma which proclaims two separate comings rather than
two Kerygmata, each with a separate view of the Parousia,
one which holds that it has occurred and the other,
that it is yet to occur.

441. Origen, Contr. Cels. 8:22, cf. 2:63 knows Acts 1:3 but
ignores the ascension and the Feast of the Ascension;
Barnabas, Ep. 15:9, holds the ascension to have occurred
on the 8th day: Tertullian, De. Bapt. 19:2, after 50
days; see P. Benoit, L'Ascension, in Rev. Bib. lvi (1949)

442. p 46 B A D* 1739 and many others.

443. pp. 126-127, esp. note 269 above; see also J. T. Milik,
Ten Years of Discovery, op cit. pp. 33ff, Milik lists
"ten or so" fragmentary MSS of Enoch containing the
sections covering chapters 1-36, 72-82, 83-90, 91-108,
to which one should add: at least so far as have been
identified and made public.

P. Wernberg Möller, *op cit.* p.162, seems to have found 23 passages from the *Similitudes in IQS*.

J. Y. Campbell, *The Origin and Meaning of the Term Son of Man*, JTS, xlvi (1947) 149.

Erik Sjöberg, *Der Menschensohn in Æthiopischen Henochbuch*, Lund 1946; see also M. D. Hooker's study on this theme, *Jesus and the Suffering Servant* (London 1959).

R. H. Charles, *The Book of Enoch* (I. Enoch tr. from the Ethiopic text with critical notes on the Greek fragments), Oxford 1912, p.67, Charles states, "Thus the date of the Parables (ch.31-71) could not have been earlier than 94 BC or later than 64 BC. But it is possible to define the date more precisely. As the Pharisees had unbroken power and prosperity under Alexandra, 79-70 BC, the Parables must be assigned earlier to the years, 94-79 or 70-64 BC."

Matthew Black, *The Eschatology of the Similitudes of Enoch*, JTS, iii (1952) p.1, Black says about the Son of Man chapters, "Chapters 70-71, I suggest, form an original constituent part of I. Enoch out of which the Similitudes have grown, by a re-writing of the Enoch legend in support of a doctrine of a supernatural Messiah".


Hugo Odeberg, *3 Enoch*, op cit. p.138, in this critical edition of 3rd Enoch (The Hebrew Book of Enoch), describes a third layer of the Enoch tradition which somehow made its way through both the Pharisaic
and Christian censors of its time. He says of the eschatological title, "Metathron-Enoch", by which title Enoch has survived in the Talmud, Targum and Midrash writings, "The exact interpretation of the word is: 'The celestial being who occupies the throne next to the throne of Glory' (the 'Divine Throne'), or the 'Throne next to the Throne of Glory'. The Etymological roots of the word are to be found in (μεταθρονον) which in its hebraized form became (לֶח ולכ , p.138). 3 Enoch articulates its doctrine of "Translation" in some detail in 48:1-2 (MSS ABFGH):

"I went and removed my Shekina from among them. And I lifted it up (MSS F,G, says "ascend") on high with the sound of a trumpet and with a shout, as it is written (Ps.47:6) 'God is gone up with a shout, the Lord with the sound of a trumpet'. And I took him: (that is) Enoch, the son of Jared, from among them. And I lifted him up with the sound of a trumpet and with a (teru'ah) shout to the high heavens." (p.166) 48:1-2, ad loc.

The Hebrew Enoch is, of course, late. Odeberg holds its composition to be somewhere in the 3rd cent. AD, but that it contains traditions from the last part of the 1st and beginning of the 2nd century AD (p.38). It nonetheless cannot be placed in the same class of earlier pre-Christian Sadducaic Enoch traditions, most of which can be assumed to have been suppressed.

452. cf.Heb.11:5, Jude :14(Enoch), and James 5:17, Rom.11:2, Mt.11:1, 17:11,12, 27:47, Mk.9:4, Lk.9:30 (Elijah); Sirach, 44:16, 48:9, Gen. 5:24, "Enoch walked with God; and he was not, for God took him"; Enoch (70:1ff, 71:1ff), 39:3, 52:1, 12:1, 14:8,9, 13:7,10,14:2.

453. Mt. 17:1-8, Mk.9:2-8, Lk.9:29-36.

454. RHC, II, op cit. p.185.

455. Matthew Black, JTS iii(1952)6, with ref. only to ch. 71 Enoch; see also, T.W. Manson, The Teaching of Jesus, op cit, p. , to which Manson attributes great originality; MSS (M) at 1:1 refers to Enoch, not as a prophet, but as the holy redeemer of the world.

456. See note 451, supra.

457. RHC, op cit, p.188, note 2.
458. Ibid, p.189; cf. Enoch 69:27, "and the sum of judgment was given unto the Son of Man"; 60:1 "and the angels, a thousand thousands and ten thousand times ten thousand were disquieted with a great disquiet. And the Head of Days sat on the throne of his glory and the angels and the righteous stood around him; cf. Matt.16:27, "For the Son of Man will come with his angels...there are some standing here who will not taste death; cf.Lk. 12:10, etc.

459. RHC, II, op cit. p.214-15, ad loc, Charles says that "that" and "this" included by the Ethiopic translator are usually renderings of the Greek article, and are so included by Charles. He says, "Thus in Enoch, this title is the distinct designation of the personal Messiah", He concludes that the Greek equivalent could not have been (υιος ἀνθρωπου) as an ordinary generic reference, but the full title (ουιος του ἀνθρωπου) characteristic and unique to Enoch. At verse (44) RHC has considered "wise up" the kings and mighty as an error in translation for "put down" the kings and mighty, as it occurs again in the same context.

460. RHC, op cit, II, p.216.

461. Matthew, although late in composition, retains a remarkable Urgemeinde tradition at (27:51-53): "and the earth did quake; and the rocks were rent; and the tombs were opened; and many bodies of the saints that had fallen asleep were raised; and coming forth out of the tombs after his resurrection they entered into the holy city and appeared unto many"; also see Heb.9 above; Origen has called Jesus "the Kingdom itself" (αυτοσαυτοις) cited by T.W.Manson, The Sayings of Jesus (1949) p.344.


the title derives from Ezekiel, as does George S. Duncan, Jesus, Son of Man, (1947), but Jesus does not seem to quote Ezekiel; see C. H. Dodd, According to the Scriptures, p.117.

