

## MINISTRY AS STEWARDSHIP OF THE TRADITION IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

*A Contribution to the Discussion of  
Church Order in Early Christianity*<sup>1</sup>

The New Testament provides us with no single norm of Church order and ministries. It is even doubtful that a single ecclesiastical

<sup>1</sup> I confess that the bibliography of the subject which is assembled here is more for the convenience of frequent subsequent citation than for the reader's guidance. The area of NT church order and ministries is difficult to cover with a manageable bibliography, not least of all because approaches to the question are so varied and issues raised in one portion of the literature are all but ignored in the others. The works we post here for frequent citation in later notes will give ample indication of the complexion of this writer's views on the topic, even if they do not suggest a principle of unity for the presentation which follows.—Hans-Werner Bartsch, *Die Anfänge urchristlicher Rechtsbildungen. Studien zu den Pastoralbriefen*. Theologische Forschung, 34; Hamburg-Bergstedt, 1965.—Walter Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum*. Zweite Auflage, mit einem Nachtrag von Georg Strecker. Beiträge zur historischen Theologie, 10; Tübingen, 1964.—Günther Bornkamm—Gerhard Barth—H. J. Held, *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew*. Trans. by Percy Scott, in NT Library series. Philadelphia, 1963.—G. Bornkamm, "Der Auferstandene und der Irdische, Mt 28,16-20," in E. Dinkler, ed., *Zeit und Geschichte. Dankesgabe an R. Bultmann zum 80. Geburtstag* (Tübingen, 1964) 171-91 (now included in the 4th German edition of the Bornkamm-Barth-Held symposium, not as yet translated).—Rudolf Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament II* (New York, 1955) 95-118.—Hans von Campenhausen, *Ecclesiastical Authority and Spiritual Power in the Church of the First Three Centuries*. Trans. by J. A. Baker; Stanford, 1969.—Hans Conzelmann, *An Outline of the Theology of the New Testament* (trans. by John Bowden, in NT Library series; New York, 1969) 254-65, 289-317.—H. Conzelmann, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*. Meyerkommentar, 11. Auflage; Göttingen, 1969. Martin Dibelius, *Die Pastoralbriefe*. Handbuch zum NT, 13, vierte, ergänzte Auflage von Hans Conzelmann; Tübingen, 1966.—Leonard Goppelt, *Die apostolische und nachapostolische Zeit*. 2. Auflage; Göttingen, 1966.—Ernst Käsemann, *Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen*, 2 vols. Göttingen, 1960 and 1964.—Ernst Käsemann, *Essays on New Testament Themes*. Studies in Biblical Theol., 41; Chicago, 1964.—Ernst Käsemann, *New Testament Questions of Today*. Trans. by W. J. Montague; Philadelphia, 1969.—Ernst Käsemann, *Jesus means Freedom*. Trans. by Frank Clarke; Philadelphia, 1969.—Ernst Käsemann, *et al.*, *Apocalypticism*. Vol. 6 of the *Journal for Theology and Church*, ed. by Robert W. Funk. New York, 1969.

office remains among us substantially as the NT churches conceived it. So much have these findings of historical criticism become common possession in recent years that they will surprise no one in the present discussion. Indeed, they could be unsettling only to those who, in docetic fashion, imagined that every NT statement on any subject had to be a perennial statement of values for the Christian Church. And Roman Christianity has seldom drifted in the direction of such a fundamentalism!

The NT is, of course, no final statement of Christian values. Least of all is it a blueprint for the right structuring of future Christian communities. It is rather the testimony of an initial and

—Günther Klein, *Die zwölf Apostel. Ursprung und Gehalt einer Idee*. FRLANT 77; Göttingen, 1961.—Günther Klein, "Lukas 1,1-4 als theologisches Programm," in *Zeit und Geschichte. Dankesgabe an R. Bultmann . . .* (cited above) 193-216; now in G. Klein, *Rekonstruktion und Interpretation. Gesammelte Aufsätze zum NT* (Munich, 1969) 237-261.—Helmut Köster, "Häretiker im Urchristentum als theologisches Problem," in *Zeit und Geschichte. Dankesgabe an R. Bultmann . . .*, 61-76.—Helmut Köster, "ἸΝΩΜΑΙ ΔΙΑΦΟΡΟΙ. Ursprung und Wesen der Mannigfaltigkeit in der Geschichte des frühen Christentums," *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche [ZThK]* 65 (1968) 160-203. This is a slightly altered version of the article which appeared in *Harvard Theological Review* 58 (1965) 279-318.—Werner Georg Kümmel, reedition of the Feine-Behm *New Testament Introduction*. Trans. of the 13th German edition by A. J. Mattill, Jr.; New York/Nashville, 1966.—Hans Küng, *The Church*. Trans. by Ray and Rosaleen Ockenden; New York, 1968.—Dieter Lührmann, *Das Offenbarungsverständnis bei Paulus und in paulinischen Gemeinden*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum A. und N.T., 16; Neukirchen, 1965.—Dieter Lührmann, *Die Redaktion der Logienquelle*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien . . . , 33; Neukirchen, 1969.—Alan Richardson, *An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament* (New York, 1958) 312-336.—Jürgen Roloff, *Apostolat—Verkündigung—Kirche. Ursprung, Inhalt und Funktion des kirchlichen Apostelamtes nach Paulus, Lukas und den Pastoralbriefen*. Gütersloh, 1965.—Heinrich Schlier, *Die Zeit der Kirche. Exegetische Aufsätze und Vorträge*, 3rd edition. Freiburg, 1962.—Walter Schmithals, *The Office of Apostle in the Early Church*. Trans. by John E. Steely; Nashville/New York, 1969.—W. Schneemelcher, "Apostle and Apostolic," and "The Origin of the Pseudapostolic Literature"; and M. Hornschuh and W. Bauer, "The Picture of the Apostle in Early Christian Tradition," in Hennecke-Schneemelcher, *New Testament Apocrypha* (trans. by R. McL. Wilson; New York, 1965) II, 25-87.—Eduard Schweizer, *Church Order in the New Testament*. Studies in Biblical Theol., 32, trans. by Frank Clarke; Chicago, 1961.—Klaus Wegenast, *Das Verständnis der Tradition bei Paulus und in den Deuteropaulinen*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum A. und N.T., 8; Neukirchen, 1962.—References to these works in the notes that follow will be abbreviated, with only author's name and the main substantive of the title given.

constitutive growth process, by which the primitive churches struggled to find their place, and secure it, in a schema of sacred history which was only gradually clarified. What emerge from this testimony are several types or patterns of church order,<sup>2</sup> ranging nearly from one pole to the other of the disciplinary spectrum. From a primitive utopianism to later, reactive rigidity, Christendom progressed dialectically during the NT period towards a more-or-less conventional ideal of "the Church in the world." When that ideal is given a modern restatement, as at Vatican II, much of the struggle and contradiction by which it was achieved is left out of consideration. Yet much can be learned from that formative process, for a stable church order, like any synthesis, can be sustained and nourished only when its elements are known and valued in isolation.

If we attempt, in this discussion, to find a unifying concept for the NT ministries we consider, this is by no means for the purpose of diluting the differences among them, nor of neutralizing the

<sup>2</sup> "The New Testament does not present us with an *ecclesiology perennis* but offers us instead certain ecclesiological archetypes," Käsemann asserts in the topical statement of his typically pungent essay, "Unity and Multiplicity in the New Testament Doctrine of the Church," in *Questions*, 252-59. Since all church order can only be viewed as the realization of the sovereignty of Christ in the world, it is of fundamental importance for our question that "the pages of the New Testament have shown us that Jesus' sovereignty is refracted in the most varied ways on earth, and that we are able to grasp it and translate it into action only fragmentarily according to the existing situation" (Käsemann, *Freedom*, 156). The foundation of the doctrine of the sovereignty of Christ embracing manifold human manifestations and precluding uniformity is the Pauline charismatic order, in which Christology and ecclesiology are both substantively and terminologically interrelated (see Käsemann's essay, "Ministry and Community in the New Testament," *Essays*, 63-94, esp. 70). The derivation of NT ecclesiologies from NT christologies explains the empirical multiplicity of both, such as was effectively demonstrated in Bultmann's *Theology* (cf. II, 237 ff.) and in Käsemann's essays, "The Canon of the New Testament and the Unity of the Church" (*Essays*, 95-107) and "The Problem of the Historical Jesus" (*Essays*, 15-47, esp. 20 ff., 46). Non-Bultmannian endorsements of the basic thesis of the variety of NT church polities are found in A. Richardson, *Introduction*, 312 f.; Rudolf Schnackenburg, *The Church in the New Testament* (trans. by W. J. O'Hara; New York, 1965) 21; Myles M. Bourke, "Reflections on Church Order in the New Testament," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 30 (1968) 493-511; and, of course, the book which occasioned the "reflections" of Monsignor Bourke, Hans Küng's *The Church*, can be numbered among the *vota* for our principle, as well as the earlier works of Küng, *The Living Church* (New York, 1963) 233-93, and *Structures of the Church* (New York, 1964).

unique historical circumstances in which they flourished.<sup>3</sup> For the unifying concept we are proposing, *stewardship of the tradition*, constitutes a recurring concern for which NT ministries were undertaken, yet emphasizes as well the quite different views of the tradition and its management by which the "stewards" were motivated. Our unifying concern, with its provision for both consistency and diversity, may therefore continue to unite ecclesiastical offices and functions, affording them both a guiding criteriology and room for the changes that history and culture demand.

#### A. *Apostles and Prophets*

In his remarkable essays on the earliest currents in Christian theology, Ernst Käsemann proposed as their core and substance the conviction of the abundant bestowal of the Holy Spirit in the wake of the Easter experience. *Post-Easter enthusiasm*<sup>4</sup> is Käsemann's

<sup>3</sup> The concern of historical criticism for safeguarding the distance between text and interpreter, for understanding the historical as particular, and for conserving the particularity of historical data especially where proximity in time and/or space invites the reductionist fallacy, is of fundamental hermeneutical importance. See Gerhard Ebeling, *Word and Faith* (trans. by James W. Leitsch; Philadelphia, 1963) 46 ff., and Robert W. Funk, "The Hermeneutical Problem and Historical Criticism," in J. M. Robinson and J. B. Cobb, eds., *The New Hermeneutic* (New Frontiers in Theol., 2; New York, 1964) 183 ff.

<sup>4</sup> See especially the essays "The Beginnings of Christian Theology," and "On the Topic of Primitive Christian Apocalyptic," in the symposium *Apocalypticism* (*JThC* 6), 17-46 and 99-133, where they are printed together with other contributions to a lively debate which they provoked. (They are also printed in *Questions*, 82-137.) The topic of Christian "enthusiasm" has come to preoccupy Käsemann in most of his writing, for it serves him as a lever for a systematic approach to the NT canon according to which "the post-Pauline New Testament writings are almost all involved in some kind of argument with the early Christian enthusiasts" (*Freedom*, 85). He clearly shows his dependence upon the Bultmannian assessment that the heights of Pauline and Johannine Christology were not maintained in the development towards institutional Christianity ("early Catholicism"),—almost a "theoretical standard for distinguishing between good and bad theology" against which Conzelmann warns (*Outline*, 289). One does not have to subscribe completely to Käsemann's sweeping systematics or to that polemical Reformer in him—never far below the surface of his elegant prose—in order to accept the hypothesis of "post-Easter enthusiasm" as a workable orientation of criticism. The identifications of "enthusiasm" with genuine Christian freedom and its absence with "the sleeping church" (*Freedom*, 54), and the quest for a "gospel within the canon" which consistently underlies Käsemann's criticism and was recently given ex-

term for that earliest impulse of Easter belief: the adherents rejoiced in the extraordinary signs of the Spirit's working among them,—such as Paul would evaluate and classify as *χαρίσματα*—, and they were united in the fervid expectation of Jesus' early return as heavenly Son of Man. This first hope born of Easter brought the fugitive disciples back to Jerusalem from Galilee, since Jewish tradition firmly associated the Deliverer's appearance with the Holy City. From that first hope also flowed the apocalyptic interpretations of Jesus' resurrection: that it was the beginning of the end-time, that the judgment, restoration, and general resurrection would follow it within a very short time. Käsemann's thesis therefore hinges on the fact that "enthusiasm and apocalyptic theology are . . . united by inner necessity,"<sup>5</sup> and the evidence for this apocalyptic leaven in the oldest NT strata is compelling indeed.<sup>6</sup> Indeed, her experience

placit credentials by him (cf. "Vom theologischen Recht historisch-kritischer Exegese," *ZThK* 64 [1967] 259-81, esp. 266 f.), can remain in abeyance for the moment. That the "enthusiasm" depiction is a useful "working hypothesis" of criticism is all we wish to affirm.

<sup>5</sup> *Apocalypticism*, 29. Cf. also 106: "The return of Jesus as the heavenly Son of man is indeed the central hope which the earliest disciples derived directly from the experience of Easter, and as such it is their real Easter faith. Thus, too, it is only at a relatively late date that the event of Easter is limited to Jesus himself, whereas originally it was understood as the dawning of the general resurrection of the dead, that is to say, it was interpreted apocalyptically and not as an isolatable miracle. We block our own access to the oldest Easter kerygma if we disregard its apocalyptic context."

<sup>6</sup> The abundance of apocalyptic materials in those oldest strata does not impose a consensus among exegetes as to its provenance and importance. As is well known, the statement of Käsemann that "apocalyptic . . . was the mother of all Christian theology" (*Apocalypticism*, 40) brought a testy refutation from his famous teacher (cf. Rudolf Bultmann, "Ist die Apokalyphtik die Mutter der christlichen Theologie? Eine Auseinandersetzung mit Ernst Käsemann," in *Apophoreta. Festschrift für Ernst Haenchen* [Beiheft 30 zur *ZnW*, ed. by W. Eltester and F. H. Kettler; Berlin, 1964] 64-69) and some hard questioning from his fellow students (Gerhard Ebeling, "The Ground of Christian Theology," in *Apocalypticism*, esp. 52-53, 55-59, 61, 64; Ernst Fuchs, "On the Task of a Christian Theology," *ibid.*, 72-75, 76, 81 f.). Käsemann's penchant for overstatement and provocative systematizing is probably responsible for some clouding of the issue, which is surely one of the liveliest in contemporary NT study. Some methodological rigor and clarification of what exactly 'apocalyptic' means (a literary form? a subdivision of eschatology? a system of thought?) need to be brought to the fray (cf. Hans Dieter Betz, "On the Problem of the Religio-Historical Understanding of Apocalypticism," *Apocalypticism*, 134-56). If apocalyptic is to be kept within the vast complex of

of Easter and the (Lord as) Spirit caused the first Church to resort to apocalyptic categories much more extensively and systematically than Jesus had done,<sup>7</sup> for she was in search of something to substitute for the consolation of his physical presence and his claim that, in his ministry, the era of God's grace and sovereignty was dawning.

The Church's enthusiastic response to Easter, coupled with her expectation of a proximate end of the ages in Jesus' return, explains the absence of structured offices and transmitted authority from the earliest testimonies. The power and universality of the Easter Spirit could not be charted or controlled by congregations awaiting the Lord's return; they had only to discern the Spirit, and obey it,

"Hellenistic-oriented syncretism" (Betz, 138, 155), of which it is but a peculiar manifestation and with which it shares many of what are often carelessly presented as its distinctive characteristics, we have to admit that the question of what originally constituted 'apocalyptic' as a thought-system, hence whether and how it "mothered" Christian theology, all but defies a definite answer in the near future!

<sup>7</sup> Or so many scholars, under Bultmann's influence, have maintained. But the view that the earliest Church 'apocalypticized' a basically un-apocalyptic Kingdom-proclamation of Jesus, which Käsemann (*Apocalypticism*, 39-40, 103 ff., 114-18; *Essays*, 43-44) shares with Philipp Vielhauer ("Gottesreich und Menschensohn in der Verkündigung Jesu," *Aufsätze zum NT* [Theol. Bücherei 31; Munich, 1965] 55-91; "Apocalyptic in Early Christianity," in Hennecke-Schneemelcher, *New Testament Apocrypha* II, 608 ff.) and Hans Conzelmann ("Gegenwart und Zukunft in der synoptischen Tradition," *ZThK* 54 [1957] 277-96, esp. 286-88, 289), now comes under some sharp criticism from a new generation of scholars, under the influence of Wolfhart Pannenburg, who reject the Bultmannians' distinction between eschatology and apocalyptic (i.e., between Jesus' Kingdom proclamation and its post-Easter interpretation) and call into doubt the "theological new beginning" and "the break which Easter brought in earliest Christian history" (Käsemann, *op. cit.*, 40, 114). A comprehensive presentation of their position can be found in August Strobel, *Kerygma und Apokalyptik. Ein religionsgeschichtlicher und theologischer Beitrag zur Christusfrage* (Göttingen, 1967). Here a fine survey of the discussion (16-30) is followed by the outline of a new approach to the problem (31-35), in which it is suggested that the principle "apocalyptic is the mother of Christian theology" ought to be extended to the pre-Easter history and proclamation of Jesus, becoming a basis for the continuity of the two epochs rather than their discontinuity (33). Jesus' awareness and pursuit of his mission did not surpass the framework of apocalyptic expectation, according to Strobel, hence it will not suffice to characterize his message as "eschatological" only; for this term "signifies everything and signifies nothing. It comes to us from dogmatics, not from the history of religions" (35).—We shall have reason to support this challenge to Käsemann with certain considerations later in our presentation.

whereever its authentic promptings occurred. Thus even when it began to appear that the Lord was tarrying and abuses of this open charismatic order were cropping up, St. Paul did not resort to appointed offices for control of the charisms; he appealed to the principles of common benefit, good order, charity, and the standard of the gospel, as their sufficient regimen (I Cor 12-14). Utopian as this order might be as a human social polity, the Church cannot be merely that,—least of all in the fervor and confidence of those earliest days. As the eschatological congregation of God's Elect awaiting his Kingdom, the Church can demand freedom, obedience, and love "as, so to speak, the 'normal thing' " in her ranks. If the Church were no longer Spirit-guided, and the 'normal thing' were thus to become law in her, "then for Paul she would be dead."<sup>8</sup>

Geographical factors likewise encouraged an open and unstructured church order in the earliest missions. Itinerant enthusiasts, like Paul, spread the new allegiance rapidly through the polyglot centers of Northern Palestine, Syria, Asia Minor, and Greece, forming local congregations which were won over by the missionaries' ecstatic testimony and impressive deeds,<sup>9</sup> but were then left to inte-

<sup>8</sup> von Campenhausen, *Authority*, 64 (with recourse to the German original [2nd ed., Tübingen, 1963] 69).

