THE USE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT IN THE NEW AND OTHER ESSAYS

STUDIES IN HONOR OF

WILLIAM FRANKLIN STINESPRING

Edited by

JAMES M. EFIRD

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS
Durham, N. C. 1972

L.C.C. card no. 70-185463
I.S.B.N. 0-8223-0288-8

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Composition by Maurice Jacobs, Inc.

THE MORAL TEACHING OF THE EARLY CHURCH

W. D. DAVIES

My friend and colleague, Professor William F. Stinespring, is best known as a philologist, a teacher of Semitic languages and a translator of significant studies from modern Hebrew. But to those who share his daily life, he is also known for the warmth of his humanity. In particular, his colleagues have been made aware of his concern with the social and moral issues that have confronted this country. It is, therefore, not unfitting that in this volume there should be one essay dealing with the biblical grounds of that concern which has so much governed him. And it is a real pleasure for me to be able to offer in his honor, not a technical study, but one in which I seek to set forth the broad outlines of the moral teaching of the early church. My aim is to present, not so much a detailed analysis, as the way in which that teaching has impressed itself upon me after years of preoccupation with it.

I

The title of this essay—"The Moral Teaching of the Early Church"—is meant to suggest, rightly, that the term *ethics*, which connotes philosophic reflection upon human conduct, is inappropriate for a description of the moral teaching of the early church; but it implies that in the early church there was a clearly defined body of teaching on morality, which can be neatly described. Let me begin by emphasizing that this was not so. In its moral teaching, as in other matters, the early church presents a coat of many colors. The documents of the New Testament reveal varying emphases.

This essay is one of the Haskell Lectures which, along with Dean Krister Stendahl, I delivered at Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio, in March 1968. Its companion lecture, "The Relevance of the Moral Teaching of the Early Church,"—which presupposes the contents of the present one—was published in *Neotestamentica et Semitica, Studies in Honour of Matthew Black*, ed. E. Earle Ellis and Max Wilcox (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1969), pp. 30–49. Both lectures should be read together. It is felicitous in this indirect way to link together two such distinguished Semitic scholars to whom I owe so much.

Any neat presentation of early Christian teaching must immediately be suspect. But having said this, it is possible to point out certain themes which do convey the moral seriousness of much of the primitive church, and I shall now attempt to point out what these themes are.[1]

I begin with a central fact: through the life, death and Resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth, early Christians believed that they were living "in the end of the days," in the time of fulfillment.[2] This conviction is to be understood, as is made evident in all the New Testament, in the light of the expectations, expressed in the Old Testament and in Judaism, that, at some future date, God would act for the salvation of his people.[3] The life, death and Resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth were the fulfillment of these expectations. And this fulfillment did not ignore the moral content of those expectations. The ethical aspirations of the Old Testament and Judaism, the Prophets and the Law, were not annulled in the Christian dispensation; they were fulfilled.[4] The early church consciously accepted the moral concern of Israel as it was illumined and completed in the light of the life, death and Resurrection of Jesus.

This acceptance emerges clearly in that in much of the New Testament the experience of the church was understood as parallel to that of the Jewish people. The emergence of the church was, if not the emergence of a New Israel, at least the entrance of Israel on a new stage of its history.[5] In the creation of the church the

1. The moral teaching of the New Testament in recent years has not been given the attention it deserves: "theological" or "kerygmatic" interests have led to its neglect. See J. M. Gustafson, "Christian Ethics" in *Religion*, ed. Paul Ramsey (Englewood Cliffs, N. J., 1965), pp. 337 f.; and my *Setting of the Sermon on the Mount* (Cambridge, 1966), pp. 436 ff. V. P. Furnish, *Theology and Ethics in Paul* (Nashville, 1968), by far the most stimulating volume in this field in recent years, on p. 7 quotes Thomas C. Ogden, who suggests that "the simple task of honest and clear exegesis may be the undiscovered beginning point for contemporary Protestant ethics"; see Ogden, *Radical Obedience: The Ethics of Rudolf Bultmann* (Philadelphia, 1964), pp. 18, 21. For the works which have been found most useful, apart, of course, from the standard works on New Testament Theology and Ethics: See *IDB*, vol. E–J, on "Ethics in the New Testament." Furnish supplies a most helpful bibliography, *op. cit.*, pp. 280–94.

2. Gal. 4:4.

3. Isa. 10:22; 35:4; 43:3; 45:17–22; 60:16. See "Eschatology of the Old Testament" by J. Hempel in *IDB*, E–J, 153 ff.; for Apocalyptic and Ethics, see H. H. Rowley, *The Relevance of Apocalyptic* (London, 1944); D. S. Russell, *The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic, 200 B.C.–A.D. 100* (Philadelphia, 1964).