465. H. Ludin Jansen, Die Henochgestalt. Eine vergleichende religionsgeschichtlichtliche Untersuchung (Oslo, 1939) p.1ff; see also M. Black's important comments, op cit. p.5.


467. R. H. Charles, has said about chapter 60, that it is a fragment of an earlier work entitled "The Book of Noah" (quoted by many sources, such as Jub.x.13, xxi.10). The contents of this chapter prove that it is from this source. Thus the statements do not refer to Enoch but Noah, "Thus it would appear that the Noah saga is older than I Enoch, and that the latter was built up on the debris of the former", R. h. Charles, II, p.168.


469. Cullmann, Christ and Time, op cit., p.150.

470. Mk. 9:1, Mt. 16:28; see W. Michaelis, Der Herr verzieht nicht seine Verheissung, 1942, p.30.


475. Bultmann, op cit, pp.26-32, where he eliminates sayings referring to the present.

476. H. Windisch, *Theologisch Tijdschrift*, iii (1918) p.217ff, discusses the concept of the pre-existent Son of Man in *Enoch* as a future prophecy, along with the other Son of Man prophecies in Enoch which had considerable influence on what he calls the last stage of New Testament development where he also places Jude. Nevertheless, examples which he cites are Mk.11:19, Mt. 17:17 and Luke 9:41; Strack-Billerbeck, II, p.333ff also discuss the influence of *Enoch*’s pre-existent Son of Man on the New Testament.

477. We have used the terms "Urgemeinde" and "Pauline Christians" to designate these two main elements within early Christianity, but this does not simply imply "earlier" and "later" Christians as both groups, at times existed side by side, although Urgemeinde here is generally associated with the Original Jerusalem Church including the "pillar" Apostles; "Pauline Christians" is here used to denote the congregations started by the Apostle Paul which were orientated to Antioch and a doctrine of future resurrection and Judgment, as a single universal phenomenon, and had the most in common with the Pharisaic eschatology.
Morgenthaler suggests the figures 63 and 29, not all of his doublets are obvious, nor do they all have a theological relationship: R. Morgenthaler, Die Lukane Geschichtsschreibung als Zeugnis, Gestalt und Gehalt der Kunst des Lukas, Zurich 1948, I, p. 97ff, esp. p. 39; Morgenthaler accepts Mark and Q and says that Luke's purpose was to establish historically what Theonblius had been taught; W. van Vliet, No Single Testimony (Utrecht 1952) p. 3, says, "Luke wanted to write as a witness and therefore took care to give twofold and threefold evidence... He wanted to show that the things he wrote about were historical reality and did not make use of Greek rhetorical methods appealing to reason to show the probability of things told, but presented his facts well attested by more than one witness": W. L. Knox, The Acts of the Apostles (Camb. 1948) p. 20ff argues for a conflation of documentary sources: "The double sections can be explained by a conflation of Mark and Q"; Knox, in Theology liii (1950) p. 34. A. Wohmardt, The Construction and Purpose of the Acts of the Apostles, in Studia Theologica xii (1958) 45-79, dwells on Luke's technique as a historian; M. Dibelius, Studies in the Acts of the Apostles, ed. Creeven (London 1976) 98ff, dwells on the existence of wide variations in the texts (Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, as over against the Western Text). Dibelius's greatest contribution is a recognition of the fact that Luke was "mainly concerned with preaching"; "In the last analysis, however, he (Luke) is not a historian but a preacher: we must not allow our attempts to prove the authenticity of the speeches to cloud our perception of their Kerygmatic nature"; Dibelius. on cit, p. 183; Although he deals with much more than the question of doublets, see Prof. Barrett's comprehensive study on the technique of Luke as a historian, C. H. Barrett, Luke the Historian in Recent Study, (London 1961), esp. p. 51.

M. Dibelius, From Tradition to Gospel, on cit, p. 13, recognising various traditions underlying the Gospels, Dibelius did not live long enough to develop his theory further. He tended to speak of the Kerygma as a single conclusion of these differing views.

F. C. Baur, Das Christentum und die christliche Kirche der drei ersten Jahrhunderte, see esp. his preface for a theoretical formulation of his views. Here, he establishes the problem most emphatically as a
historical phenomenon to be dealt with on historical
grounds; see also, Baur, Die christliche Gnosis, oder
der christliche Religionsphilosophie (1935), and his
Paulus, III, viii, 631-32, where he states his belief
that Paul was the unique hellenistic influence on
early Christianity.

481. It can now be known that the Qumran Covenanters expected a
Messianic Prophet as well as a messianic King:
IQS ix.11, speaks of a coming Messianic Prophet; also
IQpHab.ii.5, vii. 3-5, as the prophet who will bring
the divine interpretation of the scriptures.

482. The terminology employed by Jude (:9), suggests that the
ascension of Moses was a matter of dispute among the
Jews in his own time; acc. to the Assumption of Moses
(written in the 1st cent. A.D. and probably quoted in
Acts 7:36 and Jude 9, 16 and 18) Moses was translated
directly to heaven. This Hebrew or Aramaic work was
probably written by a Sadducee.

483. H. L. Strack and P. Billerbeck Kommentar zum Neuen
II, p.333ff.

484. J. Jeremias, art. ('H|ας ) in TWNT II, pp.930-943
has dealt with this role of Elijah in some detail.

P.239. Winter tends to take these as written pericopes
from a group characterised by a predisposition in favour
of members of Jesus' family and a strong attachment to,
the Temple in Jerusalem. He considers the Temple (T)
source, to be from a group close to James the Righteous,
a group that still possessed recollections of Jesus'
parents and his acquaintances. It may have been first
written in Hebrew, though indications are not as strong
as the other Baptist (B) source, presumably the lan-
guage was Aramaic; See also, Eduard Schweizer, Eine
6(1950)1-25, on the Hebrew idiom in Luke; also P.Winter,
Magnificat and Benedictus-Maccabean Psalms?, BJRL 37
(1954) 328-347, says the Magnificat and the Benedictus
are patterned after Maccabean battle hymns; see also
his, Some Observations on the Language in the Birth and
Infancy Stories in the Third Gospel, NTS i(1954) 111-121;
Winter holds the probability of a documentary source
which Luke found and utilised; however, most English
scholars have avoided a Hebrew or Aramaic source for
Luke 1 and 2. Once Semitic sources are admitted, some
fear that it will not be possible to know what is Luke
and what is his source, so H.J.Cadbury, The Making of Luke-Acts (N.Y.1927) p.67; However, even some of those who defend the Lucan authorship of chapters 1 and 2, acknowledge that they contain hymns which show principles of parallelism and movement of the lines by the beat of the accent or the number of words along the same lines as the O.T.Psalms; C.H.Box, The Virgin Birth of Jesus, (London 1916) p.68; H.Gunkel, says that they are typical Jewish eschatological hymns. H.Gunkel, Die Lieder in der Kindheitsgeschichte Jesu bei Lukas, Festgabe A. von Harnack (1921) p.43-60; see also H.W.D.Snarks. The Semitisms of St. Luke's Gospel, J.T.S. xliiv (1943) n.120ff.