<sup>9</sup> The compelling quality of charismatic deeds and speech gave them an important missionary function in the primitive churches, as Paul attests strikingly in I Cor 14,25. Here the pagans who attend a Christian service and come under the scrutiny of the charismatic prophets are expected with certainty to conclude that the divine Spirit is at work in this place: ὄντως ὁ θεὸς ἐν ὑμῖν ἔσται (cf. Käsemann, *Freedom*, 56). St. Luke, despite his well known theological transformation of his materials, has preserved valuable vestiges of the beginnings of the Christian mission in hellenistic areas in his fragmentary, and admittedly manipulated, reports of the activities of "the Seven" (Acts 6-8; 11,19-26; cf. H. Köster, *ZThK* 65 [1968] 166 ff.; Käsemann, *Freedom*, 43 ff.). The formation of this distinct missionary group, with its passionately anti-institutional and antinomian tenets (Acts 6,11 ff.; 7), is not sufficiently motivated by the historian's introduction, Acts 6,1, any more than their ministry is adequately depicted in 6,2 (διακονεῖν τραπέζαις). Luke's is an irenic retrospect upon a split in the missionary Church which was brought to an uneasy settlement in the meeting reported in Gal 2,7-10 and whose causes were no less than the profound cultural and linguistic contrasts among Christianity's earliest adherents (cf. Walter Schmithals, *Paul and James* [Studies in Biblical Theol. 46, trans. by D. M. Barton; Chicago, 1965] 16-37; Ernst Haenchen, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 13th edition [Meyerkommentar; Göttingen, 1961] 218-22). The "division of labor" in Acts 6,2 is really Luke's own, whereas Stephen's group in fact carried

grate the exciting "good news" into the religious and cultural heritage of their own locale. Cosmopolitan centers like Antioch and Damascus, then Miletus and Ephesus, where the language and religious ideals of the Greeks mingled with the surviving currents of older Eastern civilizations, provided a lively and varied atmosphere for the incredibly rapid advance of the Christian confession during the Pauline era. They also guaranteed that the new movement would be, from its outset, a *syncretistic* faith: not at all a canon of pure forms preserved from cross-fertilization, but a catalyst for the mixture of its own semitic roots with the broad sophistication of Hellenism. The notion of a virginal deposit of Christian beliefs, contaminated subsequently *ab extra* by heretical invaders and defended by faithful, "apostolic" adherents, is a fiction of conventional catechesis which cannot bear the historian's scrutiny.<sup>10</sup> Even what came to be Christian orthodoxy in later years was, in good measure, a syncretistic product, whereas the original features of Christianity in certain places would prove, by that subsequent standard, to have been heretical!<sup>11</sup>—All of which prepares us further for the recogni-

out that formative missionary activity which the historian preferred to limit initially to the Twelve: they were preachers of the word (Acts 6,9 f. 14; 8,4. 5 ff. 12.35.40; 11,19 ff.) and miracle-workers (Acts 6,8; 8,6 f.), fulfilling the kind of θεῖος ἀνὴρ image which was so appealing to the popular currents of late hellenistic religion. Stephen is pictured by Luke as a genuine charismatic missionary: πλήρης χάριτος καὶ δυνάμεως and worker of τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα μεγάλα (Acts 6,8), such that his enemies were unable to resist τῇ σοφίᾳ καὶ τῷ πνεύματι ᾧ ἐλάλει (6,10). The fact that these recollections are refractory of Luke's organic development of the origins, centered on the unique authority and initiatives of the Twelve, is a measure of their genuinity and their importance for a reconstruction of the earliest Christian missions. Indeed, the survival of the hellenistic group, despite their opposition to Judaeo-Christian nomism, was a triumph of the charismatic idealism and genuine 'freedom' of the early days (so Käsemann, *Freedom*, 43-55).

<sup>10</sup> This famous thesis of Walter Bauer, published in his book of 1934 (see *op. cit.* in n. 1), happens to have been the fruit of Bauer's work as predecessor of Ernst Käsemann at the University of Göttingen. Käsemann commemorated his predecessor's thesis in his own *Antrittsvorlesung* of 1951, in which he inaugurated a course of criticism of St. John, and other NT books, very much predicated upon the Bauer findings (see "Ketzer und Zeuge. Zum johanneischen Verfasserproblem," in *Exegetische Versuche . . . I*, 168-87). Additional support comes to Bauer's thesis from the documents turned up at Nag Hammadi, according to the essay of Helmut Köster in which the thesis is taken up again (*ZThK* 65 [1968] 160-203). See also H. Conzelmann, *Outline*, 300-302.

<sup>11</sup> H. Köster, *art. cit.*, 160-61: "The long-venerable and conventional criteria

tion that the church order and ministries of the earliest communities were not custodial and defensive, but *charismatic and creative*. The enthusiastic ministries were undertaken and recognized on the basis of the Spirit's universal influence in the eschatological congregation. Such "order" as there was, as I Cor 14, 26ff. makes clear, was an obedience *afterwards* to the *de facto* action of the Spirit in his minister, rather than an appointed mediation beforehand of the divine initiatives. In Paul's Corinth, for example, "it is not because a person has been chosen as prophet or presbyter that he may exercise this or that ministry; but on the contrary, because God has given him the charism, the possibility is given to him, through the Church order, of exercising it."<sup>12</sup>

These considerations introduce us to the principal charismatic ministries of Pauline church order, those of *apostle* and *prophet*, whose designation as "foundation" of the edifice of the Church in Eph 2,20 (cf. I Cor 12,28; Eph 4,11) no doubt reflects their "founding" function in the missionary congregations of the earliest years. As itinerant preachers, these charismatics built communities of believers in many places and held them answerable, by subsequent visits and (in Paul's case) by correspondence, for preservation of the kerygma and for deeds worthy of their calling.—The absence of empirical criteria for these ministries is especially striking in the case of the charismatic *apostle*, by comparison with the definitions of that ministry given in later NT literature.<sup>13</sup> The office of apostle,

of the distinction between orthodox belief and heresy threaten to replace the scrutiny of the historian and to falsify the verdict of the theologian. . . . That which is postulated (by the conventional criteria), viz. that heresies are always the result of inappropriate influences from outside, is absurd and misleading; for Christianity as a whole, whether 'heretical' or 'orthodox,' has incorporated into itself and exploited an incredibly vast number of foreign influences. Indeed, Christianity is, in all its manifold forms, a thoroughly syncretistic religion, and this is true of those developments which led to 'orthodoxy' as well." Cf. W. Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit*, 1-5, 193-97, 231 ff., etc.

<sup>12</sup> E. Schweizer, *Church Order*, 102. "Here, certainly, we can see the newness of the Church in contrast to the Jewish community. The Spirit's authority is obeyed as it actually comes to be; this leads to an order which conforms itself afterwards to the 'event' of the Spirit; and its only purpose is to make room for the Spirit to carry out his work of edifying the Church with as little hindrance as possible. . . . All order is an 'afterwards,' an attempt to follow what God has already designed." Cf. also von Campenhausen, *Authority*, 63-64.

<sup>13</sup> Von Campenhausen led in the critical studies of the NT apostle concept

as Paul speaks of it, was not limited to a clearly specified group, such as the Twelve.<sup>14</sup> It was not the result of appointment by the earthly Jesus, as St. Luke and subsequent, conventional ecclesiology assume (cf. Lk 6,13); hence it did not require the experience of Jesus' own lifetime as its historical credential (else how could Paul have claimed it?). And although the apostle's peculiar mandate and authority were conferred in a single initial encounter with the risen Christ,—such being the clear force of the aorists in the Pauline vocation texts—<sup>15</sup> his function as apostle did not become that of transmitting a single past revelation. He was rather the instrument of revelation as God's present and future saving act towards mankind, disclosing to man the significance and the promise of the once-for-all Christ event.<sup>16</sup> Only the sustained "happening" of revelation

which have taken possession in recent years. Cf. his "Der urchristliche Apostelbegriff," *Studia Theologica* 1 (1948) 96-130, and the books of Schmithals, Klein, and Roloff which are listed above, n. 1. Cf. also M. Bourke, *CBQ* 30 (1968) 495 ff.

<sup>14</sup> Note especially the distinct Easter experiences of "the Twelve" and "all the apostles" in I Cor 15,5,7. The transmitted fragment of I Cor 15,3b-5 is the only instance of Paul's use of the designation οἱ δώδεκα. He does not use it where we should most expect him to, according to the conventional view of the origins of the apostleship, viz. where he is at pains to clarify his relationship to οἱ πρὸ ἐμοῦ ἀπόστολοι, Gal 1,17-2,10. And like the ἀπόστολοι πάντες of I Cor 15,7, οἱ λοιποὶ ἀπόστολοι of I Cor. 9,5 is a problem for those who wish to confine the apostolic group to the Twelve and the parvenue, Paul. The "other apostles" of 9,5 are obviously those besides Paul and Barnabas, viz. Andronicus and Junias (Rom 16,7), perhaps Silvanus, "and further the unknown number of other missionaries who before Paul knew themselves to be called by the resurrected Christ to the apostolic ministry" (W. Schmithals, *Apostle*, 81; cf. his full treatment of Paul and the Twelve, 73-87). The basically itinerant, missionary character of the original apostolic function, and the probable exclusion of the Twelve from οἱ ἀπόστολοι πάντες, are steps of Schmithals' argument which (especially the second) will win fewer adherents. Cf. also D. Lührmann, *Offenbarungsverständnis*, 93-97.

<sup>15</sup> Gal 1,16; I Cor 15,8; Phil 3,12; II Cor 12,2 ff.; I Cor 9,1(pf.).

<sup>16</sup> Dieter Lührmann, *Offenbarungsverständnis*, 92: "Revelation, tradition and proclamation in Paul have this in common, that they are the interpretation of the Christ-event given to men. It is revelation which makes this interpretation possible. This could make it appear that Paul considers revelation that which legitimates proclamation and tradition. But this is contradicted by the fact that the proclamation itself is the revelation, that therefore revelation is not actual outside of the proclamation. Moreover Paul, confronting his enemies in Gal, those who proclaimed a revelation mediated by tradition, made a point of separating tradition and revelation from one another. For the understanding

in the proclamation could permit Paul to speak of ἀποκάλυψις as a charism distributed among the prophets at Corinth (I Cor 14,26. 30 [cf. v. 6]), of the disclosure of God's righteousness in the apostle's *gospel* (δικαιοσύνη γὰρ Θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ [*i.e.* τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ] ἀποκαλύπτεται—Rom. 1,17; cf. 16,25), and, through his student accurately reproducing his thought, of the "mystery of Christ . . . now revealed to his holy apostles and prophets *in the Spirit*" (Eph 3,5). Such was the sustained, intensely *present*, ultimately unsearchable and, so to speak, *un-historical* credential of the charismatic apostle and prophet. It would not be till the later NT era,

of these statements we might point out again that Paul does not use the concept of revelation in the context of statements about the Christ-event as such. Revelation for Paul is therefore not an event of the past such as could be the basis of a tradition, but a present activity of God, newly undertaken, viz. the interpretation of the saving event to men in the proclamation. Revelation so defined, however, can take up traditions insofar as they already represent appropriate interpretation of the Christ-event" (explaining Paul's authoritative use of oral-tradition formulas, like I Cor 15,3b-5,—a topic treated extensively in Klaus Wegenast, *Tradition*, esp. 50, 52 ff., 91-92). Lührmann sees the relationship of Paul's revelation-concept to that of Jewish apocalyptic writings involving *quid simile* and *quid diversum* (*op. cit.*, 107). Paul awaits revelation as the salvific act of God at the end of the present age, applying ἀποκάλυψις to the Parousia of Jesus (I Cor 1,7) and the related disclosure of the glorious state of believers (Rom 8,19). But on the other hand, Paul knows no anticipated disclosure of that final "unveiling" in visions and heavenly journeys; or, when he shows himself acquainted with that way of thinking (II Cor 12,1 ff.), he renounces precisely the claim that such experiences legitimate or contribute to the apostle's message. A passage which could be interpreted in such fashion, I Cor 2,6 ff., is shown by Lührmann to be a Pauline alteration of an inherited revelation-schema (*op. cit.*, 113 ff., 133 ff.). This scholar has clearly opted for the Bultmannian "anthropological" understanding of revelation in Paul (revelation as present saving activity of God towards men, through the preaching—*ibid.*, 155) and is aware of the innovation of the Pannenburg group, which he rejects (revelation as the indirect self-revelation of God through the complex of sacred history; in Paul, the past of the Jesus-event, the present of the Spirit in the Church, and the future of the Parousia—see Ulrich Wilckens, "Das Offenbarungsverständnis in der Geschichte des Urchristentums," in Wolfhart Pannenburg, ed., *Offenbarung als Geschichte* [Beiheft 1 zu *Kerygma und Dogma*; Göttingen, 1961] 68-69). Lührmann insists that the structure of Paul's revelation-concept provides only for present and future realities: "God's revelation activity, as eschatological saving action towards men, happens in the present and is directed towards God's act in the future" (*op. cit.*, 108). The Christ-event in itself, as a definitive past "revelation," is an idea unknown to Paul.—Once again we recognize that the influence of systematic theological positions on this debate is considerable.

when the churches were shoring up their traditions and searching for canons of legitimate belief, that the fixed, empirical criteria of the apostolic office so familiar to us would be formulated: the "closed circle" of the Twelve, the constitutive experience of Jesus' earthly "history" (Acts 1,21 f.), the conservative witness of a definite, enclosed past experience.<sup>17</sup> It was rather the *metempirical* reality of the risen Christ's presence to his Church as abundant and compelling Spirit<sup>18</sup> which founded the ministry of apostle in its earliest,

<sup>17</sup> That the Lukan historical opus was undertaken as an approach to the problem of legitimate tradition has been persuasively argued by Günther Klein, in *Zeit und Geschichte*, 195 f., with special emphasis upon the expression πολλοὶ ἐπεχείρησαν of the gospel prologue (Lk 1,1) and its reference to the raw materials of the tradition (καθὼς παρέδοσαν). Klein demonstrates the connection between the "eye-witnesses and ministers of the word," who are the tradition's originators and guarantors, and τοῖς ἀποστόλοις . . . οὓς ἐξελέξατο of the Acts prologue, and traces the process of refinement by which the restored group of "the Twelve" is reached at 1,21 ff. of Acts. The traditional concept of μάρτυς τῆς ἀναστάσεως αὐτοῦ (Acts 1,22) stands in parallel with μάρτυρες αὐτοῦ πρὸς τὸν λαόν (Acts 13,31), and in the latter text the emphasis is upon the fact that the recipients of the risen One's appearances were also the companions of his earthly *anabasis* from Galilee to Jerusalem (τοῖς συναναβᾶσιν αὐτῷ . . . οἵτινες νῦν . . .). I cannot agree with M. Bourke, therefore (*CBQ* 30 [1968] 498), that the concept of apostle still resides, for Luke as for Paul, in resurrection witness. Or rather, it is not resurrection witness which is the ground of authentic tradition for Luke, in case one prefers to think—as I am inclined to—that Luke is indifferent to the term *apostle* and rather assumes than sets out to demonstrate its confinement to the circle of the Twelve (Schmithals, *Apostle*, 247 ff. [cf. his original German work, Göttingen 1961, 236 n.80 and 237 n.89, for more of Schmithals' dispute with G. Klein on this point than the English translation has reproduced]; E. Haenchen, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 679-80, and *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* [*ZnW*] 54 [1963] 180 n.28). In any case, Klein has carried his sound insights much too far in making the limitation of the *apostle* title to the Twelve into the proper innovation and central theological concern of St. Luke (cf. *Apostel*, 202 ff.). Jürgen Roloff, *Apostolat*, 169-235, brings some interesting new perspectives to the study of the Lukan doctrine of the "twelve apostles" and joins in the generally quite adverse criticism of Klein's book, especially on the issue of the supposed Lukan subordination of Paul to the Twelve in an "early-Catholic" chain of succession, a proposal which Roloff (202 ff.) emphatically rejects.

<sup>18</sup> Ingo Hermann, *Kyrios und Pneuma. Studien zur Christologie der paulinischen Hauptbriefe* (Studien zum A. und N.T., 2; Munich, 1961) 69 ff., 75 f., 79. The non-distinction of the Spirit from the risen Christ, and the quite literal acceptance of a statement like ὁ κύριος τὸ πνεῦμα ἐστίν (II Cor 3,17), are cardinal points of Hermann's thesis which accord well with the derivation of the χαρίσματα from the one χάρις(μα) of God in Christ (cp. I Cor. 12,4 ff.

"enthusiastic" stages. The promptings of that Spirit were neither charted by human appointment (Gal 1!) nor confined to a sacred past from which the short-lived present could be in any way distinguishable.

The apocalyptic inspiration and metempirical basis of the earliest apostle's ministrations did not make them any less authoritative. The charismatic apostle was indeed a normative preacher, founder and adjudicator of the rapidly expanding missionary churches (cf. I Cor 3,10 ff.; Gal 1,6-12; Rom 15,20; Eph 2,20, etc.), and spokesman of something like a *regula fidei* which was no less than a definitive test of adherence (Gal 1,8-9; I Cor 12,3). His circle cannot be thought of as unlimited,<sup>19</sup> nor his calling based on a temporary

with Rom 5,15-16 and 6,23; Käsemann, *Essays*, 64-65), and with the fact that, for Paul, pneumatic church order is an expression and measure of the universal sovereignty of the risen One.