4. Matt. 4:4, 6–7; 5:17–18; Mark 12:28–37; etc.

5. On this see now Peter Richardson, *Israel in the Apostolic Church*, Society for New

Exodus was repeated as it were. And as a corollary to the experience of a new Exodus, the church understood itself as standing under the new Sinai of a new Moses. This complex of ideas—Exodus, Sinai, Moses[6]—largely governs Paul's references to the New Covenant,[7] Matthew's[8] presentation of the Sermon on the

Testament Studies, Monograph Series, no. 10 (Cambridge, 1969). According to him the designation of the Church as "the true Israel" does not occur until the mid-second century in the works of Justin Martyn. The phrase "the New Israel" used of the church is not found in the New Testament.

6. On this see the following: *Cahiers Sioniens: Revue Trimestrielle viii année*, no. 2–3–4 (Paris, 1954), on Moïse, *L'Homme de L'Alliance*, especially sec. 3 by Albert Déscamps, *Moïse dans les Évangiles et dans la tradition Apostolique*, pp. 171–80 and Paul Démann, *Moïse dans la Pensée de Saint Paul*, pp. 189–241; Harold Sahlin, "The New Exodus of Salvation According to St. Paul," in *The Root of the Vine*, ed. Anton Fridrichsen (New York, 1953), pp. 81 ff.; *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount*; H. M. Teeple, *The Mosaic Eschatological Prophet* (Philadelphia, 1957); and for the Fourth Gospel, R. H. Smith, "Exodus Typology in the Fourth Gospel," *JBL*, 81 (1962), 329–42; J. L. Martyn, *History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel* (New York, 1968), pp. 88, 91 ff.; T. F. Glasson, *Moses in the Fourth Gospel* (London, 1963); W. A. Meeks, *The Prophet-King: Moses Traditions and the Johannine Christology*, Supplements to Novum Testamentum, 14 (Leiden, 1967); H. J. Schoeps, *Theologie und Geschichte des Judenchristentums* (Tübingen, 1949); David Daube, *The Exodus Pattern in the Bible* (London, 1963); Joachim Jeremias on Moses in Kittel's *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum N.T.* On the "wilderness" motif, see Ulrich W. Mauser, *Christ in the Wilderness: The Wilderness Theme in the Second Gospel and its Basis in the Biblical Tradition* (London, 1963); contrast Ernest Edwin Best, *The Temptation and the Passion* (Cambridge, 1965), pp. 25 ff. But see also Jacques Dupont, "L'arrière-fond biblique du récit des tentations de Jésus," *NTS*, 3 (1956–1957), 287–304; G. H. P. Thompson, "Called-Proved-Obedient: A Study in the Baptism and Temptation Narratives of Matthew and Luke," *Journal of Theological Studies*, 11 (1960), 1–12. On "Law" in Paul, see also the suggestive essay by W. R. Schoedel, "Pauline Thought: Some Basic Issues," in *Transitions in Biblical Scholarship*, ed. J. C. Rylaarsdam (Chicago, 1968), pp. 263 ff.

7. See W. C. Van Unnik, "La conception paulinienne de la nouvelle alliance," in *Litterature et Theologie Pauliniennes*, Recherches Biblique, V (Bruges, 1960), pp. 109–126, 224 f.; see also his "Ἡ Καινὴ Διαθήκη: A Problem in the early history of the Canon," in *Studia Patristica*, 4; and in F. L. Cross, ed., *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur*, vol. 79 (Berlin, 1961). He notes the neglect of this theme in Pauline studies. Emphasis on the notion of the New Covenant was so strong in early Christianity that both Joseph Bonsirven, *Le Judaïsme Palestinien* (Paris, 1934–1935), 1: 79 f., and H. J. Schoeps, p. 90, claim that it led to a neglect or muting of that theme in rabbinic Judaism. Compare also Gottfried Quell, *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum N. T.*, 2. See also Roy A. Harrisville, *The Concept of Newness in the New Testament* (Minneapolis, 1960), pp. 46 ff. For the Covenant in Judaism see the exhaustive study by Annie Jaubert, *La Notion d'Alliance dans le Judaïsme aux abords de l'ère Chrétienne* (Paris, 1963). On the presence of Law in the early church as in the OT, see Gerhard Von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, trans. D. M. G. Stalker (Edinburgh, 1962), 2: 391 ff. "The saving event whereby Israel became Yahweh's is indissolubly bound up with the obligation to obey certain norms which clearly mark out the chosen people's sphere, particularly at its circumference. The same thing, however, occurs in the early Christian community. From the very beginning it too was conscious of being bound to certain legal norms and it put them into practice unreservedly. . . ." See I Cor. 5:5; 16:22;