489. Winter, Ibid, n.328ff. also held by A.Aytoun, The ten Lucan Hymns of the Nativity in their original language, JTS 18 (1916) 275.


492. "When it is evening" et seq. Mat.16:2-3, is included in C D K L w A Θ Π Family 1 group, and a significant number of Greek minuscules, Diatessaron, Theophylactus, Apostolic Canons (4th cent. AD), etc.; but this passage is omitted by B X, "Family 13" group according to Ferrar and minuscule 1216 (11th cent AD) and Curetonian and Sinaitic version, etc. Thus the weight of evidence seems to favor this inclusion as early and genuine.
4.93. "turned into another man", is also discussed below.

4.94. Bezae and a majority of Old Latin texts say (υἱὸς μου ἐ
θε, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεννήθηκα σε), which variant is quoted by
Justin as part of text.

4.95. Lk. 9:35, "This is my Son, my chosen": other passages
where Luke speaks of Jesus, although somewhat secret-
ively, as Son of God, are: 1:32, 35, 3:33, 4:3, 9,
4:41, 8:22, 22:70, and in the last three instances
openly. The whole notion of the Son of God was
certainly held more privately and secretly than the
notion of his Messiahship which was proclaimed by
the crowds.

497. also, I Cor. 3:21-22, "For all things are yours, whether Paul or Apollos or Cephas or the world or life or death or the present or the future, all are yours, and you are Christ's and Christ is God's".

498. I Cor. 3:21, II Cor. 11:20, II Montefiore, has gone beyond the evidence with his hypothesis that "in the first four chapters of I Corinthians Paul is explicitly attempting to correct his reader's idea of the relationship of himself and Apollos" (p. 12). To this hypothesis Montefiore has added the supposition that "The Epistle to the Hebrews was written to the Church at Corinth by Apollos at Ephesus sometime between AD 52 and AD 66" (Ibid); while one can agree to, the Urgemeinde orientation of the Epistle to the Hebrews and its possible authorship by Apollos, both of the above suppositions are indeed far fetched.

499. They are called "both Jews and Greeks" (I Cor. 1:24) as were the Sadducees and the Urgemeinde Christians.

500. Paul is not merely thinking of Apollos' letters (Acts 18:27) to come to Achaia.

501. C. K. Barrett, *Things Sacrificed to Idols*, NTS 11 (1964-5) p. 113, which rather mitigates the notion that Paul remained a practising Pharisee throughout his life; (cf. W. P. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism (London 1968) p. 321) which is somewhat similar to what Dr. Chadwick calls the "flexibility" of Paul's attitude; cf. Chadwick, *All Things to All Men* (I Cor. ix. 22) NTS 1 (1955) 261-75.
502. Rather it is because the church at Corinth abided close to the "Apostolic Decree" (e.g., "Therefore my judgment (Peter's) that we should not trouble those of the Gentiles who turn to God, but should write to them to abstain from the pollutions of idols and from uncleanness and from what is strangled and from blood". Acts 15:19-20). Corinth's food restrictions have an eschatological significance if they are patterned after Jesus' post-resurrection diet. After the resurrection Jesus ate—fish, honeycombs, etc. It is likely that if they considered themselves to be participating, through baptism, in the resurrection life, they would follow this pattern.

503. Hippolytus, Philosophumena vii.36, says Nicolas the Proselyte of Jirach knew baptism as a resurrection; Tertullian, Adv. Haer. I.viii.5, says that the Samaritan Menander had such a view of baptism; also that there were some Christians who denied the resurrection of the body (i.e., as a future expectation); Adv. Haer. II.xxi.2, says of Simon and Carlorates; see Tertullian, de Anima 50, says of Verogon that he confused baptism and resurrection; also Tert. De Resurr. Carnis.19; although probably dependent on Tertullian. 

"Hippolytus, Eusebius, Octavius II; Justin, Dial. 80; other patristic citations in R. Lock, The Pastoral Epistles (1921) p.109 who believed that this view was a provenance in Sir.11:28, 30:1; R. Lane, in his art. NTS 11(1964-5) p.165, adds to this list, Acta Pauli et Theolcae 14, which holds that men do not rise at all but live on through their children, a well known classical view of immortality. However, there is no evidence that the Urgemeinde denied the resurrection itself. It has been demonstrated here that they considered it an error to think of it as a future event which detracts from the resurrection of Christ.


506. Lane, Ibid, p.166

507. fut. (λαλήσουσιν καί ναὶς) A C (Second corrector) D (one redactor supplies λαλήσουσιν sor.) K W X Θ W numerous minuscules (including families 1 and 13) and quoted by Ambrose, Augustine, Hippolytus, Jacob-Nisibis, and the Apostolic Constitutions.

507a For the hist. of interp. see M.Rissi, Die Taufe für die Toten.


509. R. Bultmann, Exegetische Probleme des zweiten Korintherbriefes, Suppl. No. 9 Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok, p.4.

510. Walter Harrelson, Ruach in the Qumran I Materials (unpublished textual analysis quoted by M. Mansoor, op cit, p.75) has cited one hundred and seventeen occurrences of the term (ד) in IQH, 111 cases refer to "divine spirit", "human spirit" and "spirits angelic and demonic", (ט) "spirit of Holiness" occurs 8 times, it is true that IQH does not speak of the Holy Spirit as a separate person but it is used without question in a divine sense, "And steadfastly have I hearkened unto Thy wondrous counsel through Thy Holy Spirit, IQH xii.12; "Thou didst support me with Thy might and Thy Holy Spirit", IQH vii.6-7; "To atone for my iniquities (so that) I may seek Thy true Spirit and to be fortified in Thy Holy Spirit, IQH xvi.6-7; "Thou hast distilled Thy Holy Spirit upon Thy Servant", IQH xvii.26; "To cleanse me with Thy Holy Spirit and draw me near (to thee)", IQH xvi.12.