<sup>19</sup> Whether one thinks of the primitive apostolic group as extensive (Klein, *Apostel*, 42) or "restricted" (L. Cerfaux, "Pour l'histoire du titre Apostolos dans le Nouveau Testament," *Recherches de science religieuse* 48 [1960] 79), the problem remains of a possible distinction between "apostles of Jesus Christ" in the strict sense and a broader use of the term in the NT (the view of Cerfaux, *art. cit.*, 81 ff., and now of M. Bourke, *CBQ* 30 [1968] 495). One readily admits that the "apostles of the churches" in II Cor 8,23 and Phil 2,25 (cp. Acts 13,2 ff. and Acts 14,4.14) has little more than the meaning of "messengers" in the broad sense, especially in view of the specific commissions of those persons in the two Pauline texts, which would hardly rival the apostolate of Paul himself (Schmithals, *Apostle*, 60 f.). Those community messengers have little in common with the institution in which Paul claims a membership which closes the ranks (ἔσχατον πάντων—I Cor 15,8); "one can hardly speak of a clearly defined institution at all" in those cases (Roloff, *Apostolat*, 39). But aside from the few clearly non-technical uses of the word ἀπόστολος is one justified in distinguishing the band of "charismatic apostles" from the institution of "apostles of Jesus Christ," with Paul claiming membership in the latter (Cerfaux)? One has to admit that Paul never expressly acknowledges that he is acquainted with a double, technically Christian usage of the word; and if one wants to maintain that double usage nonetheless, he must demonstrate for specific texts that Paul is speaking of ἀπόστολοι not with the meaning of πάντες οἱ ἀπόστολοι, but with reference only to a special group within the charismatic circle. It is precisely this distinction which many exegetes cannot verify (so Schmithals, *Apostle*, 62 ff.; Klein, *Apostel*, 55 ff.; Lührmann, *Offenbarungsverständnis*, 95 ff. [unwilling to differentiate a proper usage even from the "community apostles"!]; Hans von Campenhausen, *Authority*, 21 f.: "A striking feature of the group is the wide range of variation in importance and human status between its various members. Alongside the leading person-

charism which all could exercise, as I Cor 14,31 suggests that prophecy was. Although of unspecified number and certainly broader than "the Twelve," the charismatic apostles traced their authority to a fundamental, incommunicable and unrepeatable "unveiling" of God's Son (Gal 1,12.15f.), in which their "gospel" and mandate had been given them. The apostolic group was therefore a closed circle, even in its earliest days; and it was to that closed circle that Paul claimed unusual and final admission, ἔσχατον πάντων ὡσπερεὶ τῷ ἐκτρώματι. . . (I Cor 15,8).<sup>20</sup> First in rank among the charismatics (I Cor 12,28) and founder of a pneumatic, parousia-oriented Christianity, the earliest apostle was a peripatetic but authoritative preacher,—able to pronounce judgment on issues and persons in the Church with unheard-of λόγοι κυρίου,<sup>21</sup> and to arbitrate that ἀναλογία τῆς πίστεως, the normative gospel, to which all initiatives in the enthusiastic congregations had to remain obedient (Rom 12, 3-8; Cor 15,1 ff.).

It is with reference to this normative gospel that Paul clarifies his apostolic stewardship of the tradition which was already the possession of the infant church. His use of the technical terms of oral tradition, παραλαμβάνειν and παραδιδόναι, to introduce the

alities of the primitive community we find virtual ciphers, such as the Jewish Christians Andronicus and Junias at Rome. . ."). On the uniqueness of the character and activity of the apostles, however, see von Campenhausen, *Authority*, 22-29.

<sup>20</sup> That the "sequence" between Peter as first-called to the apostleship and Paul as last-called (I Cor 15,5-8) is a comprehensive sequence in time and concept, is affirmed by Roloff, *Apostolat*, 49. Lührmann's renunciation of just about any specificity to the apostle-concept (see previous note) should probably be resisted, and at least the closed circle of "apostles of Jesus Christ" (even including all the personages mentioned in I Cor 15,6?) should be firmly maintained.

<sup>21</sup> I Thess 4,15; I Cor 14,37; I Cor 9,14. Related is the apostle's account of the Eucharistic institution, I Cor 11,23: ἐγὼ γὰρ παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου. . . , in which the supremely authoritative word of the apostle is declared to be without need of authentication as legitimate tradition (Roloff, *Apostolat*, 87). It is actually the sovereign Lord who speaks through the apostle, who is his "plenipotentiary" (von Campenhausen's word, *Authority*, 22). On the definite indication of rank in the πρῶτον ἀποστόλους of I Cor 12, 28, where the gradations of the charismatic community are set forth (cp. Eph 4,11), cf. von Campenhausen, *Authority*, 61.

credal fragment of I Cor 15,3b-5, which is surely not his composition,<sup>22</sup> has suggested to some<sup>23</sup> that Paul was a servant of transmitted formulas according to the rabbinic norms of verbal fidelity and disciplined repetition. Yet there are many such kerygmatic formulas embedded in the letters, and their vocabulary and conceptualization undergo noticeable change according to the time and locale of Paul's mission;—consider the apocalyptic summary of I Thess 1,9-10,<sup>24</sup> the antithetical flesh-spirit Christology of Rom 1,3-4,<sup>25</sup> the Gnostic Redeemer-odyssey of Phil 2,6-11.<sup>26</sup> Not only are

<sup>22</sup> K. Wegenast, *Tradition*, 53-56; Eduard Schweizer, "Two New Testament Creeds Compared," in Klassen-Snyder, eds., *Current Issues in New Testament Interpretation* (New York, 1962) 166 ff.; Ferdinand Hahn, *Christologische Hoheitstitel. Ihre Geschichte im frühen Christentum* (FRLANT 83; Göttingen, 1963) 197 ff.; Franz Mussner, "'Schichten' in der paulinischen Theologie, dargetan an I Kor 15," *Biblische Zeitschrift* 9 (1965) 59-70, esp. 61 ff. (very ample bibliography, p. 61 f. n.6); Hans Conzelmann, "Zur Analyse der Bekenntnisformel I. Kor 15,3-5," *Evangelische Theologie* 25 (1965) 1-11; *Outline*, 65 f.; J. H. Schütz, "Apostolic Authority and the Control of Tradition: I Cor xv," *New Testament Studies* 15 (1968-69) 439-57, esp. 448-49.—One of the earliest studies which recognized the formulaic quality of this passage: Alfred Seeberg, *Der Katechismus der Urchristenheit* (1903), has recently been reprinted (Theologische Bücherei 26; Munich, 1966); cf. 45 ff., where even Seeberg can cite predecessors (45 n.1).

<sup>23</sup> Birger Gerhardsson, *Memory and Manuscript. Oral Tradition and Written Transmission in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity* (Acta Sem. Neotest. Upsaliensis 22; Uppsala, 1961) 288-306. The point of the monograph of Wegenast is, of course, to disprove this contention (cf. *Tradition*, 91), and he has the endorsements of Roloff (*Apostolat*, 85 f.) and Lüthmann (*Offenbarungsverständnis*, 90) for his position. Nevertheless, one scholar warned recently of over-emphasis on the contrast between rabbinic norms of tradition and Pauline practice, since there is evidence that rabbinic theory and practice did not coincide in this matter and traditions received interpretative expansions even when avowals of the transmitters would seem to exclude them. See Wolfgang Gerber, "Jüdische und christliche Überlieferung," *Theologische Zeitschrift* 25 (1969) 81-90.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. Alfred Seeberg, *Der Katechismus der Urchristenheit*, 82 f.; Ulrich Wilkens, *Die Missionsreden der Apostelgeschichte. Form- und traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen* (Wissenschaftliche Monographien . . . 5, 2nd ed.; Neukirchen, 1963) 81-82.

<sup>25</sup> Eduard Schweizer, "Röm 1,3 f. und der Gegensatz von Fleisch und Geist vor und bei Paulus," *Evangelische Theologie* 15 (1955) 563-71 (Schweizer, *Neotestamentica* [Zürich/Stuttgart, 1963] 180-89); K. Wegenast, *Tradition*, 70 ff.; A. Seeberg, *Katechismus*, 61 ff.; F. Hahn, *Christologische Hoheitstitel*, 251-59 (bibliog. 251 n.3).

<sup>26</sup> Ernst Käsemann, "A Critical Analysis of Phil 2:5-11," in *God and*

these pre-Pauline formulas already acculturated versions of the missionary gospel, but they are often forcibly adapted by Paul to the different contexts of his instruction<sup>27</sup> and freely edited with his own characteristic phrases and ideas.<sup>28</sup> He therefore shows himself to be no mechanical repetitor of missionary formulas, no "servant of the tradition" in the strictest rabbinic sense, but rather the master and authoritative mediator of transmitted data for the new circumstances and needs of his churches.<sup>29</sup> He exploited variations in thought and

*Christ: Existence and Province* (JThC 5; New York, 1968) 45-88; Georg Strecker, "Redaktion und Tradition im Christushymnus Phil. 2,6-11," *ZnW* 55 (1964) 63-78; Wegenast, *Tradition*, 83 ff. (extensive bibliog., 84 n.1); F. Hahn, *Hoheitsstiel*, 120 ff.

<sup>27</sup> It is interesting that Paul uses the word "gospel" (εὐαγγέλιον) in the contexts of all the formulas we have cited, such that the formula seems in each case to articulate the content of the "gospel"—cf. I Thess 1,5; I Cor 15,1; Rom 1,1 (cp. II Tim 2,8); Phil 1,27. This causes Roloff (*Apostolat*, 84 ff.) to suggest that the one transcendent gospel of Paul can be diversely articulated by received human traditions (παραδόσεις), according to the needs and context of his instruction, although the gospel itself is not equivalent to, or exhausted by, any one of the formulas. Wegenast demonstrates, in connection with each of the formulas, how it is authoritatively moulded by Paul to the situation of his preaching (*Tradition*, 61 ff., 74 ff., 88 ff.) and to peculiarities of his own understanding. The clearest example of this, developed by Käsemann in reference to the hymn of Phil 2,6-11 (cf. *art. cit.*, n.26 above), is the context of Phil 1,27-2,18, which is one of ethical exhortation (μόνον ἀξίως τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τοῦ Χριστοῦ πολιτεύεσθε—1,27), for which purpose the Christ-hymn is exploited as an ethical model, even though the concern of the pre-Pauline hymn was probably not to propose a model of conduct at all, but to propound the mystery of salvation. The adaptation to context is accomplished by the editorial introduction of the hymn, Phil 2,5. Such adaptive introductions occur repeatedly in Paul with pre-existent, hymnic materials (Col 1,15 ff., e.g.).

<sup>28</sup> Rom 1,3-4 is a convenient example of this, where the "Son" in v. 4 has a meaning different from "his Son" in the editorial introduction, v. 2—the latter being the Pauline pre-existent Son, the former the messianic "Son" so constituted by the resurrection. Exegetes differ on other *vocabula* contributed by Paul to the formula; perhaps ἐν δυνάμει, but probably not the "flesh"/"spirit" antithesis, which belonged to the formula originally (cf. Wegenast, *Tradition*, 71). There has always been lively discussion, too, about the characteristic Pauline expressions added to the Christ-hymn in Phil 2. Poetic reconstruction suggests θανάτου δὲ σταυροῦ (v. 8), ἐπουρανίων καὶ ἐπιγείων καὶ καταχθονίων (v. 10), εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ πατρὸς (v. 11), although Strecker, for one, would suggest the whole of v. 8 as a Pauline addition to the hymn, explicating the death as part of the Redeemer's odyssey (cf. *art. cit.* in n.26, 70-71).

<sup>29</sup> J. Roloff, *Apostolat*, 85; K. Wegenast, *Tradition*, 91-92.—"Thus it is the apostle's task . . . to seek out and make use of traditions in which the gospel can come to expression. But . . . the traditions are never by themselves the

language among established formulas, and drew from them new meanings for new situations. Even when he was repeating the oral tradition of the very early congregations, as with the Eucharistic narrative of I Cor 11,23 ff., Paul is convinced of the heavenly origin and authority of his traditions (ἐγὼ γὰρ παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου), which he then utilizes to interpret the situation of his churches (e.g. I Cor 11,26) and to enjoin the way of life which the truth expressed in the tradition demands (e.g. I Cor 11,17-22. 27-34; cf. Phil 1,27-2,5.12 ff.<sup>30</sup>). Paul was, in other words, a charismatic ἐρμηνεύς in the not-so-new sense of "the new hermeneutic"<sup>31</sup>: he was not the custodian of a fixed deposit, but the creative arbiter of the apostolic gospel in the era of its most dramatic spread and its most extensive acculturation. From this enthusiastic and sublimely eclectic missionary adventure came new and lasting appropriations of the kerygma for the life of the risen Christ's adherents.

Much the same creative role with nascent Christian traditions was played by the charismatic *prophets*, whose traces in the NT are much more obscure than the apostles' but have gained some clarity from the researches of Käsemann.<sup>32</sup> These earliest enthusiasts, who were destined to fall into disfavor as a Christian orthodoxy evolved,<sup>33</sup>

gospel. If they were, we should still be at the level of the rabbinic tradition-principle. . ." (Roloff, *op. cit.*, 90). "The gospel is consequently, for Paul, always the testimony of the self-revelation of the crucified Jesus as the risen One, and as such points back to the incarnate Son of God by virtue of distinct traditional formulas and is meant to affect definite men, in order to awaken in them faith in the incarnate Son, whom the Apostle serves as witness and representative in an historically unique manner" (*ibid.*, italicized by the author). "Thus is Paul plenipotentiary interpreter of the gospel, and in his interpretation the exalted Lord of the community himself speaks" (*ibid.*, 96).

<sup>30</sup> The relationship between the traditions and norms of living in the Pauline churches is made clear where παράδοσις, παραδιδόναι, and παραλαμβάνειν are used to introduce or summarize parenthesis: I Cor 11,2; Phil 4,9; I Thess 2,13; 4,1; (II Thess 3,6). Comparable use of the word εὐαγγέλιον is made in Phil 1,27 (see n.27 above).

<sup>31</sup> Cf. the summary of James M. Robinson, "Hermeneutic since Barth," in *The New Hermeneutic*, 1-77, e.g. 4 ff., 65 ff.

<sup>32</sup> Especially "The Beginnings of Christian Theology" (see n.4 above) and "Sentences of Holy Law in the New Testament" (*Questions*, 66-81).

<sup>33</sup> Käsemann's undocumented statement that "the post-Pauline New Testament writings are almost all involved in some kind of argument with the early Christian enthusiasts" (*Freedom*, 85), apart from the considerable exceptions which K. himself would admit, including Mark and the basic Johannine

made their greatest contribution in the tradition of Jesus' sayings,—that ancient Palestinian heritage to which Paul had either no access or purposely no recourse.<sup>34</sup> The sayings tradition occupies the oldest strata of the synoptic tradition, primarily the Q material shared by Matthew and Luke, but also certain Markan items and archaic passages peculiar to Matthew or Luke. Even within this most ancient layer of the Synoptics, as is well known, there are the clearest traces of change and adaptation by the post-Easter congregations, extending—so almost everyone thinks—to the creation of entire logia to answer the questions which first arose for the congregations which confessed a victorious but physically absent Lord Jesus.—Now who, it might be asked, were the daring forces in the primitive Church who felt able to take such initiatives with the Lord's own sayings? The enthusiastic groups apparently did not shrink from even this greatest of liberties with the tradition! *But who in the Church?* In whom was the conviction of the Spirit's direction so unbounded? The prophets, Käsemann answers.

But how make this answer more than a conjecture? A close look at some items of the sayings tradition will help, for in some of them the prophets come in for special mention.

... *the Wisdom of God said: I shall send them* (Lk: *Prophets and apostles*) (Mt: *prophets and wise men and scribes*),

tradition, rests on at least enough evidence to support the antecedent probability of a progressive decline in the acceptability of enthusiasm. It is well known, for example, that the heresy of Montanism was, in essence, an attempt to revive enthusiastic prophecy (cf. von Campenhausen, *Authority*, 181 ff., with ample documentation; W. Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit*, 137 ff., quoting largely from the two anti-Montanists of the late second century quoted by Eusebius in *Hist. eccl.* V, 16 ff.; H. Köster, *ZThK* 65 [1968] 171, 201 f.). Not unexpectedly, Montanus claimed that the early expectation of the parousia had been wrongfully scuttled in Christian circles, together with the demand for a radically new ethos that went with that expectation. It would have been difficult to revive enthusiasm without reviving proximate eschatology, Montanus rightly perceived. His revival, however, like Marcion's of Pauline charismatic polity, stood too much in contradiction of the experience of the Church at large to survive on any wide scale.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. Rudolf Bultmann, "Die Bedeutung des geschichtlichen Jesus für die Theologie des Paulus," *Glauben und Verstehen* I (Tübingen, 1958) 188-213, esp. 190 f.; W. Schmithals, "Paulus und der historische Jesus," *ZnW* 53 (1962) 145-60; Ernst Haenchen, "Die frühe Christologie," *ZThK* 63 (1966) 145-59, esp. 150-55.

some of whom they will kill and persecute, that the blood of all the prophets, shed from the foundation of the world, may be required of this generation. . . (Lk 11,49f./Mt 23,34f.).

This is not the place for an extended analysis of the complex tradition-history of this Q-saying, hence we cannot decide whether Luke's "prophets and apostles" is a salvation-historical revision of Matthew's three Jewish ministries, which would have been original in a saying quoted from Jewish wisdom-tradition,<sup>35</sup> or whether Matthew's is a revision, based on the ministry-structure of his Judaeo-Christian church, of an original which named the two fundamental Christian ministries.<sup>36</sup> The extensive Matthean revisions which no one disputes in the rest of the logion, viz. the specification of the persecutions according to Christian experience, and the change from "the blood of all the prophets" to "all the righteous blood" (v. 35) to avoid the difficulty to the former posed by Abel at least, support the view that it is likewise Matthew who is revising in the case of the ministries. Besides, if it can be sustained that Lk 11,49ff. was once an isolated (Jewish) saying used by the Christian charismatics before it came into the present, admittedly salvation-historical context of Lk 11,<sup>37</sup> we have a saying which referred to

<sup>35</sup> R. Bultmann, *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*, 3rd edition (Göttingen, 1957) 119 n.1; E. Haenchen, "Matthäus 23," (orig. *ZThK* 48 [1951] 38-63) in Haenchen, *Gott und Mensch. Gesammelte Aufsätze* (Tübingen, 1965) 44. Cf. the evidence for a Jewish source of Matthew's version in Adolf Schlatter, *Der Evangelist Matthäus. Seine Sprache, sein Ziel, seine Selbständigkeit*, 6th ed. (Stuttgart, 1963) 686 f.

<sup>36</sup> Georg Strecker, *Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit. Untersuchung zur Theologie des Matthäus* (FRLANT 82; Göttingen, 1962) 37 f.; Reinhart Hummel, *Die Auseinandersetzung zwischen Kirche und Judentum im Matthäusevangelium* (Beiträge zur ev. Theol. 33; Munich, 1966) 27.