511. "That is the time of salvation for the people of God and an appointed epoch for all men of this lot, but eternal annihilation for all the lot of Belial, IQM i.5 (cf.II Cor.6:15, "What accord has Christ with Belial, also cf. Martyrdom of Isaiah, 3:1ff), "The day when this will happen has been appointed from old, IQM i.10; also persecution as preparation for the End of Days, pHab.ix.6; "The last generation", pHab.ii.7; the last epoch, pHab.vii.2; "The last time shall be lengthened (or delayed) and will exceed everything that the prophets have said, since the mysteries of God are wonderful," pHab.vii.7ff. There is no question that the Qumran Community considered
itself to be living in the last days and that it looked to the final Judgment as an immediate and imminent possibility, but this subject is too vast for treatment here; cf. H. Ringgren, The Faith of Qumran, op cit, p.198, 152ff.

512. (ἐρμηνεύειν ἔλογον) was as much a spiritual gift as "speaking in tongues (I Cor.12:10). This was by no means mere translation, but interpretation of divine "angelic" language (I Cor.13:1). The interpretation itself was revelatory in character and ranks as a charismatic gift (I Cor.14:26); cf. James M. Robinson, The New Hermeneutic, ed. J.M.Robinson and J.B.Cobb (New York 1964); see also H. Ringgren, op cit, p.7ff, 10,11; IQH xiii.15:16, mentions a spirit having dominion over man, IQH iii.22-23, "Spirits of Knowledge" and spirits of truth that guide man.

513. Even here there is some doubt, he states that he might go himself to Jerusalem with the delegates who bear it, "if it is meet for me to go" (I Cor.16:4); II Cor.12:16, almost implies Paul's misuse of funds, "But granting that, I myself, did not burden you, I was crafty, you say, and got the better of you by guile". This argument has, perhaps, been carried farther than its evidence by, W. Bieder, Paulus und seine Gegner in Korinth, Theol. Zeit. 17(1961)319-333.


515. Ibid, p.140

516. Ibid.

517. I Clement (to the Corinthians), Ignatius of Antioch and Polycarp, are three early fathers who appear not to know II Corinthians, or at least do not wish to quote it. I Clement xlvii.1, mentions in singular form a letter which he calls "the" letter of the late Apostle Paul to the Corinthians. In Ignatius' letters and Polycarp's letter to the Philippians, Bornkamm has found about 20 references to I Corinthians, but almost no reference to II Corinthians. The few passages which commentators traditionally cite as from II Corinthians could possibly be from
other sources. He states that the oldest clear cut reference to II Corinthians is Marcion, who mentions it in his apostolic canon, G. Bornkamm, The History of the So-Called Second Letter to the Corinthians, NTS 8 (1961-2) 263. Lest he be misrepresented, Bornkamm does not deny the existence of II Corinthians as a single document in the days of Clement, or that it could not have been written by Paul. But he holds that II Corinthians must have been known at first only in a limited area in Corinth and Achaia before being accepted as another Epistle by Marcion and the Church.

518. Those who maintain that (10-13) are a separate letter fragment in themselves, on textual grounds include, H. Windisch, Der zweite Korintherbrief (1924) p.16ff; A. Jülicher, Einleitung in des Neue Testament (1931) p.96ff; M. Krenkel, Beiträge zur Aufhellung der Geschichte u. der Briefe des Apostels Paulus (1890) and others cited by Windisch.

519. H. Windisch, op cit., p.12ff, mentions the most important criticism on II Corinthians this list should include: A. Hausrath, Der Vierkapitelbrief des Paulus an die Korinther (1870) is recognised as the first to put faith in the "four chapters" hypothesis, which has been followed or modified by many others; G. Bornkamm, op cit., p.258, mentions most of the important recent criticism after Windisch, which has expanded and improved upon the "four chapters" hypothesis, including: R. H. Strachan, The Epistle II of Paul to the Corinthians (1935); A.D. Nock, Paulus (1940); T. W. Manson, St. Paul in Ephesus, (3) The Corinthian Correspondence, BJRL 26 (1941-2) 101ff, 331ff; W. L. Knox, The Acts of the Apostles (1948) p.61; C. H. Dodd, New Testament Studies (1954) p.85ff; J. Héring, La Seconde épître de saint Paul aux Corinthiens (1958) p.11ff; W. Schmithals, Die Gnosis in Korinth (1956) p.16ff.


522. R. Bultmann, Exegetische Problem des zweiten Korincherbuchs, op cit., p.14, n.16; also held by J. Weiss, Das Urchristentum, (1917) p.265-268; this theory has been opposed by W. Schmithals, Die Gnosis in Korinth

523. cf. 6:1lf, 7:14, here Paul speaks about his great "confidence" which he has in his "opponents".


525. see pp.403 ff. above.


527. Particularly, F.C. Baur, Paulus, der Apostel Jesu Christi: sein Leben und Wirken, seine Briefe und seine Lehre: ein Beitrag zu einer Kritischen Geschichte des Urchristentums (1845), Eng. tr., St. Paul (1873-5). Baur saw Paul as a Gentile Christian in opposition to the others because of his Gnostic belief in a supreme God from whom all life proceeds and who sought to reconcile all his creation with himself, "Even the Christology of the Epistles bears unmistakably the impress of Gnosticism", p.7ff (ET). This Gnosticism, he held, was similar to the system of Valentinus; Mayerhoff, Der Brief an die Kolosser, usw (1838), has suggested that the Epistle was directed against the Gnostics in particular. This view is countered by Pfleiderer, Das Urchristentum, seine schriften und Lehren in geschichtlichem Zusammenhang (1902), who maintained that the hellenistic transformation of the church began with Paul; also A. Hilgenfeld, Die judische Apokalyptik in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung (1957) who saw Colossians as a Pauline struggle between hellenistic "mysteries" and Jewish eschatology; a more recent discussion is W. Schmithals, Die Gnosis in Korinth. Eine Untersuchung zu den Korintherbriefen (Gottingen 1956); but see J. Munck, The New Testament and Gnosticism, Stud. Theol. xv (1961) 181-195; and R. Bultmann, Gnosis, in TWNT, op cit, p.41, n.2, "Colossians is contending against syncretistic Gnostic false teaching".

528. F. C. Baur, Ibid.

529. H. J. Schoeps, Urgemeinde, Judenchristentum, Gnosis (Tubingen 1956) presents arguments similar to Baur's, to the effect that Paul was a Gnosticiser in opposition
to the "Pharisaic" Jewish Christianity of Jerusalem, p.23. He underlines the anti-Gnostic character of Ebionitism of the 2nd and 3rd centuries which he associates with the Jerusalem church as adversaries against Paul, p.30 ff; see esp. his "Der Kampf um das Apostolat", p.14ff.

530. See the note by Ralph Marcus in the Loeb Josephus, Vol. VII, p.77 note C where he says that Polybius (Hist.v. 45ff) indicates that Zeuxis was Antiochus' governor (στρατηγὸς) of Babylonia (in 220 BC) and that he became governor of Lydia (201 BC), Hist.xvi.1.8. He assumes that this same Zeuxis was transferred along with the transportation of 2,000 Jewish families from Babylonia to Phrygia after 213 BC, when Antiochus III conquered the provinces in Asia Minor held by Achaeus. However we can be certain that Colossae is praised as a (πόλις μεγάλη) as early as Herodotus (vii.30) and as (πόλις οἰκουμένη καὶ εὐδαιμων καὶ μεγαλη), Anab.1.2.6) it thus was already a highly civilised place before the time of Antiochus III.

531. Jos. Antiq. xii.149; see Lightfoot, The Churches of the Lycus, p.20, who gives reasons for estimating that the number of adult Jewish freemen in the region of Laodicea in 62 BC, can be no less than eleven thousand.

532. Jos. Antiq.xii.150, In at least one important MS group (FLV) contains the variant (Θεον αυτῶν) "their God" Loeb ed. note ad loc.

533. An important group of MSS read: (ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν διάκονος) they are: p10, 13,15,16,32,46, A B C D G pm H I M o22o, 6, 33, 81, 104, 326, 424, 1175, 1739 alike; (marginal lection): txt C K L 0142 al latsy.

534. KJV is following a late variant (ἀ μὴ ἐφοράκεν) in C K L 0142 and (σύκ) in G.

535. 2:16-19, throws a curious light on the Apostle Stephen, if these words were interpreted as a psychological reaction-compensation on the part of Paul.

536. See the so-called "Liturgy of the Sabbath Offering" (otherwise known as the "Angelic Liturgy") Strugnell, J., The Angelic Liturgy at Qumran-4Q, in V.T.Suppl.7 (1960)pp.318-345; in Congress Volume (Oxford 1959),
this liturgy contains a description of the throne of God strongly reminiscent of the vision of Ezekiel and Enoch. There is no agreement whether these songs were sung at particular sacrifices at Qumran or whether they were intended to replace the sacrifices; H. Ringgren, The Faith of Qumran, op cit, p.227, says of them that for each Sabbath of the year they listed which of the angels should pronounce the blessing and by which formulas they should praise God.

537. W. D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism (London 1962), p.150, Davies says of Col.1:14, that it is "one of the most disputed Christological passages in all the Pauline Epistles" he points out that this passage was used as proof by the Religionsgeschichte school that Colossians was not Pauline and that Holtzmann has omitted this passage in his treatment of the Christology of Paul; cf. M. Dibelius, Handbuch zum Neuen Testament (1911) Vol. xii, p.9; J. H. Holtzmann, Lehrbuch der Neutestamentlichen Theologie (Tübingen, 1911) pp.73ff; F. C. Porter, The Mind of Christ in Paul (New York, 1950) pp.179ff, has rejected verses 15-17 outright as incompatible with Paul's thought as a whole and irrelevant to the context in which they occur as an "insertion into the text by someone whose religion had been that of the Logos type of hellenistic Judaism".

538. W. D. Davies, op cit, p.151, C. F. Burney, bases this view on Prov. 8:22, to which he holds Col.1:15 is a direct allusion because the term "reshith" (יְרֵשֶׁת) in Prov.8:22, was used by Rabbinic Judaism as the key to the interpretation of the "Bereshith" (Gen.1:1) which begins the Hebrew Bible and interpreted (by the Pharisees) as meaning "by wisdom" rather than "In the beginning" or (Ἐν ἀρχῇ) of the non-Pharisaic traditions. Thus, according to Burney, when Paul says Christ is the (πρωτότοκος πάσης κτισώσεως) he is thinking of him as "reshith" which was expanded by the later Rabbis to include the meanings of "Beginning" (before all things) "sum-total" (all things are summed up in Him), "Head" (He is the head of the body) and "First-fruits" (first begotten of the dead) all of which are included in Paul's passage, C. F. Burney, Christ as the APAXH of Creation, J. J. S. xxvii. (1925) p. 175.

539. T. K. Abbott, Epistle to the Ephesians and Colossians,
I.C.C., op cit, p.219, says "it, of course, means 'all the fullness of the Godhead', (πᾶν τὸ Θεότητος) as in ii.9 (πᾶν τὸ) being personified.

But even if (δὲ Θεότητος) is taken as the subject, it is not natural to interpret this expression by that in ii.9, where (κατοίκεῖ) is also used". Severianus and Theodoret interpret (πᾶν ἡρωμα) of the Church, following Eph.1:23; Schleiermacher refers to (πᾶν ἡρωμα) in Rom.11:12, 25, 26 and explains the word as "fullness of the Gentiles in the whole Israel", but there is little to support this view, Ibid, p.219.

540. W. D. Davies, op cit, p.177.

541. The textual and literary problems might well comprise the subject of a thesis in itself, but where these questions regarding Kerygma are addressed to the texts, they do not fail to provide a fund of answers.

542. H. J. Cadbury, The Dilemma of Ephesians, NTS v. (1958-9) 91:102, Cadbury defines the dilemma as the relationship of the author to his written sources, a struggle between composition and tradition, according to the principle that "books precipitate books" (Goodspeed). Cadbury holds that the "living situation" was as important as the literary one thus it is also a "historical problem", etc. Ibid, p.91; Best recent discussion in German, N. A. Dahl, Addresse und Proönium des Epheserbriefes, Theol.Zeit.vii (1951) 241-264.