<sup>37</sup> It is not without interest for the context of Lk 11,49 that Luke's account of the martyrdom of the charismatic missionary, Stephen, follows upon the climax of the martyr's speech at which he recalls the persecution of the prophets of old (Acts 7,52). We discussed the role of Stephen's group in the primitive church earlier in this paper. Luke's salvation-historical perspective regarding the group's fortunes is summed up thus: ὑμεῖς αἰεὶ τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ ἀντιπίπτετε, ὡς οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν καὶ ὑμεῖς (Acts 7,51). He could well have created the same effect by reversing the order of the ministries as mentioned in the older saying of Lk 11,49, thus making the charismatic prophets (like Stephen was!) into the OT prophets and the "apostles," become the *fontes traditionis* in the overall plan of his work, into the representatives of the NT epoch.

Christian prophets at all levels except that of Luke's composition (and the remote, supposedly Jewish source), and we have an instance of Matthean revision, to be paralleled in other instances we shall cite, based upon the first evangelist's experience of church ministries and desire to moderate the charismatic ones. But that cannot be decided at this point.

A further specific reference to the prophets in the sayings tradition occurs among the missionary maxims gathered into discourse form in Mt 10. This item's origin in Q can be conjectured, not demonstrated.

*He who receives a prophet because he is a prophet (εἰς ὄνομα προφήτου) shall receive a prophet's reward, and he who receives a just man because he is a just man (εἰς ὄνομα δικαίου) shall receive a just man's reward (Mt 10,41).*

Scholars have suggested<sup>38</sup> that there survives here an ancient church order, from the days of the wandering prophets, whose authority was based on the self-evidence of their charismatic activity and the urgency of their eschatological summons. They founded communities of adherents and ruled their membership, which, in this saying, receives the Jewish designation *saddiqim*, "just men." The eschatological necessity of responding to both the founding prophet and his followers has—as is characteristic of the enthusiastic era—no historical or rigorously reasoned basis (we have already discussed this feature of the charismatic apostleship). The compelling power of the prophet's call is just *there*, in the event of the Spirit working through him (εἰς ὄνομα προφήτου). And the prophet's confidence of embodying the person and power of the Lord are effectively reproduced by the Matthean editor, who, possibly for the first time, associates with our logion the adjacent maxim, "He who receives you receives me . . ." (Mt 10,40).

There are several things about Mt 10,41 which help us to diagnose the enthusiastic prophets' influence on the tradition of Jesus' sayings. First, the eschatological reference of the two apodoses (reward clauses) shows the speaker's perspective to be that of proximate end-expectation. Secondly, the saying is in the form of two casuistic

<sup>38</sup> See Käsemann, *Apocalypticism*, 27, who cites Meyer and Klostermann.

statements of sacred law, such as one of the classic prophets of Israel might have formulated.<sup>39</sup> The widespread influence of OT prophetic forms in the sayings tradition<sup>40</sup> indicates not just that the prophets of Israel influenced Jesus, but that there was a body of Christian preachers who were conscious of speaking in Jesus' own name and who observed the conventions and style of the historic prophets, thus attempting to revive their ideals and authority in the Christian mission in Israel.—In addition, thirdly, we note that in this statement of sacred law, protasis and apodosis are in the relationship of duty and reward (and correspondingly, in other cases, we suspect, of guilt and punishment). The correspondence of the two parts of both statements amounts to an *eschatological law of talion*:<sup>41</sup> that which you do now, God will do to you in the judgment; that which you fail to do now, God will refuse to do to you in the judgment. At this point, we can think of numerous other examples of the very same sayings-form in the Synoptics:

*Whoever does away with the least of these commandments*

<sup>39</sup> Cf. Claus Westermann, *Basic Forms of Prophetic Speech* (trans. by Hugh C. White; Philadelphia, 1967). The correspondence between human deeds and divine rewards/punishments is a mainstay particularly of the prophetic judgment speeches, Westermann shows (160-61), where the formal correspondence between accusation and announcement of punishment runs "through the whole history" of the form. A few examples among many are I Sam 15,23; II Sam 12,7 ff.; I Kgs 20,42; Os 4,6; Am 2,1 f. The influence of ancient legal norms upon certain of the prophetic judgment-oracles is illustrated by Elia's speech against Ahab (I Kgs 21,19), which is based upon Ex 21,12. For the influence of actual judicial protocols, of which accusation and announcement of punishment were separate moments, see *op. cit.*, 135-36.

<sup>40</sup> R. Bultmann, *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*, 113-26; "The Study of the Synoptic Gospels," in Bultmann-Kundsin, *Form Criticism. Two Essays on New Testament Research* (trans. by Frederick C. Grant; New York, 1962) 56 ff.—"Prophecy had also to remind those who were beset by temptation of the demands of their calling, to admonish, to warn and to punish them. This it did by proclaiming God's recompensing action on the Last Day. The stylistic form in which prophecy found it possible to express this message was offered by the Old Testament, i.e., by those sayings in which the fulfillment of some condition on earth was to be followed in the eschatological future by promise or threat, blessing or curse. . . . the proper *Sitz im Leben* for our eschatological divine law is the situation in which primitive Christian prophecy 'judges' the messianic people of God, as once the old prophets 'judged' Israel" (Käsemann, *Questions*, 79).

<sup>41</sup> See the exposition in Käsemann, *Apocalypticism*, 29 ff., and *Questions*, 77 ff.

*will be called the least in the Kingdom of heaven*  
(Mt 5,19).<sup>42</sup>

*Whoever confesses me before men, I will confess him. . . .*

*Whoever denies me before men, I will deny him . . .*  
(Mt 10,32f.).<sup>43</sup>

*With the judgment you pronounce you will be judged,*  
*and the measure you give will be the measure you get*  
(Mt 6,1/ Lk 6,37f.).

*To him who has more will be given, but*  
*from him who has not even what he has will be taken*  
*away (A floating logion: Lk 19,26/ Mt 25,29/ Mt*  
*13,12 = Mk 4,25 = Lk 8,18).*

To these and other<sup>44</sup> examples of the prophetic *jus talionis* in the synoptic sayings tradition one can add some interesting examples in Paul, including an important one which just happens to occur in the context of his discussion of charismatic prophecy, in I Cor 14,38: (concerning the Pauline regulation of the charisms as the word of the Lord himself) *If anyone does not recognize this, he is not recognized.*<sup>45</sup> Likewise, the warning in I Cor 3,17: *If anyone destroys*

<sup>42</sup> "The tradition preserved by Matthew from what is manifestly a rigorously legalistic Jewish Christianity condemns, in its eschatological seriousness and its knowledge of the criteria and objects of divine wrath, a different kind of Christian proclamation, which for its part declares the law to be wholly or partially abrogated. We are thus given a glimpse into what cannot really be called anything else but a confessional dispute within earliest Christianity" (Käsemann, *Apocalypticism*, 22). The saying of Mt 10,23 represents the driving conviction of Judaeo-Christian enthusiasm: ". . . you will not have gone through all the towns of Israel before the Son of Man comes"; with its disappointment the movement collapsed, together with its picture of the reestablishment of the twelve tribes (Mt 19,28) and its struggle for the mosaic law and against the practice of the Gentile mission (*ibid.*, 45).

<sup>43</sup> It is the conviction of many scholars—not Käsemann's, of course—that this saying is a genuine utterance of the earthly Jesus (cf. H. E. Tödt, *The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition* [trans. by D. M. Barton, NT Library series; Philadelphia, 1965] 55 ff.), at least in the version of Lk 12,8 f. (cp. Mk 8,38), where Jesus himself and the future Son of Man seem to be distinct from one another. So also R. Bultmann, *Die Geschichte der syn. Trad.*, 117 f.; Günther Bornkamm, *Jesus of Nazareth* (trans. by I. and F. MacLuskey; New York, 1960) 176. If this position is correct, the change from Lk 12,8 f. to Mt 10,32 f. would be the extent of the prophets' influence on this saying, and they would not be the *inventors* of the enthusiastic talion oracles after all!

<sup>44</sup> On the decline and subsequent adulteration of this form, see Käsemann, *Apocalypticism*, 30 ff.

<sup>45</sup> Käsemann, *Questions*, 68-9.

*God's temple* (the body), *God will destroy him*.<sup>46</sup>—Hence, besides having added to and embellished the tradition of Jesus' sayings with their talion promises and threats, the charismatic prophets also influenced St. Paul, who occasionally exhorts his communities in the oracular style that, by this time, the colorful prophets have made popular.

The startling freedom to speak in the Lord's own name and with his authority is thus shared by the two leading charismatic ministries, apostle (cf. Paul's *λόγος κυρίου*) and prophet. The point of the prophets' talion oracles is that "the judge of the world takes notice of what has happened on the earth"<sup>47</sup> and, in his minutely exacting judgment, vindicates his prophetic servant to the very letter of his eschatological message. In the charismatic prophet Christ has himself become present and the process of the end-events has begun. As pledge of the imminent parousia, the powerful spirit of prophecy gives its bearer authority to make the appeal of the Lord himself, and thus to expand and apply the traditions of the Lord's own teachings. Too, the unity in principle of the prophet's enthusiasm and his apocalyptic consciousness becomes responsible for the heavy apocalyptic overlaying of the sayings tradition, such as has long been a lively topic of exegetical debate.<sup>48</sup> Have the prophets

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*, 66 ff. Cf. the pairing of talion and chiasmus in Gen 9,6: "Whoever sheds the blood of man, by man shall his blood be shed." Käsemann also makes much of Paul's prophetic "anathemas" in I Cor 16,22 and Gal 1,9, and the action of community in I Cor 5,3 ff. "We are concerned here with a divine law in which God himself remains the agent and which, inasmuch as God makes it to be promulgated and executed by charismatic men, may be called charismatic law. . . . The Judge of all the world who stands at the door is the founder and foundation of the law in question and of its peculiar mode of existence: it thus becomes a function of the Spirit" (*ibid.*, 72 f.). The eschatological law-sentences in the NT thus annul the antithesis of law and spirit, especially since they are pronounced by the apostles and prophets with the sinners' salvation in view, not their abandonment.

<sup>47</sup> Käsemann, *Apocalypticism*, 27.

<sup>48</sup> The issue was outlined above, n.7, where the major spokesmen of both sides are mentioned. The discussion of Käsemann's hypothesis in the symposium *Apocalypticism* appropriately takes up the question of how Jesus' supposedly un-apocalyptic proclamation of "God's nearness" could be responded to, or supplanted, by an apocalyptic proclamation. G. Ebeling, who agrees that apocalyptic is a definitely secondary development in the NT testimonies (*ibid.*, 53),

invented, or do they follow Jesus' lead?—the familiar question, and we have gone no further with it because we are saying "the prophets" instead of "the church." There is a point in this endless quarrel at which evidence ends and temperament and predisposition take over. We are not prepared to think that even the enthusiastic prophets, with their intense conviction that the judge of the world was speaking through them, abandoned all continuity with the pattern of the actual teaching of the historical Jesus. If a case could be made for such abandonment in the talion maxims, which do not seem to be in closest harmony with Jesus' proclamation of God's favor and the absence of human claims,<sup>49</sup> it is still hypercritical to account all the Son of Man sayings, for example, to the apocalyptic inspiration of the prophets;<sup>50</sup> or to presume that beyond their admitted pictorial embellishments of Jesus' judgment sayings,<sup>51</sup> the prophets did not

is nevertheless dissatisfied with K's explanation of the intervening Easter- and spirit-events as causes of the transition. How then does Christian apocalyptic remain a response to the preaching of Jesus, rather than to Easter and Pentecost exclusively (*ibid.*, 58 f.). Short of declaring Jesus an apocalyptic preacher himself, as the Pannenburg group is prepared to do, one is hard put to find a good answer to Ebeling's question. K. does address himself to it in earnest (*ibid.*, 115 ff.), and it seems to have directed his efforts in the more recent monograph, *Jesus means Freedom*. I, for one, cannot conceive that Ebeling now considers his question answered; but then, a century and a half of research has not settled the *Jesusfrage*, and it is hardly fair to expect so much so soon from Käsemann's most valuable studies.

<sup>49</sup> It is no surprise that Ernst Fuchs, whose *Studies of the Historical Jesus* (Studies in Biblical Theol. 42; Chicago, 1964) so much emphasized these as the themes of coherence between the preaching and the conduct of Jesus in the flesh, should regard Käsemann's apocalyptic as "not the 'mother,' but the enemy of all theology oriented to Jesus himself" (*Apocalypticism*, 75), and "all statements of an 'eschatological *ius talionis*'" as "dangerous, fatal, because in actual fact they eliminate Jesus himself by turning Jesus into an apocalyptic figure, that is, by using apocalyptic to get rid of him" (*ibid.*, 76). Unfortunately, it looks as if the historical-Jesus debate is as much prisoner of systematic positions currently as it ever was!

<sup>50</sup> Käsemann, *Apocalyptic*, 43 ff., 106 ff., and *Questions*, 78. Most recently subscribing to this position of Käsemann and Vielhauer has been Norman Perrin, *Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus* (NT Library; Philadelphia, 1967) 198.—See n.43 above, and H. E. Tödt, *The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition*, 64-67.

<sup>51</sup> In this way the sanction of familiar apocalyptic traditions and techniques was sought for Jesus' words, according to the analysis of Tödt (cf. *op. cit.*, 35, 46-47, 66 78-79, etc.).

have a substantial basis of apocalyptic set forth in the teachings of the real Jesus.<sup>52</sup>—But we shall not resolve the question of the prophets' fidelity beyond our presuppositions if we do not press for further possible items of their contribution to the sayings tradition.

A possible second category of prophetic logia are those which express the apocalyptic principle of *the reversal of values at the judgment*.<sup>53</sup> This is quite the contrary of the talion principle, and it is close to the core of the actual teaching of Jesus,—if anything is! It embraces certain general maxims which float about the synoptic compositions and appear with altered meanings in various contexts.

*The first shall be last and the last first* (Mt 20,16; Lk 13,30; Mt 19,30; Mk 10,31).

*He who humbles himself shall be exalted; he who exalts himself shall be humbled* (Lk 18,14; Mt 23,12; 18,4; Lk 14,11; cp. I Pet 5,6).

*He who would save his life will lose it; and whoever loses his life will save it* (Mk 8,35 & par.; Mt 10,39; Lk 17,33)<sup>54</sup>

<sup>52</sup> Even the long-standing Bultmannian theorem that Jesus awaited an exalted Son of Man who was, however, other than himself (shared by H. E. Tödt), is now rejected by the Pannenburg scholars, who insist that the Son of Man was the substance of Jesus' self-awareness and expectation (see August Strobel, *Kerygma und Apokalyptik* (cited in n.7 above) 53-57, 60, 62, etc.). Strobel appeals to Käsemann's own recognition of the apocalyptic preaching of the Baptist as the point of departure for Jesus' own preaching (cf. *Apocalypticism*, 103), then asks where the tradition offers any indication whatever that Jesus departed from this formative influence as substantially as Käsemann claims (Strobel, *op. cit.*, 150 ff.). K. would have us believe in an apocalyptic *terminus a quo* of Jesus' ministry, and an apocalyptic *terminus a quo* of enthusiastic Christianity after Easter, but in a substantially *non-apocalyptic* message of the preaching Jesus in between! A case of critical acrobatics, without a doubt!

<sup>53</sup> Käsemann, *Apocalypticism*, 37 ff. See also D. S. Russell, *The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic* (OT Library; Philadelphia, 1964) 264-71, esp. 269.

<sup>54</sup> The occurrence of this "floating logion" once in Mt 10, the compendium of charismatic missionary ideals which also contains the pinions of Käsemann's theory, should not be overlooked. The composite nature of the chapter as it now stands is obvious, but it is just as certainly built around a prior complex of mission sayings already gathered in Q. The basic Q discourse on the sending out of the disciples is generally accepted as having embraced Lk 10,2-12/ Mt 9,37-10,16 (D. Lührmann, *Logienquelle*, 59 f.; F. Hahn, *Mission in the New Testament* [trans. by F. Clarke, in *Studies in Bibl. Theol.* 47; Chicago,

*Nothing is now hidden that will not be revealed; nothing is now secret that will not be brought to light* (Mt 10,26; Lk 8,17; Lk 12,2; Mk 4,22)<sup>55</sup>

These principles, like the beatitudes (Lk 6,20 ff./Mt 5,3 ff.), proclaim that the proximate judgment of the world will end man's history, his values and his calculations, and introduce the era of God's sovereignty, which can only be anticipated as a total overturning of what has hitherto prevailed. If this articulates the very essence of apocalyptic thinking, it also gets close to those original and consistent themes of the teaching Jesus himself, present in parables like the labourers in the vineyard, the pharisee and the publican, and the prodigal son, which critical opinion is, as a whole, most willing to trace back to the Master's own speech.<sup>56</sup> That means that even if one is persuaded that the talion oracles were mostly intruded into the sayings tradition by the charismatic prophets, the same cannot be the case with the "reversal" maxims. These derive in principle and pattern from the authentic utterances of the earthly Jesus,—in-

1965] 41 ff.), to which, after an insertion from the Markan eschatological discourse, Matthew joined a separate Q complex, 10,26-33 (=Lk 12,2-9), then additional units from Q: 10,34-36 (=Lk 12,51-53), 10,37-39 (=Lk 14,25-27/17,33) 10,40-42 (=Lk 10,16). The Q sequence was probably Lk 10,2-15.21 f., meaning that Mt 11,21-24.25-27 was originally attached to the *Aussendungsrede* and the materials assembled in Mt 10,26-42 came from scattered points in the sayings-source, according to Matthew's well-known synthesizing techniques (cf. Lührmann, *Logienquelle*, 61 f.). The reasons for the assembling of all the *charismatic* mission sayings into Mt 10 we may hope to clarify presently, in our analysis of Matthew's contribution to our topic.

<sup>55</sup> This proverb probably lamented the inevitable disclosure of secrets, whereas "with fascinating audacity, prophecy reverses the insights of worldly wisdom: from the eschatological standpoint the thing to do is just what is otherwise anxiously avoided" (Käsemann, *Apocalypticism*, 37). The same observation can be seen to apply to the previous maxim, and both occur in the context of Mt 10.