543. Cadbury has collected an imposing list of authors who deal with the historical aspects of this problem; some of the most important include: J. Schmid, Der Epheserbrief des Apostels Paulus (in Biblische Studien, xxii, 3 and 4, Freiburg 1928), Ernst Percy, Die Probleme der Kolosser und Epheserbrief (Acta Reg. Societatis Humaniorum Litterarum Lundensis, xxxix, Lund 1946), Edgar J. Goodspeed, New Solutions of New Testament Problems (Chicago 1927), The Meaning of Ephesians (Chicago 1933), The Key to Ephesians (Chicago 1956) and his art. JBL lxiv (1945)197-8; C. L. Mitton, The Epistle to the Ephesians (Oxford 1951); Some who hold the Epistle to be spurious are: C. Masson, L'Epître de Saint Paul aux Ephesians (Commentaire du N.T.IX); P.Bonnard, Galates (Neuchâtel, Paris 1953); H.J.Holtzmann, Kritik der Epheser- und Kolosser-Briefe (Berlin 1872); On the theme of variations between Ephesians
and the other Pauline letters: O. Roller, Das Formular der Paulinischen Briefe (1933), of which Cadbury states there are just as many "special terms" in the other letters, thereby leaning toward Pauline authorship; John Knox, Philemon Among the Letters of Paul, revised ed. (London 1960).

This destination is by no means certain. It is omitted by p.46, (original) B (original) Tertullian, Origen, etc.


H. J. Cadbury, op cit, p.97.

Ibid, p.98, Cadbury says "Acknowledge as one must the likeness and difference between Ephesians and the others, we are confronted with an imponderable comparison", p.101.

P. N. Harrison, Paulines and Pastorals, (London 1964) 31-64, esp.pp.63 and 64.

G. B. Caird, The Apostolic Age (London 1958) p.133

H. J. Cadbury, op cit, p.95.

Traditional view: J. B. Lightfoot, St. Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon, revised text, (London 1892) p.37, places the writing at about 63 AD toward the end of Paul's career; also his, Philippians (London 1894) pp.30-46, in which he holds that Colossians and Ephesians should be placed in St. Paul's first Roman captivity; so also Zahn, Th., Einl.z.N.T., (1906) p.316, tr. Introduction to the New Testament (London 1909); E. Percy, op cit, says that the language and subject matter forbid any earlier date than Paul's Roman captivity; Ephesus, as the place of writing, is favoured by a few who date it about 55 or 56 AD, such as G. S. Duncan, St. Paul's Ephesian Ministry (London 1929), because "It would be a five day journey (300 miles) from Colossae to Rome and only 100 miles from Colossae to Ephesus", an important fact because Onesimus would have presumably made the journey three
times; see P.N. Harrison, Onesimus and Philemon, Angl. Theol. Rev. (Oct. 1950), who develops this theory in some detail.

553. See the use of (דְּלֵי) in Job 32:8, 33:4, (cf. 26:14); also terms employed in Gen 1:2, 41:38, Ex 31:3, 35:31, Nu 11:29, 24:2, 27:16, Jud 3:10, 6:34, 1 Sam 10:6, 11:6, 16:13, 14, 19:20, 23, II Sam 23:2, I Kg 18:12, 22:24, 2:16, II Ch 15:1, 18:23, 24:20, etc. for "Spirit of the Lord", "Spirit of the Most High", and "Spirit of God".


556. Tosef. 'Eduy ii. 2, Yeb. 15b, "Zadok the Shammaite" also regarding the issues of bitterness between the Hillelites and Shammaites.

557. Bab. Tal. Yebhamoth 46a: (_resolve the dispute re the washings of a proselyte) "A proselyte only becomes so after he is circumcised and has been washed with water... With regard to a proselyte who has been circumcised but not washed with water, R. Eliezer says that he is a proselyte notwithstanding; for we find that, in the case of our fathers, they were circumcised but not washed with water. With regard to one who has been washed with water but not circumcised, R. Joshua says that he is a proselyte notwithstanding, for we find that, in the case of our mothers, they were washed with water but not circumcised. But the doctors say that neither the one nor the other is a proselyte."

maintains that all three were the earlier practice for which he gives further evidence; also Bengel, Ueber das Alter der judischen Proselytentauf e, p.20; Schnackenburger, Ueber das Alter der Judischen Proselytentauf e, p.138.

559. Schürer, GJV, op cit, II,11.p.319, on the basis of B. T. Kerithoth 81a, which is an explanation of Kerithoth ii.1, which says, "Your fathers entered not otherwise into the covenant than by circumcision, washing with water, and the offering of blood", Schürer, note 299, p.319.

560. See Schürer, op cit, p.320.


562. Käsemann, op cit, p.136, following H.H.Wendt, Die Apostelgeschichte (1913) A. Schlatter, Die Geschichte der ersten Christenheit (1927) p.193 (tr.P.Levertoff, The Church in the New Testament Period, SPCK (London 1955) p.162, "At Ephesus, Paul met a group of men who were attached to John the Baptist...A question of great importance arose here. Should the movement launched by John the Baptist be absorbed into the Church, or should it continue as a separate parallel community?" p.162; and K. Lake, Beginnings of Christianity, IV, p.237.


564. Käsemann, op cit, p.139.

565. Ibid.

566. J. Wellhausen, Kritische Analyse der Apostelgeschichte, op cit, p.39; E. Preuschen, Die Apostelgeschichte (1912) p.115; and other cited by Käsemann, p.137.

567. Luke uses the term Synagoge which I have taken for Jewish Christian Synagogue in the sense of James 2:2.
Romans 12:11, "fervent in Spirit" (ρυπατάς γένοιτις) is used definitely here of Christian edification; see M. Dibelius op cit, p.95; J. Weiss, op cit, Vol.I, p.316; K. Lake, op cit, p.233; and Käsemann's argument, op cit, p.143.

Käsemann has argued, "The Church of the latter day could not admit the existence in the sacred past of primitive Christian free-lances and communities resting on any other than apostolic authority; because otherwise it would have granted letters patent to the Gnostics and other heretics by whom it was being menaced", op cit, p.145.


O. Cullmann, L'Opposition contre le Temple, op cit, p.158.


W. C. van Unnik, op cit, p.172.

579. W. C. van Unnik, op cit, p.177.


583. 13:18, "I am not speaking to you all; I know whom I have chosen", 15:18, "If the world hates you...", 15:20, "They will persecute you", 16:1 "I have said this to keep you from falling away", 16:4 "I did not say these things to you from the beginning, because I was with you", etc.

584. Jh. 7:20, 8:48-49,52, 10:20-21.


586. Eusebius, H.E., 24.8, curiously translates "sacrificing priest".

587. Ibid.

588. Ibid.


591. Ibid.

The main proponents of the old view of a polemic between John the Baptist and the Urgemeinde were, W. Baldensperger, Der Prolog des Vierten Evangeliums, 1898; E. Lohmeyer, Das Urrchristentum, op cit, Vol.I, p.27, n.2, and his Commentary on Revelation in Lietzmann's Handbuch zum N.T., 1925; R. Bultmann, Die Religionsgeschichtliche Hintergrund, op cit, Vol.II, p.1, W. Bauer, Das Johannesevangelium, in Lietzmann's Handbuch, op cit; G.H.Schraeder, Der Mensch im Prolog des Vierten Evangeliums, p.306, attempts to reconstruct a Mandaean proto-type of the Fourth Gospel prologue; C.F.Burney, The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel, 1922, holds Mandaean sources; C.C.Torrey, HTR xvi (1923)305-344, says the prologue is a translation from an Aramaic original; R. Kittel, Die Hellenischen Mysterienreligionen und das Alte Testament, 1924, held a position similar to that of Cullmann's today regarding an early Jewish Gnosticism; cf Cullmann, Die Christologie des Neuen Testaments, op cit, p.28, he argued originally for a polemic but now holds a uniformity of the Gospel; cf. NTS v(1959)157-173, as participating in the current of pre-Christian Gnosticism; M. Goguel, Jean Baptist, op cit, p.274, argues for an early Gnosticism and believed that the Fourth Gospel contains a polemic against the disciples of John, p.104.

S. G. F. Brandon, The Fall of Jerusalem, op cit, p.68-73; Bickermann takes this break so seriously that he holds that all of the Gospels were written after 70 AD, E. Bickermann, Bibliotheca Orientalis x (1953)37ff.

W. F. Albright, criticises Brandon for not taking the break seriously enough and holds that there can be no continuity in Aramaic literature (of any kind) from 70 AD to the 2nd century on which to build an Aramaic proto-type for the Fourth Gospel as do Torrey and Olmstead, W. F. Albright, Recent Discoveries in Palestine and the Gospel of St. John, in N.T. essays for C. H. Dodd, Cambridge, 1956, p.155.

The term "Gnosticism" is totally inadequate to describe this early phenomenon as we have discussed above, p.1-4.
V. Taylor, The Formation of the Gospel Tradition, London 1935, p.6, 51-52, esp. 191-201; Prof. C.J. Cadoux, JTS xxx, p.311, has presented strong arguments for the Johannine framework for the ministry. He states that 2:20 cannot be a calculated fiction; the older critical view is reflected in Bernard, ICC, St. John, i, pp 86ff, who supports the Marcan framework.


John the Son of Zacharias, the Son of Eleazar, 8th of the 24 courses of priests; this grandfather is referred to by E.L.Sukenik, Jüdischer Gräber Jerusalem um Christi Geburt, 1931, p.17ff; and Albright, Archaeology of Palestine, op cit, p.244ff. Also see above, p.122 and footnote 261 where Jason is described as the descendant of Eleazar; cp.I Chr.24:3 Zadok the son of Eleazar.


J.A.T.Robinson interprets 4:1, NTS op cit, p.272ff, following Armitage Robinson, The Historical Character of St. John's Gospel, London 1929, p.271, as a turning point or break in the ministry of Jesus, after which he, presumably, began to preach a new Gospel; cf. J.A.T.Robinson, Theology, 50(1947)43-8, depends heavily on the supposition that 3:24 was a correction of the Synoptic Gospels rather than vice versa.

Esp.Hom.ii.52, xvii.4,13, Rec.ii.47, and Hyppolytus, Adv.Haer,xxx.18, xxxvi.3, liii.2 and Ebionitic literature; cf. E.Hennecke, Neutestamentliche Apoc.,
Tübingen 1924, p.19.

607. Origen, De Principiis, I, e,7, discourses on the belief in Adam as the reincarnated Prophet.


610. Bernard, The Gospel According to St. John, I, 1:28, ad loc, p.42; George Gro~ Ency Bib., believes (περαν) to be an interpolation, col.548; This view is also taken by P. Parker, JBL, lxxiv (1955) 257; There are good reasons to believe that the confusion started with Origen's conjecture and from thence into the Byzantine text; see Origen's Comm. Iohannan, VI, 40, 204, at 1:28, ad loc, this reading is attested by ΚΥ 3 syr. Sin.Cur, but Origen admits that he personally did not succeed in finding a place called "Bethany" anywhere along the Jordan.

611. G. Dalman, Sacred Sites and Ways, 1935, p.94. Dalman should perhaps be credited with the actual discovery of Bethesda, which has been preserved under centuries of debris. However, it is likely that Siloam has been exposed and known much longer.

612. W. F. Albright, HTR, xvii(1924)93ff; cf B.W.Bacon, JBL xlix (1929) 50-5.

613. Ibid, p.244-8.

614. E. Bickerman, Arch.Hist.Droit Oriental, v(1950)133ff, has called attention to the symbolic acts in the Last Supper associated with an oath or a covenant. He holds that the Sacrament was later viewed as the institution of a rite for the future and not as a unique action; also A.D.Nock, Early Gentile Christianity and its Hellenistic Background, (New York 1964) p.125, states "undoubtedly for a long time an appreciable number of Christians did not follow the Pauline view of the Eucharist; see A.D.Nock, St. Paul (London 1938) p.57."
615. W.F. Howard (1931 ed.) op cit, pp.151-157, is convinced that the Fourth Gospel has authoritative information by which it "corrects" the other accounts, as in the more accurate timing of the anointing at Bethany (12:1). Although John simply states that it was a "supper", there is some doubtfulness in Matthew and Mark that the supper should be identified with the Passover (Mk.14:2, 43, 47, 53, 15:46; Lk.22:38, 23:56). The possible Lucan suggestion that Jesus knew that he would not live to eat the Passover, Mark and Luke's superficial handling of the Cleansing of the Temple as an insertion or afterthought, Paul's reference to Christ as "Our Passover" (I Cor.5:7), all disclose that this teaching was known at an early date, along with a host of evidence which substantiates the Johannine view; see F.C. Burkitt and A.E. Brook's essay, JTS ix, pp.569-72; G.Dalman, Jesus-Jeschua (pp.80ff) Eng.tr pp.86ff, 90, 91, 211; cf. B.W. Bacon. Expositor VIII.xxvi. p.432ff on I Cor. 15:4; G.H. Box, JTS iii (1902) pp.35ff; F.C. Burkitt, JTS xvii (1916) pp.291ff; W.O.E. Oesterley, The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy, pp.157, however, tends to identify the Last Supper with the Kiddush.