<sup>56</sup> Cf. e.g., the essays "The Quest of the Historical Jesus," and "Jesus' Understanding of Time," in E. Fuchs, *Studies of the Historical Jesus*, esp. 19 ff., 130 ff., 154 ff., 160 ff. "Jesus distinguished between the present and the future, just as love distinguishes between the present and the future. . . . Therefore the time of love consists of the difference between present and future. In this difference the past is abolished" (160). Cf. G. Bornkamm, *Jesus of Nazareth*, 64-81, where the remark: "Jesus' attitude and message can in no way be interpreted as a 'reversal of all values'" (80) is intended only to avoid the picture of Jesus as a revolutionary in the modern sense.

deed, from the substance of his proclamation of God's incipient sovereignty and the uselessness of men's claims and calculations.<sup>57</sup>—How is it, on the other hand, that the maxims quoted above gained such currency by the evangelists' time as to be capable of insertion as axioms throughout their compositions? This could occur, it seems, because of the charismatic preachers between Jesus' time and the evangelists', who gave the principles popularity and adaptability through repeated use of them in varying instructional contexts. Who else but the colorful prophets would have given oracular restatement to Jesus' "reversal" principle in so many ways, and with such passion and authority, that now the oracles reappear in innumerable gospel passages, with the most widely divergent thought-content and underlying *Sitze-im-Leben*, to remind us of the authentic apocalyptic substance of the kingdom-message that Jesus actually preached? Here, at least, the prophets were faithful stewards in their imaginative expansion of Jesus' words.

Ascribing other genera of the sayings tradition to the activity of the prophets becomes a bit adventurous, especially if one leaves the area of recognizable forms from classic prophecy.<sup>58</sup> It is true that prophetic forms undergo alteration and dilution in the tradition, probably because of a corresponding recession of the prophetic office itself,<sup>59</sup> but it will not do simply to say "the prophets" where form-

<sup>57</sup> The importance of this doctrine as a focal point of continuity between pre-Easter and post-Easter (e.g., Pauline) proclamations has been correctly emphasized by Eberhard Jüngel, *Paulus und Jesus* (Hermeneutische Untersuchungen zur Theol., 2, 2nd ed.; Tübingen, 1964) esp. 279-84, and August Strobel, *Kerygma und Apokalypik*, 153 ff. The community of thought-structure between these logia and many Pauline passages is plain to see,—e.g. I Cor 1,18-31, considered by Jüngel a cardinal text for the justification doctrine, which is Paul's counterpart to Jesus' kingdom proclamation (*op. cit.*, 30 ff.). The recent, fairly vigorous revival of the classic Jesus-Paul issue will benefit from the closer study of apocalyptic (see W. G. Kümmel, "Jesus and Paulus," *N.T. Studies* 10 [1963-64] 163-81).

<sup>58</sup> E.g. as a solution to the historical problem of Mt 28,18-20; cf. Ulrich Luck, "Herrenwort und Geschichte in Matth. 28,16-20," *Evangelische Theologie* 27 (1967) 494-508, esp. 503 ff.

<sup>59</sup> "According as post-Easter prophecy loses its leading function in the church and the near expectation recedes, so the stylistic forms, too, must change, and beyond the realm of the borders of Palestine and Syria there remain only the scantiest relics of the whole complex we are here exploring,

critics of the sayings have always said "the community." Still within the sphere of prophetic speech-forms, however—hence within that of sound method for our question,—are certain synoptic logia which form-criticism has long diagnosed as products of post-Easter perspective. One thinks of the *I-have-come* sayings,<sup>60</sup> which offer an epitomized summary of Jesus' earthly ministry from the church's vantage-point and which usually have the prophetic-apocalyptic ring to them: ". . . to cast fire upon the earth"; ". . . not to sow peace but the sword"; ". . . to pit a man against his father . . ." etc. (cf. Mt 10,34 ff.). There are also the pictorial predictions of the judgment of the Son of Man, in which heavy apocalyptic coloring betrays secondary elaboration.<sup>61</sup> In these cases one readily pictures the prophets asserting the close comparison between the mission of Jesus in Israel and their own. The oracles against Chorazain, Bethsaida, and Capernaum (Mt 11,20-24)<sup>62</sup> probably reflect the fact that these Galilean towns were refractory objects of the mission of the post-Easter prophets as well as—if not rather than—Jesus's own mission. —Finally, and interestingly, the work of the Lord's prophetic spokesmen appears in the famous logion about the forgivable sin against the Son of Man versus the unforgivable blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. The distinction of the two sins appears in what was apparently a Q version of the saying (Lk 12,10/Mt 12,31-32) but disappears from the version of Mk (3,28-30), for reasons proper to the latter's theology.<sup>63</sup> In the Q saying the charismatic prophet dared to distinguish between Jesus' days on earth, when one could have rejected the message and still had time to repent, and the present short space

namely, Mk 8,38; 13,13b; 16,16; Lk 9,26; 12,8-10" (Käsemann, *Apocalypticism*, 36 f.).

<sup>60</sup> R. Bultmann, *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*, 164-68; E. Käsemann, *Apocalypticism*, 35; Heinrich Zimmermann, *Neutestamentliche Methodenlehre. Darstellung der historisch-kritischen Methode* (Stuttgart, 1967) 150.

<sup>61</sup> See n.51 above, and (in summary) H. E. Tödt, *The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition*, 222 ff.

<sup>62</sup> "It is plain that Chorazain and Bethsaida (which are not otherwise mentioned in the gospels) were among the goals which the early Christian mission in Galilee was unable to capture" (Käsemann, *Apocalypticism*, 38; also 32 f.).

<sup>63</sup> H. E. Tödt, *op. cit.*, 118-20; Käsemann, *Freedom*, 55; Alfred Suhl, *Die Funktion der alttestamentlichen Zitate und Anspielungen im Markusevangelium* (Gütersloh, 1965) 100 f.

of the prophet's own speaking in the Holy Spirit: now little time remains, and rejection of the Spirit's prophecy will certainly spell doom in the forthcoming judgment of the Son of Man.<sup>64</sup>

So much for the enthusiastic prophets and their contributions to the tradition of Jesus' sayings. A ready compendium of their utterances can be found, in all probability, in the missionary discourse of Mt 10, in which (for reasons we shall explore) the first evangelist has confined the remnants of charismatic discipleship from his tradition.<sup>65</sup> The prophets were θεῶν ἄνδρες, uniting with their pneumatic speech the persuasion of powerful deeds modeled after the Lord's own (cf. Mt 7,22; 10,13 f.), and this exciting feature of their work probably accounts for the continued popularity of their missions beyond the borders of Galilee, in hellenistic mission territory.<sup>66</sup> But most to the point of our discussion, the prophets managed their tradition as Paul had his, viz. with freedom and creativity. As stewardships of the tradition, enthusiastic apostleship and prophetism were both innovative and formative rather than custodial and conservative. Of course, the liberties which the enthusiasts took with the tradition were stabilized by their urgent eschatological outlook and could scarcely continue without controls once that outlook had been discredited. A new generation, concerned with stability and legitimacy of beliefs, would not long endorse the techniques of pneumatic prophetism; hence the prophets as such have no significant role in the churches of the later NT literature,<sup>67</sup> and the second-century

<sup>64</sup> Käsemann, *Apocalypticism*, 40 f.; G. Bornkamm, *Tradition and Interpretation* . . . , 34.

<sup>65</sup> Material stamped with the prophets' personality and activity came to Mt from both the Mk and Q traditions. From Mk: 10,1.14 (a gesture evocative of classical prophetism!). 19 f. (transferred from the eschatological discourse!); from Q: 10,5 f.(?) .7-8.12f. 15.26-41.

<sup>66</sup> See n.9 above. G. Bornkamm has noticed the thrust of hellenistic *Kyrios*-confession towards charismatic missionary endeavour coupled with antinomian attitudes, the very partnership which is deplored in Mt 7,21 ff. The Stephen-account of Acts 6 is the prime documentation of this, but B. also points to the inauthentic resurrection-appearance text in Mk 16,15 ff. (an ancient piece, even if not from Mark's hand), and the traditional substrata of numerous Acts accounts of the mission (Acts 8,6f.13; 13,1-3.6-12; 14,3.8ff.15). Who is to deny the *residuum* of this mentality even in passages of strong Lucan feature, like Acts 15, where the charismatic missionaries content themselves with reciting their experience of the *magnalia Dei* (15,4.12) while Peter is made the spokesman of their typical attitudes (15,8-10)?—See Bornkamm, in *Zeit und Geschichte*, 177, 179 ff.

Montanists were able to stage their brief revival of prophecy only by reviving imminent eschatology as well.<sup>68</sup> If later authors like Matthew see in the charismatic prophets mere libertines, unworthy of the Kingdom of heaven (Mt 7,21 f.), this was not the case with the earliest, Judaeo-Christian prophets (e.g. Mt 5,19), who were certainly not proponents of eclectic openness and indulgence. They stressed rather the rigor and unconditional either-or of Jesus' summons, reinforcing it with talion oracles and pictorial threats of the judgment of the Son of Man. Such would certainly not be the tone of religion desired by many moderns who advocate a revival of Christian prophetism. Like the hellenistic counterparts of the earliest Galilean missionaries, many of our contemporaries relish the enthusiasts' freedom with the tradition while shrinking from their eschatological rigorism, thus from an important factor which preserved their fidelity to Jesus. A true Christian ministry must combine creativity with fidelity, or risk the rejection of the Church at large. This explains the reflexes of control and delimitation which were soon brought to bear upon the prophets' heritage, the sayings tradition, during its subsequent history in the early Church. Such con-

<sup>67</sup> Matthew, with his warnings against *ψευδοπροφήται* (7,15 ff.; 24,11.24), is still able to retain a listing of the *προφήται* among the Lord's *ἀπεσταλμένοι* (23,34). Lk noticeably avoids emphasis on this as a Christian ministry, introducing a salvation-historical perspective in his parallel to Mt 23,34 (11,49) and using the title generally only of OT prophecy and its representatives. His formula in Lk 16,16 actually consigns prophecy to the old order (*ὁ νόμος καὶ οἱ προφῆται μέχρι Ἰωάννου*), of which John the Baptist was the final representative. There are, to be sure, four passages in Acts which preserve reports of the activity of Christian prophets: 11,27 f. (Agabus, predicting the famine); 13,1 ("Saul" included!); 15,32 (the Antiochean prophets, Judas and Silas, who "consoled and strengthened" the church there *καὶ αὐτοὶ προφῆται ὄντες*—meaning along with Paul and Barnabas?); 21,10 ff. (Agabus again, this time predicting Paul's arrest in Jerusalem). In all these cases, Luke is quite clearly transmitting traditional material, and he himself appears to have no special interest in the prophetic ministry, except perhaps as a convenient designation for Paul and Barnabas, avoiding their designation as apostles. But cf. 14,4.14—traditional material also.—In the rest of the literature the Christian title of "prophet" appears only in Pauline books (I Cor and Eph), and this is certainly astonishing in view of the fact that Eph 2,20 mentions the prophets along with the apostles as the "foundation" (*θεμέλιος*) of primitive Church structure. The only satisfying explanation is, of course, the decline of this as an acceptable ministry in the Church at large.—After the NT era, the "Shepherd of Hermas" appears to offer the only exception to what is otherwise a steady continuation of the same trend.

<sup>68</sup> See n.33 above.

trol was exercised with lasting effect by the literary evangelists,<sup>69</sup> and it is now to them that we turn for traces of new ministries and a newly conceived stewardship of the Jesus-tradition.

#### B. *The Teacher-Scribe (St. Matthew)*

James M. Robinson<sup>70</sup> has speculated that the sayings-collections of the primitive Church, like Q and its earlier components, were not transmitted as such beyond the first century because of the uncontrolled expansion to which they were subject. Some of them did fall

<sup>69</sup> This cannot be a blanket statement, for there is no clear trace of anti-enthusiasm in Mark or John. Quite the contrary, these gospels are claimed by Käsemann to be either a product of enthusiasm (Mk) or at least an attempt to resist the movement away from it towards "early Catholic" ecclesiology (Jn). One gets a bit uneasy with Käsemann's systematics at this point, but his observations are still not without their force. In discussing Mark's gospel as a product of the enthusiastic polity (cf. *Freedom*, 55 ff.), he is able to point to some fairly strong diagnostic signs of it: the θεῖος ἀνὴρ portrait of Jesus, the stress on the ἐξουσία (Mk 1,22.27; 11,28 ff.) and the δύναμις (Mk 5,30; 6,2.5) of the Lord's speech and deeds, especially his exorcisms; also his imparting of the same ἐξουσία to his disciples for their mission (Mk 3,15; 6,7; 13,34). Particularly when one observes the pericope of the "strange exorcist" (Mk 9,38-40), with its remarkable "anti-institutional" flavor, its omission by Mt and only partial retention by Lk, and its very strong contrast with Mt 7,21-23 (but strong resemblance to I Cor 12,3!), one is less inclined to scoff at K.'s suggestion than at first.—His thesis on the Johannine gospel was first put forth in his Göttingen *Antrittsvorlesung* of 1951, "Ketzer und Zeuge. Zum johanneischen Verfasserproblem," now in Käsemann, *Exeg. Versuche und Besinnungen* I, 168-87. He was convinced that the "excommunication" of sympathizers of "the Presbyter" and his envoys by Diotrephes, recorded in III Jn 9-10, reflects the historical fact that the group from which the Johannine literature came was an unorthodox "conventicle" in the developing "Catholic" church of the late years of the first century, refractory of the momentum towards institutional polity and thus experiencing the hostility of "orthodox" circles. Much as this idea was vigorously rejected and refuted in the years following K's Göttingen début—partially accepted but partially labeled "fantastic" by even his former teacher, R. Bultmann (cf. *Die Johannes-Briefe* [Meyerkommentar, 7. Auflage; Göttingen, 1967] 99 f., 100 n.1)—, K. has not hesitated to carry it further in a monograph on the Johannine question, in which his hypothesis is further grounded under the headings of John's Christology, community-ideal, and doctrine of the unity of believers (cf. *The Testament of Jesus. A Study of the Gospel of John in the Light of Chapter 17*. NT Library series; Philadelphia, 1968). See the incisive criticisms of this construction by Günther Bornkamm, "Zur Interpretation des Johannes-Evangeliums," *Evangelische Theologie* 28 (1968) 8-25; now in Bornkamm, *Geschichte und Glaube* (Ges. Aufs. III; Munich, 1968) 104-21.

<sup>70</sup> "λόγοι σοφῶν. Zur Gattung der Spruchquelle Q," in *Zeit und Geschichte. Dankesgabe an R. Bultmann*. . . , 77-96.

into Gnostic use, as we know from recent papyrus discoveries like the Gospel of Thomas, which is a sayings-collection even though the subscript of the present document calls it a "gospel." The subscript was probably dictated by the preference for the synoptic narrative-gospel in later Christian orthodoxy, whereas the Thomas-collection had undergone the kind of adventurous expansion which the narrative-gospel framework was meant to preclude, viz. the utterances, ultimately Gnostic, of a surviving brand of enthusiasm. The gospels of Matthew and Thomas offer an interesting comparison, for both contain large segments of the sayings tradition and both are thought to have originated in the same sector of the primitive Church, bearing as they do the names of apostles who are consistently named together in the ancient lists.<sup>71</sup> Yet Matthew's gospel, like Luke's and unlike Thomas', sets the heritage of Jesus' sayings into the protective framework of Mark's narrative outline. This was a conservative and legitimizing initiative with Jesus' words, preventing their further embellishment by locating them at definite times and places of Jesus' public life. Soon after the composition of Matthew and Luke, the kind of loose-knit and variable compendium of Jesus' λόγιοι that is still found in Did. 1 and I Clem 13<sup>72</sup> disappears from the literature of the *Grosskirche*, and one finds thenceforth only studied quotation of the sayings in their synoptic (mostly Matthean!) form and setting. The conservative, normative concern of Matthew's innovation is thus quite clear, and seems to have been quite successful.

Considering that Matthew's work was that of an appointed ministry in his congregation, that of *teacher-scribe*, the conservative effect of his composition may represent a further development in the process we have been tracing. The Judaeo-Christian roots and (probably) the surviving synagogue-membership of Mt's group<sup>73</sup>

<sup>71</sup> Mt 10,3; cp. Mk 3,18; Lk 6,15. It is interesting that the prescript of the so-called "Book of Thomas the Athlete," contained in the same Nag Hammadi codex as the gospels of Thomas and Philip, mentions Thomas and Matthew together, as follows: "The secret words spoken by the Saviour to Judas Thomas, and which I have written down, I, Matthew, who heard them while they spoke together" (Hennecke-Schneemelcher II, 307 f.; Robinson, *art. cit.*, 82 f.; H. Köster, *ZThK* 65 [1968] 182).

<sup>72</sup> Robinson, *art. cit.*, 88 f.

<sup>73</sup> G. Bornkamm, in *Tradition and Interpretation*. . . , 21-22, 24 ff.; G. Barth, *ibid.*, 86 ff.; E. Haenchen, "Matthäus 23" (cited n.35 above), in

explain his interest in the office of Christian scribe, which is three times provided for in his composition. The scribe becomes one of two aspirants to discipleship in Matthew's editing of the vocation-apotheisms from Q, whose number he reduces from three (Lk 9,57-62) to two (Mt 8,18-22), suggesting thereby the pre-eminence of the scribe over "another disciple," who is the second questioner.<sup>74</sup> In this church order, the evangelist himself would qualify as a leader of his church in virtue of his scholarly, scribal stewardship of the Jesus-tradition. The fact of the scribe's leadership in his church is con-

Haenchen, *Gott und Mensch*, 30 ff.—One cannot treat this question as settled, however, in view of the fact that redaction-historical studies of the recent past have increasingly favored the view that Matthew was a Christian of Gentile rather than Jewish origin, and was writing for folk of the same background (so Strecker, Trilling, Walker, Blair, etc.; see W. G. Kümmel, in Feine-Behm *Introduction to the N.T.*, 80 ff.). We cannot do more than mention this complicated question at this point and register our preference for what seems the better documented view, that Matthew is the voice of a rigorous Judaeo-Christian congregation, reasserting the Mosaic tradition over against an antinomian enthusiasm which was the basis of much of Christianity's appeal in the environment of Hellenistic syncretism (so Käsemann, Bornkamm-Barth, Hummel, Köster).—"Matthew opposes a group who appeal in support of their libertinism to the fact that Christ has abolished the law; these opponents rely on their *charismata*, their spiritual gifts, but not on their πίστις. . . . The knowledge of this battle-front is important for the understanding of Matthew's gospel. The constant exhortation to do God's will, to yield fruit, and the threat of judgment according to works takes on in this way a different look, because that to which it specifically refers is thus given" (G. Barth, in *Tradition and Interpretation*. . . , 164; H. Köster, *ZThK* 65 [1968] 169 ff.; Käsemann, *Apocalypticism*, 19 f.).