621. "qoyn" is often overlooked because of commentator's interest in the term (ygc) as a key to the Evangelist's "system" of thought; among these R. Bultmann, in
Vom Worte Gottes, ed. E. Lohmeyer, Deutsche Theologie III, p.14ff, asserts that (_above_ ) is here used in the Greek sense and is formally the opposite of the Hebrew conception of (_above_ ); however, this view is not shared by H. Kleinknecht, TWNT, ed. G. Kittel IV, p.76ff, who has found it entirely possible for the Greek concept of (_above_ ) to merge with the Hebrew understanding of the word. Normally, the Greek use has nothing to do with the function and activity of speaking, but with its ordered and reasonable content; W.F. Arndt and F.G. G High, ed. of Bauer's Wörterbuch, ad loc, pp. 478-80, and H. Leisegang, art, "Logos" in Pauly, Real-Ency. xiii (1926) 1035-81, distinguishes between the Greek use which designates what the "word" is and the Hebrew use which refers to what the "word" accomplishes, "Whereas to Plato the 'logos' may determine how and what a being is, the Hebrew (_above_ ) is dynamic both objectively and linguistically from the verb (_above_ ) which is usually used in the Pi'el, but both of the forms in which it is commonly explained imply an event or activity of speaking", e.g. activity of creation as an event, Gen.1:15,27, of revelation, I Sam.3:1, Jer.1:4.11, 2:1, 13:8, Ezek.3:16, 6:1, as command, Jer.32:6,8 thus (_above_ ) is not merely a "word" but a deed, Gen.24:66, I Kg.11:41.

622. Recently, Torlief Boman has commented, "if word failed to become deed", in Hebrew thought, "the failure is not in the fact that man has produced only words and no deeds, but in the fact that he brought forth a counterfeit word, an empty word, or a lying word which did not possess the inner strength and truth for accomplishment, or else it accomplished something evil", Boman., Das Hebräische Denken im Vergleich mit dem Griechischen (Göttingen 1960), tr. J.L. Moreau, Hebrew Thought Compared with Greek (London 1960) p.60.

The literature is now so great that there are already several important surveys on these source debates, B.W. Bacon, The Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate, 1910; W.F. Howard, the Fourth Gospel in Recent Criticism and Interpretation, 1931, revised and brought up to date by C.K. Barrett, 1955; P.H. Menoud, L’évangile de Jean d’après les recherches récentes, 1947, is particularly critical of Bultmann’s Gnostic source theories, pp. 17-21; Hermetic and Philonic sources have been actively defended by C.H. Dodd, The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, Cambridge, 1953; Those who reject the historicity of the Fourth Gospel on the grounds of foreign influence theories, H.J. Holtzmann, Einleitung in das NT, 1892; P.W. Schmiedel, Religionsgeschichtliche Volksbücher I, Herne 8, 10, 12, Das vierte Evangelium (1906), Evangelium Briefe und Offenbarung des Johannes, tr. M.A. Canney, The Johannine Writings, 1908; so also A. Jülicher, Einleitung in das N.T., 1900, tr. J.P. Ward, 1904, rejects outright the historical value of the Gospels; The Contention of these writings has been countered by the massive work of V.H. Stanton, The Gospels as Historical Documents, 1903, a classic in Johannine historical study, but much of which is out of date, Stanton maintained that the earlier work of the Apostle John was interpreted by a second century mind which produced its present form.

C. H. Dodd, op cit, p. 53.

Ibid, p. 280.


R. Bultmann, Das Evangelium des Johannes, Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament, Tübingen 1950, his views on the Urgemeinde’s relationship to the Gnosticism of the Baptist’s followers has been repeated in his, Theologie des Neuen Testaments II, Tübingen 1948-53, p. 349-439, and Die Theologie des Johannes-Evangeliums und der Johannes-Briefe, here his basic position is very close to W. Bauer’s, Das Johannes Evangelium, 1925.

Bultmann, Theologie, op cit, p. 361ff, which has recently been criticised in Theologische Rundschau, 1951, Studies in a Coptic-Manichaean Psalm Book, 1949, p. 156-166; as well as the Criticism of W.F. Albright, From Stone Age
to Christianity, op cit, pp.292-300.


631. Bultmann, Theologie, op cit, p.361, n.1; but see also Bo Reicke NTS i(1954-5)141; Especially, O. Cullmann, L'Opposition contra le Temple, op cit, NTS v(1959)157-173; K.G. Kuhn, Die in Palästina gefundenen hebräischen Texte und das Neue Testament, ZTK(1950)p.194; F.M. Braun, L'arrière_fond judaïque du quatrième Évangile et la Communauté de l'alliance, Rev. Bib. lxii(1955)p.5; not so with C.H. Dodd "I see no evidence that our evangelist could have learned at Qumran the kind of Rabbinic thought with which he shows acquaintance", Hist. Trad., op cit, p.16, n.3.


634. R. Bultmann, ZNW xxiv(1925)144ff.

635. W.F. Albright, Archeology of Palestine, op cit, p.244-8, lists numerous examples of recent archeological finds which demonstrate that the Fourth Gospel has more accurate topographical data and describes more accurately the milieu of pre-70 AD Palestine, according to archeological standards, than any of the other Gospels; J.D. Thompson, Archeology and the Bible (1962); J.W. Crowfoot, Early Churches in Palestine (London 1941); esp. M. Burrows, art. Bib. Archeologist i.(1938) p.176 (No.3); L.H. Vincent, Rev. Bib. lx(1952)p.513ff.
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