<sup>74</sup> G. Strecker, *Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit* (cited above, n.36) 37 ff., has the uncomfortable task of squaring his recognition of the prominence of the Christian scribe in Matthew with his insistence on the Gentile Christian provenance of the gospel, in which (he feels) the material of distinctively Judaeo-Christian stamp is all pre-editorial. It is no surprise that S. practically ignores this clearly editorial adjustment of the discipleship apothegms in his discussion of the treatment of the γραμματεὺς in the gospel, since its implication—when taken together with the designation of the scribe as οἰκοδεσπότης in 13,52—is that the scribe is part of the Matthean community's officialdom, not the survival of an old function in the "second, viz. Gentile-Christian generation" of the congregation.—Nor should the difference between the scribe's address of Jesus as διδάσκαλος (8,19) and the "other disciple's" invocation of κύριος (8,21) be exaggerated into a symptom of a negative resolution of the scribe's initiative (so Strecker, *op. cit.*, 124 n.2). Taken in conjunction with Mt 23,8, our passage might well be demonstrating the required submission of the scribe to the one "Teacher" in the new congregation.

firmed by the logion with which Matthew puts an editorial conclusion to this chapter of parables, at Mt 13,52:

*A scribe become disciple of the Kingdom of heaven is like the head of a household (a community leader, therefore), who takes from his treasure things new and old.*

The scribe is holder of a treasure,—a new notion of tradition, it would seem. His conversion to the Christian group (μαθητευθείς) results in the mixture of old things (his Jewish heritage) and new (the Christian realities) in the treasure; hence the scribe is mediator of new understanding in a new situation, nourished by his ancient, Mosaic tradition.<sup>75</sup> That he is therefore an indispensable, successful teacher of the church is made clear by the sequence of this editorial *dernier mot*: the question, *have you understood all these things?*, is answered, *yes*, by the disciples, whereupon the *mashal* of the teacher-scribe follows. Here there still remains the notion of an adaptive, innovating administration of the Jesus-tradition, but it is taking a decisive turn towards consolidation of the normative past, including the past of the old law (Mt 5,17 ff.). When this programmatic sequence is considered next to the unmistakable anti-enthusiastic reflexes in the first gospel,<sup>76</sup> one comes to recognize that the Christian

<sup>75</sup> Wolfgang Trilling, *Das wahre Israel. Studien zur Theologie des Matthäus-Evangeliums* (3rd edition; Munich, 1964) 204. That the scribal ministry and techniques have contributed distinctive features to the composition of the evangelist himself, hence were probably his own role in his congregation, is admitted by G. Strecker (*op. cit.*, 38-39).

<sup>76</sup> E. Käsemann, *Questions*, 78: "(Matthew) . . . is characterized by an anti-enthusiastic temper which causes the teacher and Christian rabbi rather to conceal than to expose to view the activity of primitive Christian prophecy. . . . the heir of the prophets (i.e. sentences of holy law in the NT) has here been taken over and altered in character by the Christian rabbi. The eschatological divine law proclaimed by charismatic men characterized the primitive community in the strongest possible fashion and became the point of departure for all subsequent Church order and for ecclesiastical law itself."—A protest against the view that Matthew was "anti-enthusiastic" was registered by Eduard Schweizer at the August 1969 meeting of the "Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas," in his presidential address entitled "Gesetz und Enthusiasmus bei Matthäus." I have only the report of R. Schnackenburg on the meeting (*Biblische Zeitschrift* 14 [1970] 159) and am as yet unable to read Dr. Schweizer's paper, which will be appearing shortly, I presume, in *New Testament Studies*.—One of the fullest and most convincing exegetical demonstrations of the anti-enthusiastic mechanisms in the composition of the first

scribe is indeed a conservative and delimiting "stewardship of the tradition," as Matthew conceives the office.

This much of Matthew's concern is common to all three Synoptics: the Church, faced with the prospect of an unexpectedly extended future and troubled by an inevitably centrifugal enthusiasm, moved to consolidate her tradition by investigating her constitutive past. Now the tradition of Jesus' earthly teaching, already expanded and adapted by the prophets, had to become fixed and normative. Jesus is the decisive past by which an uncertain present chooses to be guided; some can even speak, in current exegesis, of an "absolutism of the earthly Jesus"<sup>77</sup> in St. Matthew's project. Hence the anti-enthusiastic tone of the first gospel does not surprise us. The denunciation of the charismatics who fail to meet the severe Matthean ethical standard (Mt 7,21-23), who are "workers of ἀνομία" (7,23; 13,41), is only the most explicit form of a sentiment which has molded the whole Matthean project. There is, for example, no mention of charismatic speech and miraculous deeds in the universal missionary mandate which concludes the gospel (28,18-20),—even though such elements are the chief credentials of the missionary in the parallel tradition of the Markan epilogue (Mk 16,17-18).<sup>78</sup> In Mt 28, the command to "make disciples" embraces solely the components of formalized baptism and of teaching all that the Lord Jesus had himself taught on earth. The aorist ἐνετειλάμην in 28,20 stands emphatically against the uncharted, present promptings of the Spirit which the charismatic claims; now a comprehensive code of what Jesus taught delimits the scope of what the church of the present is to teach.

Correspondingly, the portrait of the disciple of Jesus as charismatic θεῖος ἀνὴρ has been *historicized* by Matthew,<sup>79</sup> that is, con-

gospel is that of G. Bornkamm, "Der Auferstandene und der Irdische, Mt 28,16-20," in *Zeit und Geschichte* (see n.1 above).

<sup>77</sup> Rolf Walker, *Die Heilsgeschichte im ersten Evangelium* (FRLANT 91; Göttingen, 1967) 116: more precisely, an "absolutizing" which "threatens" in Mt.

<sup>78</sup> G. Bornkamm, in *Zeit und Geschichte*, 179 ff., who cites O. Michel, "Der Abschluss des Matthäus-Evangeliums," *Evangelische Theologie* 10 (1950-51) 20 f.

<sup>79</sup> Bornkamm, *art. cit.*, 181 f.; R. Walker, *op. cit.*, 116 f.: "The word of the earthly Jesus, which covers all of sacred time up to the end, is now in

fined to the stage of the Galilean mission discourse in Mt 10, with the implication that it was only Jesus' presence in Israel which endowed his followers for mighty works and speech. The *de facto* presence in the Galilean discourse of numerous *dicta* of the enthusiasts may explain how this body of sayings came to be viewed as Jesus' provision for a mission in Galilee during his lifetime, but this has not yet defined the role that the editor assigns to the discourse. When we observe, for example, that the promise of the persecuted disciple's speaking what the Spirit alone dictates (Mt 10,19-20) has been moved by the editor from its Markan location in the eschatological discourse (Mk 13,11), where it would have been thought to apply to the post-Easter church, to the once-for-all past of the Galilean mission of Jesus,<sup>80</sup> we are convinced that the Matthean

need of no expansion or actualizing for the post-Easter period. This applies to the history of the salvation based on this pre-Easter word: the word is concluded, being both once-for-all in the past and yet lasting, a word definitively spoken for all times and circumstances, which makes the post-Easter 'spirit' superfluous.—Though he was the first to raise the issue of "historicizing" in Matthean redaction studies, G. Strecker did not develop the differences of missionary ideal and activity between the Galilean (Mt 10) and universal (Mt 28) "epochs" (cf. *Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit*, 194 ff., 208 ff.).

<sup>80</sup> Most treatments of Matthew's initiative in transferring Mk 13,9-12 to his c. 10 stress merely the salvation-historical motivation of it: that the eschatological discourse is then left to refer only to the world-wide mission (ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ οἰκουμένῃ—24,14), whereas the discourse in Mt 10, with its restriction of the mission to Israel (vv. 5 f. 23), acquired the sayings dealing with persecutions in "sanhedrins" and "synagogues" (v. 17). Mt. 10 therefore represents the program for the mission that failed, the messianic visitation of Israel, which brought the final infidelity of the original chosen people and the transfer of their election to others (cf. R. Walker, *Heilsgeschichte*, 60 ff., 83 ff., 120; G. Strecker, *Der Weg*. . . , 44 ff., 194 ff.). But the establishment of the two epochs, that of the mission to Israel (to which the activity of Jesus himself [15,24] and "the Twelve" [10,5 f.] was confined) and that of the world-wide mission of the Church (Mt 24/28,18 ff.), does not exhaust Matthew's schema. It is no accident that the material transferred to the "historicized" missionary program for Israel includes the promise of pneumatic speech before the persecutors (10,19-20), whereas the place Mark had given to that promise in the eschatological discourse has been devoted by Matthew to a warning against ψευδοπροφηται and their ἀνομία (Mt 24,11 f.; cp. Mk 13,11). It is therefore not only the activity of the historical Jesus and the Twelve that Matthew has "historicized" in the past epoch of Israel, but *all charismatic mission activity* as well. The implication is not only that it was the presence of the historical Jesus and the unique discipleship of the Twelve that made that activity possible; it is also implied that the *charismatic mission failed*, where-

discourse has the predominant editorial function of confining a certain concept of missionary endeavour to the unrepeatable sacred past of Jesus' lifetime. After all, Mt 10,8 defines the disciples' mission in Galilee as an enthusiastic mission; and that mission failed, whereupon the exclusively Jewish horizon of missionary endeavour ceased (Mt 10,5 f. 23),—together, it is suggested, with the economy of enthusiastic techniques. It is only logical to assume, too, that the mention of prophets in the Christian mission (in Mt 10,41 and 23,34) is not accidentally confined to the epoch of the unsuccessful appeal to Israel. With all these considerations in the background, Mt's omission of charismatic features from the universal missionary program of 28,18-20 is shown to be no accident, but indicative of a new church order and a new conviction about how the tradition, now a sacred heritage of the *past*, is to be faithfully stewarded.

We are already at the threshold of what the German Lutherans have long called "Early Catholicism," whose amusing academic odyssey to points ever nearer the origin is apparently still in progress.<sup>81</sup> The derivation of authentic tradition from the unique past experience of the Twelve disciples becomes, as is well known, a necessary underpinning of Early Catholicism. This conservative mechanism has usually been associated with the historiography of St. Luke, but Mathew shows us that it was operating at his level as well. The schematic association of the Twelve, usually interchangeable

upon the universal mission becomes one of sacramental activity and the communication of a fixed tradition (28,19 f.), with all endowment of charismatic ἐξουσία noticeably absent.

<sup>81</sup> Cf. the rather sweeping definition in Hans Conzelmann, "Heidenchristentum," *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (3rd ed.; Tübingen, 1959) III, 139; the unmistakably greater reserve in Conzelmann, *Outline*, 289 ff.; and the anti-continental English pungency of the criticisms of Stephen Neill, *The Interpretation of the New Testament, 1861-1961* (Oxford, 1964) 186-90. Neill's correct ascription of *Frühkatholizismus*, as a term of theological controversy, to the surviving polemics of the Reformation cannot lead us—as it seems to have led Neill—to ignore *Frühkatholizismus* as a reality of historical criticism. Much as one has the feeling that the term too much dominates the researches and writings of a scholar like Käsemann—by whom just about every NT author except Paul and John is so stigmatized!—we cannot hold out against the recognition that the Church acquired fixed structures and institutional character only in the course of that *subsequent* experience of history's undisturbed continuation which the *subsequent* NT books attest. As if the believers' allegiance did not compel him to take those books seriously!

with "the disciples," with all the deeds and teachings of Jesus' public life is an editorial convention which all three synoptic redactors observe,—so Bultmann has shown.<sup>82</sup> This becomes clearer in Matthew, where the expression "the twelve disciples" occurs three times at least,<sup>83</sup> and where the authority of the congregation's teacher-scribes is shown to be derived from the "power of the keys" conferred upon Peter (Mt 16,19) and the Twelve (Mt 18,18).<sup>84</sup> The principle of apostolic unicity and succession thus proved a necessary lever for defining legitimate tradition and preventing enthusiastic excesses. The Church could not have lasted without this principle, once she had recognized that there was an indefinite future to her redemptive history. The principle is best represented in Luke-Acts and the Pastorals, where some of the more familiar ministries emerge (bishop/elder, deacon), again as custodial functions, like the Matthean scribe's, to shore up and preserve the Church's transmitted heritage.

### C. *The Original "Stewards of the Word" and their Successors (Luke-Acts)*

The congregations of Lk-Acts and the Pastoral epistles are probably to be situated at the same later NT period.<sup>85</sup> Their concern is the same but, obviously, their method of pursuing it is different. Lk-Acts is a novel Christian historiography, whereas the Pastorals

<sup>82</sup> *Die Geschichte der syn. Trad.*, 368 ff., 381, 390 f.

<sup>83</sup> Mt 10,1; 11,1; 20,17 (26,20). On the clear Matthean identification of οἱ μαθηταὶ schematically with οἱ δώδεκα, and the derivation of certain redactional initiatives from this identification, see Rudolf Pesch, "Levi-Matthäus (Mc 2,14/Mt 9,9; 10,3). Ein Beitrag zur Lösung eines alten Problems," *Zeitschrift für die ntliche Wissenschaft* 59 (1968) 40-56, esp. 50 ff.; also G. Strecker, *Der Weg* . . . , 191 ff.; W. Trilling, *Das wahre Israel*, 30.

<sup>84</sup> Cf. R. Hummel, *Die Auseinandersetzung* . . . (cited n.36 above) 59-64, whose remarks on the beginnings of a quasi-rabbinical concept of tradition in this Matthean construction seem to retain their validity despite the reservations of R. Walker, *Heilsgeschichte*, 117-18. See also G. Bornkamm, in *Tradition and Interpretation* . . . , 44-49 (in Mt 18, the congregation inherits the Petrine "power of the keys" as teaching and disciplinary authority, to be vindicated by the judgment of the Son of Man at the end); also H. von Campenhausen, *Authority*, 125 ff., 129 f.

<sup>85</sup> Hans Conzelmann, "Luke's Place in the Development of Early Christianity," in L. E. Keck and J. L. Martyn, eds., *Studies in Luke-Acts. Essays presented in honor of Paul Schubert* . . . (Nashville/New York, 1966) 298-309, esp. 302 f. and n.101(p.315).

observe the established epistolary form; the Twelve are the apostolic norm for the historian, whereas Paul is the norm for the letter-writer, who even writes in his name; authentic tradition is Jesus-tradition in Lk-Acts, kerygmatic Pauline tradition in the Pastorals. Still, these very different projects reflect the very same phase of NT ministry and church order.

Luke's two-volume history has a criteriological intention, and it is clear right from the statement of objectives in the gospel prologue: *that you may understand the certainty of the things about which you have been instructed* (1,4) tells us the historian's concern; *the things that were fulfilled for us, as they were transmitted to us* (1,2) states his subject.<sup>86</sup> His problem is the problem of legitimate tradition, as the familiar παραδιδόναι announces.<sup>87</sup> The free, adaptive παράδοσις of Paul and the prophets had reached a critical abundance and discordance, as may be gathered from the audibly pejorative phrase, πολλοὶ ἐπεχείρησαν (1,1).<sup>88</sup> For a solution Luke again appeals to the normative past; this time there emerges a schema of salvation-history which is centered about the Jesus-event as its mid-point rather than its end.<sup>89</sup> The studied continuity between Jesus and

<sup>86</sup> Günther Klein, "Lukas 1,1-4 als theologisches Programm," in *Zeit und Geschichte* (see n.1 above).

<sup>87</sup> Luke and the "many" who preceded him faced the same problem: "Was bisher mündlich umlief, war schriftlich zu fixieren" (Klein, *art. cit.*, 200).

<sup>88</sup> Klein, *art. cit.*, 195 f.—"Why is Luke's appeal in v. 3 not to the reliability of the informants named in v. 2 but to that of his own method? If the eye-witness tradition in v. 2 were depicted primarily as the transmission of facts, the reference of Luke in v. 3 back to his own verification process would amount to a vote of no-confidence in that tradition. But if it is primarily the tradition's form as oral tradition which the author has in view, then he is hereby taking cognizance of the tradition-historical distance in time between that information which is still accessible in his day (cf. the ἡμῖν!) and its origin in the testimony of the eye-witnesses. If it is this distance which creates the objective difficulty in faithfully converting the oral διήγησις into a written account, then our author's reliance upon his own verification means his methodical attempt to eliminate the prevailing factor of uncertainty in his endeavour" (*ibid.*, 200 f.).

<sup>89</sup> Hans Conzelmann, "Zur Lukasanalyse," *ZThK* 49 (1952) 16-33, esp. 26, 32; *The Theology of Saint Luke* (trans. from 2nd German ed. by Geoffrey Buswell; New York, 1960) esp. 12-17. Conzelmann's analyses are adroitly surveyed and criticized by Joachim Rohde, *Rediscovering the Teaching of the Evangelists* (trans. by D. M. Barton, with additional material from the author, in NT Library series; Philadelphia, 1968) 154-78.

all that the present Church teaches and does rests upon the unique witness of the Twelve, "those who were eye-witnesses from the beginning and became stewards of the word" (ὕπηρέται τοῦ λόγου—1,2), as the prologue states. These guarantors of the tradition are qualified by a uniquely comprehensive experience, which spanned *all the time that the Lord Jesus came and went among us, beginning from the baptism of John until the day when he was taken up from us* (Acts 1,21 f.—the scope of the gospel narrative, in other words!).<sup>90</sup> Notice the stress on the *beginning* in both texts which state the unique credentials of the Twelve.<sup>91</sup> The witnesses who traced their experience of Jesus to that "beginning" and were with him also as risen One, during the forty-day instruction concerning "the kingdom" (Acts 1,3), now comprised the college of "the twelve apostles," his official "witnesses to the people" concerning his resurrection (Acts 1,22.25; 13,31).<sup>92</sup> Their unique exposure to the two epochs, that of Jesus and that of the Church (with the connecting sacred period in which the risen One reviews the former epoch<sup>93</sup>), make the Twelve the single channel of authentic tradition from the now distant "beginnings" to the life of the present Church. The tradition flows now by empirical history and succession rather than by impalpable movements of the Spirit; that is why Luke, and the Christian Church ever after him, could assume that the Twelve are the only ones to whom

<sup>90</sup> On the novelty of this criterion of the apostolic ministry cf. *The Jerome Biblical Commentary* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1968) 45:15, and n.17 above.

<sup>91</sup> Lk 1,2; οἱ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς αὐτόπται/Acts 1,22: ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ τοῦ βαπτίσματος Ἰωάννου . . . Cp. Lk 3,23; 23,5; (Acts 1,1) Acts 10,37.

<sup>92</sup> Klein lists the exclusive *notae apostolorum* as three: participation in the earthly life of Jesus ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ τοῦ βαπτίσματος Ἰωάννου; the 40-day instruction of the risen One (Acts 1,3; 13,31); the post-Easter designation of μαρτυροῦς πρὸς τὸν λαόν (13,31; cp. 1,8.22; 10,41). The three qualifications together constitute membership in the college of "the Twelve," and the first and second are indispensable prerequisites of the third. "Thus the status of witness becomes a reality only after the *historia Jesu* has come to a close and his resurrection is accomplished" (Klein, in *Zeit und Geschichte*, 204).

<sup>93</sup> Acts 1,3: τὰ περὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ, states at once the *specificum* of Jesus' own historic preaching (Lk 4,43; 16,16; Conzelmann, *St. Luke*, 114) and "a summary description of the missionary message" of the Church (Acts 19,8; cp. 8,12; 28,23.31; 18, 25 f.; Conzelmann, *op. cit.*, 218). The continuity between Jesus' and his witnesses' preaching has been already emphasized in the third-gospel narrative, usually through editorial additions to the source narrative (Lk 9,2.11.60; 8,1).—On the function of the Lucan "40 days" as a "sacred period between the times," see Conzelmann, *op. cit.*, 203 f.

the title "apostle" really belongs.<sup>94</sup> This apostolic ecclesiology is now conventional, of course, and though it was in formation before St. Luke, it is to him that we owe its systematic development.<sup>95</sup>

οἱ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέται γινόμενοι τοῦ λόγου. As a solution to the tradition-problem, this prologue statement is the reason Luke had to expand his history beyond the Markan outline to include the beginnings of the Church; for he had to demonstrate the line of continuity between Jesus, the witnesses, and the Church as he, the evangelist, knew it. His demonstration included the thematic use of ἀρχή (ἀρχεσθαι) in the prologue of both volumes (Lk 1,2; Acts 1,1<sup>96</sup>), the unmistakable resonances of Jesus' passion predictions in the kerygmatic sermons of Peter in Acts,<sup>97</sup> and, above all, the attribution of all fundamental initiatives of the Church's beginnings, including the Gentile mission, to the action of the Twelve (usually through Peter, their spokesman). A question that Luke could not leave unanswered, therefore, is how the "service of the word," at first the exclusive work of the Twelve in Jerusalem, was passed on to the postapostolic Gentile Church of the present.

<sup>94</sup> *Ibid.*, 216 n.1: "What characterizes the apostle is not the missionary commission, but the link with the life of Jesus, that is, with the unique historical facts concerning him." Cf. Klein, in *Zeit und Geschichte*, 216.

<sup>95</sup> One of the initial obstacles to an adequate analysis of Lucan theology, Conzelmann recognized (*ZThK* 49 [1952] 17), was "the temptation to take Lucan motifs as general NT motifs" since his theology represents a *Durchschnittstyp* of that which came to dominate early (and indeed, subsequent!) Christianity. "He has left his mark, as hardly anyone else in the earliest time of Christianity has done, on the church's piety through all the centuries," says Käsemann (*Freedom*, 121). It is no wonder that modern interpreters have difficulty discerning the innovations Luke is responsible for! Since many of them are conventional tenets of theology (particularly ecclesiology) now, it is hard for us to see them as *innovations*!

<sup>96</sup> Conzelmann saw (*ZThK* 49 [1952] 20) that the "beginning" of Lk 3,23 and that of Mk 1,1 were quite different, if only because John the Baptist was pointedly excluded from Luke's and pointedly involved in Mark's. The theory of history at work in Lk 3,23 is the one that comes to expression in Lk 16,16: ὁ νόμος καὶ οἱ προφῆται μέχρι Ἰωάννου· ἀπὸ τότε ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ εὐαγγελίζεται. The ἀπὸ τότε designates the *terminus a quo* of the apostle's requisite exposure to the *historia Jesu*,—the ἀρχή, in other words.—For the fuller, Lucan sense of ἤρξατο . . . ποιεῖν τε καὶ διδάσκειν in Acts 1,1, see the *Jerome Biblical Commentary*, 45:9.

<sup>97</sup> Ulrich Wilckens, *Die Missionsreden der Apostelgeschichte* (cited n.24 above) 115-21.

The answer, of course, involved Paul, the Gentile missionary who was commissioned by the Twelve (according to Luke) and answerable to them; but it also involved the ministries, the "elders" and the "deacons," who come forward in Acts as they do in the Pastorals.

It is interesting to observe Luke's integration of the ministries into his historical schema. The first of them to be mentioned is the ordained deaconate of Stephen's group (Acts 6), which is, as Lk requires, initiated and accomplished by the Twelve at Jerusalem. The purpose of the ordination which Lk gives, however, is scarcely believable: the Seven were ordained for table service in the daily distribution, we are told (Acts 6,1-4), whereas this is not at all the work which they go on to do in the subsequent Acts narrative.<sup>98</sup> The fact is—and Lk cannot suppress it—that the Seven were hellenistic miracle-workers and preachers of the word, fulfilling the popular image of the θεῖος ἀνὴρ and extending the enthusiastic mission beyond Palestine's borders (cf. Acts 6,8-9.15; 7,55 f.; 8,4-8.12-13.34-39; 11,19 ff.).<sup>99</sup> If such was the case, why did Lk tell us that they were ordained by the Twelve for table service? Obviously his tradition and his theological schema are in conflict at this point. As yet, in Lk's schema, only the Twelve can exercise the "ministry of the word" (διακονία τοῦ λόγου—6,4) at Jerusalem, which is the historical and geographical center of Lucan *Heilsgeschichte*. The unicity of the bond between the two eras must be maintained at Jerusalem, and it is the preaching of the Twelve and them only! Stephen and his followers were actually charismatic apostles or prophets in the

<sup>98</sup> See n.9 above.—It may be said with equal assurance that the designation ἑλληνισταί means more than simply Greek-speaking Jews, as opposed to Palestinian Jews. For whereas Diaspora Jews are frequently encountered in the Acts narrative, the term used for Stephen's group occurs only at Acts 6,1 and 9,29. It is clear that the term designates a *party* or *viewpoint* within the earliest Church, such as drew wrath and repression from ruling Judaism (Acts 8,1) and supplied the innovators who began the Gentile mission (Acts 11,19 ff.). See Johannes Bihler, *Die Stephanusgeschichte im Zusammenhang der Apostelgeschichte* (Münchener theol. Studien, hist. Abt. 30; Munich, 1963) 191, 216 ff., in addition to the works mentioned in n.9.

<sup>99</sup> Add to this data the anti-law and anti-temple attitudes which Stephen was accused of (Acts 6,11.13 ff.) and one has a fairly complete portrait of just the kind of antinomian party that Matthew was opposed to (Mt 7,21 ff.; cf. G. Bornkamm, in *Zeit und Geschichte*, 117, 179 ff.; J. Bihler, *Stephanusgeschichte*, 219).

original sense,<sup>100</sup> and they were so important for the preparation of Paul's Gentile mission, beginning at Antioch, that Luke could not suppress their memory. Yet his historiographical objective, his answer to the tradition problem, required his finding another reason for their ordination than the service they had really performed. Naturally, the official ἐπίθεσις τῶν χειρῶν τῶν ἀποστόλων is an imposition on the record from Lucan retrospect both in Acts 6,6 and Acts 8,17.<sup>101</sup>

A second ministry, the ἐπίσκοποι/πρεσβύτεροι (these are interchangeable for Lk, as for the Pastoral author—cf. Acts 29,17.28), enters the Lucan picture, casually at Acts 11,30 and 14,23, systematically and purposefully in Acts 15,4-16,4. The latter section is the report of the "Jerusalem Council,"<sup>102</sup> which concerned what is, for Luke, the focal issue of the epoch of the Church: the legitimacy of the Gentile churches. How could it be shown that this most fundamental reality of the author's present was in true fidelity to the "beginning"? First, of course, by showing that the law-free mission came from Peter's initiative, not Paul's, and that it really was God's will; this was done in Acts 10-11. But then too, it had to be shown how this apostolic initiative had been ratified and continued by the Jerusalem church's second-generation directorate, the "elders." That

<sup>100</sup> Bihler, *op. cit.*, 209-16, 233-38, 250 f.

<sup>101</sup> Paul's gesture continues the same perspective in Acts 19,6, as Käsemann pointed out in "The Disciples of John the Baptist in Ephesus" (*Essays*, 136-48). The Spirit is communicated only by the *Una sancta*, founded on the unique witness of the original Twelve and now located with their designated successors (Paul is thus already "second generation," in a sense!). We have here "an ideological theology of history. Its characteristic feature is this: it reads back into the past as an historical reality the postulate of an *Una sancta* grounded on the apostolic fellowship and then, conversely, uses this postulate to validate the claims of the orthodox Church of (Luke's) own times. . . . We can only understand him as an historian if we have first understood him as a theologian. As a theologian he can only be understood from his doctrine of a legitimate Church" (Käsemann, *Essays*, 148; cp. his general characterization of Lucan ecclesiology ["early Catholic"] in *Questions*, 22, and the endorsement of our analogy between the "Hellenists" episode and that of the Baptist's disciples at Ephesus [Acts 19,1-7] by J. Bihler, *Stephanusgeschichte*, 237-38).

<sup>102</sup> Ernst Haenchen, "Quellenanalyse und Kompositionsanalyse in Act. 15," in *Judentum, Urchristentum, Kirche. Festschrift für Joachim Jeremias* (Beiheft 26 zur *ZnW*, ed. by W. Eltester; Berlin, 1964) 153-64; also Haenchen, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 396-414.

is why James, their spokesman, speaks after Peter in Acts 15,13 ff. Contrary to the testimony of Gal 2, Paul is not spokesman of his own cause in Acts 15; he cannot be. The argument must be carried by the representatives of the Mother-church, the historical and geographical *una sancta*.<sup>103</sup> The Mother-church is represented by her first-generation leader, Peter, and by her second-generation elder, James. Like the ordination in c. 6, of course, this official is visited upon the record; the Church-order is that of Luke's time, not the apostles'. St. Paul, although Luke submits to past fact in making him the Gentile missionary *par excellence*, can have no "canonical status," so to speak, in the Acts schema.<sup>104</sup> He was activated by the Twelve, through Barnabas (Acts 11,25),<sup>105</sup> and his mission was to carry out the commission given him by the Twelve and their successors in the churches of Jerusalem and Antioch.—Evolving here, obviously, is the apostolic ecclesiology so familiar to us from our *De ecclesia* tracts.

The ministries in Luke are very clearly "stewardships of the tradition"—*διακονία* τοῦ λόγου, to use his own phrase, commissioned by the Twelve. The concern to show faithful continuity, and the structure of the offices which Luke imposes upon the tradition, show the identity of his church's situation with the one presupposed

<sup>103</sup> G. Klein, *Apostel*, 173 ff.

<sup>104</sup> E. Haenchen, *art. cit.*, 158-60, 164; *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 399-404.

<sup>105</sup> ἐξῆλθεν δὲ εἰς Ταρσὸν ἀναζητῆσαι Σαῦλον, καὶ εὐρῶν ἤγαγεν εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν. "Here too, therefore, the subordination of Paul to those who rank before him, the bearers of the tradition, remains in effect and becomes quite striking, for this is where Luke is narrating his first real contact with the Gentile-Christian branch of the Church" (Klein, *Apostel*, 167).—I am willing to admit that Klein has exaggerated the Lucan design of subordinating Paul to the Twelve in Acts—especially in his analysis of the three "vocation" accounts—, but I cannot concede to J. Roloff that nothing remains of his case at all (cf. *Apostolat*, 200 n.99, 207). Roloff is willing to join the long line of interpreters who consider that the Twelve and Paul are on an equal footing in the Acts (cf. a partial listing in Klein, *op. cit.*, 210 f. n.973), but he as much as ignores the role of Barnabas as Jerusalem's envoy (Acts 11,22; cp. 9,27), which is just the kind of subtle contribution to his information that we are accustomed to find in Luke's writing where points of concern to him are being made. I would consider this the strongest observation in favor of subordination—to be taken, of course, in the context of the notoriously difficult comparison of Acts 9-11/15 with Gal 1-2 —, and Roloff's case against Klein is not enhanced by his ignoring it.

by the letters to Timothy and Titus. We are thus led to make those letters our final consideration.

D. *The "Charism of Office" (The Pastoral Epistles)*

It is well known that the writer to Timothy and Titus urges the prototype of a conservative stewardship of the tradition. The contrasts on this score between his documents and the authentic Pauline letters have been amply discussed in recent exegesis.<sup>106</sup> The custodian of the apostolic tradition is now presented as the single addressee of the Pastorals, the first documents of the Pauline tradition to be so addressed. The letters thus introduce us to the forerunner of the monarchical bishop,<sup>107</sup> who is not to receive the title ἐπίσκοπος until the Ignatian writings (presuming the latter to be chronologically later than the Pastorals, and they may not be!). A single observation proves to be amply diagnostic of the Pastoral writer's departure from the order of the historic Pauline communities: he allows only two occurrences of the word χάρισμα in his correspondence, and both are in connection with the *rite of ordination* by which the single delegate was constituted "in office" (I Tim 4,14; II Tim 1,6).<sup>108</sup> In addition, a new term for tradition makes its ap-

<sup>106</sup> E.g. E. Käsemann, "Ministry and Community in the NT," *Essays*, 85 ff.; von Campenhausen, *Authority*, 106-19; E. Schweizer, *Church Order*, 77-88; H. Schlier, *Zeit der Kirche*, 129-47; K. Wegenast, *Tradition*, 132-58; H.-W. Bartsch, *Rechtsbildungen*, 9-26; Dibelius-Conzelmann, *Pastoralbriefe*, 1-9; R. Bultmann, *Theol. of the NT II*, 183 ff.—Cf. the critical summary of W. G. Kümmel in the Feine-Behm *Introduction to the NT*, 258-72.—To be sure, the contrasts between the great Epistles and the Pastorals invite oversimplification and exaggeration (so L. Goppelt, *Apost. Zeit*, 134). Much more cautious in this regard is the treatment of J. Roloff, *Apostolat*, 236-71.

<sup>107</sup> Käsemann, *art. cit.*, 87 f. Or perhaps we should say "the prototype" (*Urbild*), as K does, because Paul writing to his "delegate" is actually being made to provide for the office which is already in existence and needs to be authenticated.

<sup>108</sup> "We can now speak inelegantly, but with absolute accuracy, of the *spirit of office*" (*art. cit.*, 87; cp. *Exeg. Versuche*. . . I, 129). Käsemann speaks tendentiously of "a patriarchal system" taking root in the pastoral communities (*Freedom*, 96), now that the charisms are under the control of ecclesiastical office.—But we do well to avoid dramatic antitheses with the Pauline order until we have heard our author out. Käsemann ignores, for example, the participation of *prophecy* in the ordination as noted in I Tim 4,14: διὰ προφητείας. It appears that a prophetic voice at least influenced the delegate's choice, whereupon the elders laid their hands upon him (cf. Eduard Lohse, *Die Ord-*

pearance in these writings,—familiar to us but not to those whom the writer was seeking to govern: the term “deposit,” παραθήκη, replacing quite noticeably the Pauline term (and idea) παραδόσις. The tradition was now a “bank deposit,” a treasure “put aside” for safekeeping, to be transmitted unaltered, *nihil addendo et nihil tollendo*.<sup>109</sup>—The change of concept and atmosphere from the Pauline era become most obvious in the thematic conclusion of I Tim (6,20):

*O Timothy, guard the deposit (τὴν παραθήκην φύλαξον), and avoid the empty chatter and the contradictions of that which is falsely called “knowledge” (γνώσις), for by proclaiming it some have missed the mark as regards the faith.*

That pretended “knowledge” which is being combatted here was probably the original form of Christianity in many places,<sup>110</sup> yet

*nation im Spätjudentum und im Neuen Testament* [Göttingen, 1951] 81),—a warning against taking the Pastorals’ ordination too strictly according to apostolic succession (as e.g. Schlier, *Kirche*, 143 f., and Käsemann, *art. cit.*, 88). The *charisma* is thought to come *with* (μετά) the laying on of hands in I Tim 4,14, but *through* (διὰ) it in II Tim 1,6—a difference which is no doubt connected with the different ordaining *parties*, the Elders in I Tim, the Apostle himself in II Tim. The difference is based on the nature of the letters, community-rule (I Tim) vs. personal testament (II Tim), rather than on difference of concept or authorship (cf. Dibelius-Conzelmann, *Pastoralbriefe*, 56 f.). Without being able to decide upon the exact influence of “prophecy” upon the delegate’s selection (cf. I Tim 1,18; 4,14), we may at least accept the formula, “pneumatisch begründeter Amtsauftrag” (Roloff, *Apostolat*, 260) for the Pastorals’ understanding of *charisma*, and insist that office has not yet been made the *medium* of the Spirit in these documents, but office is the *consequence* of divine designation to become the apostolic surrogate in administering the “deposit” of apostolic teaching. A measure of divine sovereignty and transcendence is preserved here which is damaged beyond recognition in the interpretation of Käsemann.

<sup>109</sup> I Tim 6,20; II Tim 1,12.14 (cf. Dibelius-Conzelmann, *Pastoralbriefe*, 69 f.; Wegenast, *Tradition*, 143 ff.; Roloff, *Apostolat*, 246-48). Whereas erroneous teaching is the product of arbitrary human caprice, the apostolic teaching (to be administrated by the delegate and his subordinates) is taken out of the reach of those who would tamper with it, in the same way as the property laws provide for personal possessions to be left on *deposit*, to be returned unharmed to the owner on his demand. The one who has left this “deposit,” and will demand it back on the day of his “appearance,” is the Lord Jesus himself (I Tim 6,14).

<sup>110</sup> The word γνώσις is used here “technisch als Selbstbezeichnung der Irrlehrer,” although it offers by itself no specific information as to what form

Timothy's correspondent sees it, as would the Church at large for over two hundred years, as a libertine infidelity which threatened the unity and purity of the Church. To fortify the Church against this surviving enthusiasm, our author can no longer conceive her as the unlimited earthly domain of the risen Christ, embracing a rich variety of gifts and expressions; rather, she is now "the pillar and bulwark of truth" (I Tim 3,15) against those who "teach otherwise," who "wander away," who "make shipwreck." Rather than the eclectic haven of ideas and mores born of the most widely divergent cultures, the Church is now the insulated "household of the faith," "the family of God," "exposed to hostile attack and needful of protection."<sup>111</sup> It is true that Paul's practice of incorporating acculturated gospel formulas into his expositions has not been eliminated by his namesake,<sup>112</sup> a fact which sustains the impression one gets

of Gnosis the author's opponents represented (Dibelius-Conzelmann, *Pastoralbriefe*, 70). K. Wegenast has gathered together the numerous allusions in the letters to the tenets of the false teaching, and they contain parallels to the later forms of Gnosticism combatted by the Church fathers (e.g., I Tim 1,6 ff.; 4,3; 5,23; 2,11.15; II Tim 2,18; 3,6; Tit 1,10.15; 2,4; etc.—Wegenast, *Tradition*, 136 ff., with citations from Justin, Irenaeus, Tertullian, etc.). The letters resist any more specific identification of the heretics of their concern,—even the interesting one of Walter Bauer (*Rechtgläubigkeit*, 225 ff.), who thought these documents were intended to vindicate Paul's orthodoxy against the exploitation of him by Marcion. Bauer even suggested that the "Antitheses" of Marcion are the specific reference of the ἀντιθέσεις τῆς ψευδοκνήμου γνώσεως in I Tim 6,20 (229; but cf. Dibelius-Conzelmann, *loc. cit.*).—Without the benefit of the valuable "Thomas" literature which papyri since discovered have provided, Bauer concluded that Marcionites were the evangelizers of the eastern Syrian region between Edessa and Mesene (*op. cit.*, 21, 34), which was not "catholicized" until the fourth or fifth century. Since it is now known that that region produced the literature of Thomas (cf. Hennecke-Schneemelcher II, 440), Bauer's judgment must be modified (H. Köster, *ZThK* 65 [1968] 173), but not his recognition that it was no "orthodox" Christian confession to which the region was originally won over. If not a Gnosticism strictly recognizable from patristic refutations, the school of thought of the Thomas-documents was a "typical example of hellenistic syncretism" (Köster, *art. cit.*, 188) such as would certainly qualify as proto-Gnostic, just as would the "myths and fables" and "empty babblings" of the pastoral author's concern!

<sup>111</sup> Käsemann, *Essays*, 85 and *Freedom*, 88 f., 96 f.

<sup>112</sup> The important qualification must be added, however, that formulaic material "is not elaborated on theologically," as it is so consistently and characteristically in Paul, "but only recited" (Dibelius-Conzelmann, *Pastoralbriefe*, 4). Bartsch observes (*Rechtsbildungen*, 170) that traditional formulas utilized by the Pastoral author are linguistically distinctive by comparison to the gen-

from rabbinic studies<sup>113</sup> and elsewhere (perhaps even from *experientia communis!*), that the theory and practice of self-professed "traditionalists"<sup>114</sup> are not at all times perfectly coherent. Still, the Pastoral author's concept of the role of any *traditor* in the Church is totally adhered to in at least one important instance, II Tim 2,8, where the formula cited κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου contains no nuance beyond the "gospel of God" of Rom 1,3-4, whose status as a Gentile-Christian byword at the time even of the composition of Romans is required by the circumstances of that letter.<sup>115</sup> Repetition in place of adaptation, safekeeping in place of adventurous acculturation: such is the "stewardship" of the Christian tradition which Paul's *alter ego* of the Pastorals is now urging and, in part, implementing.

In the Pastorals, as in Luke-Acts, there is an historical reflex which strives to define faith's legitimate content. It is not Luke's appeal to the Jesus-tradition, but the pseudonymous exploitation of St. Paul and his received teachings as norm and sanction of orthodoxy. Paul is the one to whom the truth was originally entrusted (I Tim 1,11; II Tim 1,11), and is therefore the source and legitimation of a gospel which can thus be circumscribed and commended to the Church's ministers for safekeeping. Paul is consequently "law-

uine Pauline examples, often involving the kind of ontological statements about the Divine which are not typical of Pauline material (e.g., I Tim 2,5; 6,16). Most characteristic is the heavily hellenized vocabulary of the formulas: the famous hymnic piece of I Tim 3,16, the *λύτρον* statement of I Tim 2,6 (Mk 10, 45), the participial phrases of II Tim 1,10, etc. These formulas are indeed interpretations of the Christian message in strongly hellenized language-vesture (Bartsch), but their mode of utilization by the author (only superficially imitative of Paul) is already an indication of how he expects them to be used in the churches. They are for repetition as the "sane doctrine" of the Apostle, not for hermeneutical exploitation!

<sup>113</sup> See n.23 above, particularly the article of W. Gerber cited there.

<sup>114</sup> Using the term in its current, conventional acceptance,—in which it becomes really a misnomer, as Gerhard Ebeling explains (*Theology and Proclamation* [trans. by John Riches; Philadelphia, 1966] 27).

<sup>115</sup> Wegenast, *Tradition*, 75. The formula in II Tim 2,8 is not dependent upon Rom 1,3 f. at the literary level, but belongs to a developing two-level Christology in which the earthly and exalted periods of the Lord's existence are distinguished (cf. Ferdinand Hahn, *Christologische Hoheitstitel* [cited n.22 above] 258). Notice the immediate validation of the formula through personal association with the Apostle: κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου (cp. I Tim 2,6 f., and ἡ παραθήκη μου II Tim 2,12—Dibelius-Conzelmann, *Pastoralbriefe*, 81).

giver" and "author of a binding tradition"<sup>116</sup> when he bids his delegate:

*Follow the pattern of the sound words you have heard from me . . . ; guard the good deposit through the Holy Spirit that dwells in us (II Tim 1,13-14).*

The Spirit functions here only as seal of that which human tradition and order have set forth. Whereas, in the original Pauline churches, order and ministry followed upon the Spirit's action, now it precedes and mediates that action; hence charism and empirical ordination are inseparable, and the latter is prior.

The criteriologies of the apostleship of the Twelve in Acts and Paul's apostleship in the Pastorals correspond closely as answers to the tradition problem. The Pastoral author must strive, as relentlessly and methodically as St. Luke does, to avoid any suggestion that the tradition's source lies farther back than the Apostle himself. Instead, however, of Luke's inverted pyramid, with the experience of the Twelve at the bottom and the lines of continuity to the expanding Church of the present drawn by schematic historiography, the Pastoral correspondent writes from the simulated perspective of the tradition's source itself,—speaking, therefore, from the pyramid's apex to the ages that would follow. If Paul had once presented himself as a link in the chain of community tradition, using the technical terms *παραλαμβάνειν* and *παραδιδόναι* (I Cor 15), his descendant must now avoid that terminology and make Paul the tradition's *author* rather than its hermeneut.<sup>117</sup> For him, tradition

<sup>116</sup> Wegenast, *Tradition*, 140, 141; also E. Schweizer, *Church Order*. . . , 80.

<sup>117</sup> Wegenast, *Tradition*, 139-40; H. Schlier, *Kirche*, 131.—It is probably true that the contrasts have been overstated in this respect between Paul and his literary successor. It is hardly correct, for example in the area of parenthesis, to make the original Paul's approach one of adaptive exhortation and admonition exclusively, and his successor's one of rigid, peremptory law-giving—as if either author never realized the approach said to characterize the other! Moreover, J. Roloff protests against the portrayal of the Pastoral Apostle's role as that of "author" and "originator" of the tradition (cf. *Apostolat*, 248-49), on the grounds that the letters emphasize the Lord himself as the tradition's "proprietor," who will demand it back untampered with and pass judgment on its custodians (so II Tim 1,11-14). Hence the *μὸν* of the expressions quoted in n.115 cannot be *genitivus auctoris*, since even the Apostle has no plenipotentiary disposition of the kerygmatic materials. He was their

consists in Paul's confiding his fixed treasure to designated guardians, not his free mediation of a word whose sole guarantor is the invisible Spirit. This latter conception was rather that of our author's opponents, the early Gnostics, who considered Paul's Christian experience the prototype<sup>118</sup> and wished to continue the unstructured, pneumatic church order of his communities long after its necessary eschatological basis had been disproved by experience. The pastoral letters, written in Paul's name and authority, were aimed at the heretics' recourse to Paul as patron of their *gnosis* and their pneumatic

recipient, and is now rather their faithful guardian and κηροῦξ than their originator.—Perhaps this is a salutary warning, for the "loaded" terms of theological discussion often threaten to create semantic chaos in exegesis. The terms "author" and "originator" are possibly not the best with which to explain the Pastoral *Apostelbild*. But neither would it do to lose sight of the point that Wegenast and Schlier are making: that by stopping the tradition's "chain" at the apostolic author of the letters—hence by avoiding Paul's own formula δ καὶ παρέλαβον (I Cor 15,3)—, there is achieved a fixation or taxative definition of the tradition similar to the one Luke was aiming at. Tradition is codified as *deposit*; the παραθήκη is the content of the letters (Dibelius-Conzelmann, 70), to be preserved as *written*. To stress this latter obligation, the kerygmatic formulas are stated in the letters without theological expansion, as if *traditio* were merely the exact repetition of *dicta apostolica*. But to know what *dicta* are truly *apostolica*, I must have their derivation from the apostolic source made visible and compelling for me, and this is what both the Lucan and Pastoral projects are dedicated through their different methods to achieving.

<sup>118</sup> Documentation of the Gnostics' exploitation of the "chain of tradition" *vocabula* (παραλαμβάνειν, παραδιδόναι, παράδοσις, διαδοχή) to support their system of esoteric revelations and restricted chains of recipients is offered in von Campenhausen, *Authority*, 157 ff., and Wegenast, *Tradition*, 123 ff.—"Jesus is understood as no other than the revealer of a new doctrine and the founder of a school; the apostles are the teachers and mystagogues who pass on the tradition and initiate those who are worthy into the secret revelation" (M. Hornschuh, in Hennecke-Schneemelcher II, 87). Naturally, such a system retained the earlier and broader concept of 'apostle,' without empirical credentials or restriction to the Twelve of history; and Paul, with his independent claim to apostleship through revelation, could well serve as their model and support (cf. von Campenhausen, *op. cit.*, 110 f.; H.-F. Weiss, "Paulus und die Häretiker. Zum Paulusverständnis in der Gnosis," in W. Eltester, ed., *Christentum und Gnosis* [Beiheft 37 zur *ZnW*; Berlin, 1969] 116-28). Weiss names the Marcionites and the Valentinian Gnostics as the principal venerators of Paul, who was "the Apostle" for them. The attempt to revive enthusiasm and the doctrine of the coincidence of resurrection (spiritual) and baptism are cited as major aspects of Gnostic Paulinism.—For a much more extensive discussion of the topics of tradition, apostle, and Paulinism in second-century Gnosticism, see Georg Günter Blum, *Tradition und Sukzession. Studien zum Normbegriff des Apostolischen von Paulus bis Irenäus* (Berlin/Hamburg, 1963) part II, 98-160.

anarchism. The avoidance of the "chain of tradition" semantics in the Pastorals counters, in fact if not by design,<sup>119</sup> the Gnostic use of it with Pauline pretensions and in behalf of an esoteric tradition.

The historical changes which lie between the real Paul and his Pastoral descendant are fairly clear. Proximate eschatology has receded, pneumatic anarchy threatens. To stabilize his churches, our author employs a similar empirical relationship between *apostolic* and *post-apostolic* eras as Luke sought to demonstrate historiographically. Here the writer is himself the apostle, the tradition's source, and his addressee is, to quote Käsemann, "the extension of the apostolic office into the post-apostolic age."<sup>120</sup> The single delegate and his coadjutant officials, all empirically ordained, join in fortifying the public treasury of truth which the apostle has left behind. These ministries are thus a highly conservative stewardship of Pauline tradition<sup>121</sup>—but are so more in theory than in fact, it would seem,

<sup>119</sup> By design, most think—if it is not an anachronism to suppose that the exploitation of the tradition-terminology which is well documented in the generation after the Pastorals had begun at the time and occasion of their composition. Cf. von Campenhausen, *Authority*, 161; Dibelius-Conzelmann, *Pastoralbriefe*, 69 f.; Wegenast, *Tradition*, 137 f.; G. G. Blum, *Tradition und Sukzession*, 56; J. Roloff, *Apostolat*, 249 n.59.—Cited in all these instances is an essay which remained inaccessible to me: H. von Campenhausen, "Lehre-reihen und Bischofsreihen im zweiten Jahrhundert," in *In memoriam Ernst Lohmeyer* (Stuttgart, 1951) 240-49, esp. 244 f.

<sup>120</sup> Käsemann, *Exeg. Versuche*. . . I, 129 (*Essays*, 87). Though I have been citing the English translation of the essay, "Ministry and Community. . .," the translation is my own, from *Exeg. Versuche*. . . I, 109-34. This is due rather to the circumstances of the preparation of this paper than to any reservations about the translation of *Essays*.

<sup>121</sup> Käsemann's judgments in this respect (cf. *Freedom*, 96 ff.) are harsh and are, in the final analysis, governed by the Bultmannian *Sachkritik* which seems to divide the NT up into two segments, the crest of the wave (Paul/John) and the decline! The vindication of Lucan theology against this prejudice by Ulrich Wilckens (cf. *Studies in Luke-Acts*, 60-83) can be applied, *mutatis mutandis*, to the work of the Pastoral 'Apostle.' If Käsemann really believes that "the Spirit defines dialectically what the Church is" (*Freedom*, 98), he must allow for the personalities and historical circumstances which lead the Church to positions even dialectically opposed to his own, so that "the many struggles, antagonisms, and splinterings" can continue to demonstrate the inalienable humanity of this *creatura verbi* during the *Zwischenseit*, and the Spirit can continue to demonstrate His sovereign transcendence and his incalculability! If all inspired writing and all the formative ecclesial experiences of the early years have now to conform, through some arbitrary wielding of the

since the author's reformulations of the kerygma—I Tim 3,16 especially<sup>122</sup>—and even his very defensive and highly fortified ecclesiology represent *de facto* innovation on his part, and assure us that the necessarily adaptive, hermeneutical aspect of all tradition and ministry has not been abandoned—even here!

#### CONCLUSION

The last statement anticipates our conclusion.

We have seen something of the dialectic of the NT quest for a durable church order. We have traced it specifically in the provisions for *stewardship of the tradition* which were essential to all the ministries we investigated. Although the stewardship of the charismatic ministries was more creative and adaptive, and that of the appointed ministries more custodial and conservative, this contrast can be overstated and frequently is. In no instance were these ministries creative or custodial to the exclusion of the opposite tendency, however much

principle of "the gospel within the canon" (Käsemann, *ZThK* 64 [1967] 266 f.), to a one-sided, enthusiastic Christian ideal, little suited—among other things—to weather the storms and perversities of extended human experience, what can be said to remain of the Spirit's inscrutability? If we all decide what the Church must inevitably be, how will the Spirit continue to define her *dialectically*? His dialectical definitions are grounded first of all, it seems to me, in the NT testimonies which *challenge us and our generation, with all our frail philosophical certitudes and our theological shibboleths, and our pre-judgments about the gospel within the canon!* The Pastoral writer is indeed not a popular spokesman in 1970. Should we not grant, however, that unless the Spirit is our puppet, even this author might have a corner on the *gospel*, if for no other reason than because he is in the early Church's *canon*?—In any case, the "tyranny of the question" in exegesis can be quite as threatening to the Spirit as anti-enthusiastic church polities. Both resist the dialectical definitions of the Spirit, and it is not certain which is the more recalcitrant!

<sup>122</sup> Cf. Bartsch, *Rechtbildungen*, 27 ff.; Dibelius-Conzelmann, *Pastoral-briefe*, 49 ff.; Eduard Schweizer, in *Current Issues . . .* (*art. cit.* in n.22 above) 168 ff.; A. Seeberg, *Katechismus* (cited n.22) 112-25. Notice the connection with the "mystery"/Epiphany Christology of Rom 16,25 f.; Col. 1,26; Eph 1,9; 3,9 f.—"hidden from of old," "now unveiled" and proclaimed. The relative-clauses in parallelism suggest the hymnodic style of the *Odes of Solomon* (e.g. 19,8 ff.), and the contrast of spheres (flesh/spirit, cosmos/doxa, angels/nations) is always reducible to that of the earthly and heavenly worlds.—It is ironic that the portrait of the Redeemer presented here—perhaps an enthronement process embracing exaltation, presentation, and enthronement—represents the inroads of the very kind of hellenistic syncretism (proto-Gnosticism) against which this author's restrictive church polity is conceived!

the exclusion might have been favored by circumstances of the time and place. The charismatic apostle could not ignore questions of continuity and fidelity, as the argument in I Cor 15,1-11 clearly shows. Neither could the prophets have broken completely with the forms of Jesus' own speech, as we insisted in connection with the differentiation of their suggested traces within the synoptic logia tradition. For when, in fact, the charismatic ministries became libertine and unhistorical—as we suppose they did when separated from the vivid eschatology of the early years—, they tended to be forced out of the mainstream of Christian development. Nor were the later ministries, whose documentation we found in Mt, Lk-Acts, and the Pastorals, without their measure of innovation,—as was perhaps best stated in Matthew's prescription for the office of Christian scribe:

“. . . the head of the household, who takes from his treasury things *both new and old*” (Mt 13,52).

It was always perceived, in other words, that tradition is not correctly stewarded when either meaningful adaptation or faithful preservation of the *tradita* is ignored. The process of *tradio* cannot be equated with its raw material, the *tradita*; neither can it go on without that material, for then historical continuity is lost,—which means fidelity to Jesus is lost, as Matthew and Luke understood. *Tradio* is faithful mediation of the constitutive testimony of Christ in ages and circumstances which the inspired *testes* could not have foreseen. The Spirit is active in the successful coordination of *historical data* and *sensitive innovation* by the *traditor*—the *minister*, that is.<sup>123</sup>

As a consequence, however the Church of the future may reconceptualize and relocate her ministries, we shall always be certain that without the dialectical balance of *historical fidelity* and *charismatic creativity*, no Christian ministry in the true sense can remain.

RICHARD J. DILLON  
St. Joseph's Seminary  
Yonkers, New York

<sup>123</sup> Readers of Gerhard Ebeling will recognize his influence in these remarks; cf. especially the essay cited above in n.114.