Mount, and Mark's[9] reference to a new teaching which John presents as a new commandment.[10] In its vital contents the moral teaching of primitive Christianity must be understood in relation to the teaching which Judaism traced back to Sinai: this relationship is variously expressed, sometimes in terms of reform, sometimes in terms of antithesis, and sometimes in terms of fulfillment. What is clear is that "Law" is bound up with the Christian Gospel, as it was bound up with the message of the Old Testament and Judaism.[11] To put this in technical terms, the structure of primitive Christianity is, in some aspects at least, modelled upon, or grows out of, the structure of Judaism. This means that Law is integral to the Gospel of the New Testament as it was to that of the Old.[12]

cf. Acts 8:20; II Tim. 2:19. Important are Günther Bornkamm, "Das Anathema in der urchristliche Abendmahls Theologie" in *Das Ende des Gesetzes: Paulus Studien* (Munich, 1952), pp. 123 ff.; E. Käsemann, "Satze Heiligen Rechts in Neuen Testament," *NTS*, 1 (1955), 248 ff. On the difficulty which Protestants have in doing justice to the Mosaic element in the NT, see the brilliant work of F. J. Leenhardt, *Two Biblical Faiths: Protestant and Catholic*, trans. Harold Knight (Philadelphia, 1964), pp. 42 f. "Protestants have the greatest difficulty in not underestimating the value of the Mosaic tradition in the corpus of revelation . . . the Pauline polemic against the threat of Judaism and Judaic Christianity often remains, in the mentality of Protestant readers of the apostle, the sole key to the understanding of the Gospel. What is argued by St. Paul against the Judaic and Judaizing interpretation of the Law is applied by them in the most massive way to the whole structure of the Mosaic faith."

8. See Davies, *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount*.

9. Mark 1:27 ff. The emphasis on "teaching" in Mark emerges from R. Morgenthaler, *Statistik des neutestamentlichen Wortschatzes* (Zürich, 1959); his data are given on p. 97, n. 1 of *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount*. See Eduard Schweizer, "Anmerkungen zur Theologie des Markus" in *Neotestamentica et Patristica, Freundesgabe Oscar Cullmann* (Leiden, 1962), pp. 37 f.

10. John 13:34; the context of this new commandment within the last supper, which at least has Passover undertones, is important.

11. See my article "Torah and Dogma," *The Harvard Theological Review*, 61 (1968), 700 ff.

12. One of the most illuminating developments in Old Testament studies has been the rehabilitation of the Law. Through the work of Alt, Von Rad, Martin Noth, Buber, Zimmerli, Clements, and others, the influence of the covenant tradition, with its Law, on the prophets has become clear. And just as the prophets have been connected with the Law that preceded them, so Finkelstein in a brilliant study has connected them with the Law that followed them in Judaism. The old antithesis of Law and Prophet has been challenged. The prophets are emerging as "teachers." This has an important bearing on our understanding of Jesus. To place him among the prophets is not to displace him from the role of teacher. On the above, see Albrecht Alt, *Die Ursprünge des Israelitischen Rechts* (Leipzig, 1934); Gerhard Von Rad, *Das Formgeschichtliche Problem des Hexateuch* (Stuttgart, 1938); reprinted in *Gesammelte Studien zum A. T.* (Munich, 1958), pp. 9–86; and his *Old Testament Theology* (2 vols.); Martin Noth, *Die Gesetze im Pentateuch* (Munich, 1958), pp. 9–141. Walther Zimmerli in a

II

But in what sense can this be asserted? What Law is integral to the Gospel? This brings us to the motif which most governs early Christian thought on morality. I have already asserted that the early church reinterpreted the moral tradition of the Old Testament and Judaism in the light of Christ; and it is the Person of Christ that is normative for the understanding of morality, as of all other aspects of life, in the New Testament.[13] Just as early Christians reinterpreted the temple,[14] Jerusalem,[15] the sabbath[16] and

series of lectures *The Law and the Prophets: A Study of the Meaning of the Old Testament* (New York, 1965), gives a fascinating account of the theme in scholarship; see also R. E. Clements, *Prophecy and Covenant* (London, 1965). On the prophets in Judaism, see my article, "Reflexions on Tradition: The Aboth Revisited" in *Christian History and Interpretation: Studies presented to John Knox* (Cambridge, 1967), pp. 127 ff. Martin Buber in his work *The Prophetic Faith* (New York, 1960), pp. 24 ff., puts great emphasis on the influence of the Sinai tradition on the prophets.

13. This essay was completed before V. P. Furnish's work *Theology and Ethics in Paul* (Abingdon, 1968), reached me. On p. 114, he writes: "In the discussion of Paul's preaching which follows, the traditional 'chronological-dogmatic' approach has been abandoned altogether. Instead, it is suggested at least as a working hypothesis, that the heuristic key to Pauline theology as a whole [and therefore to Pauline ethics (my addition)] the point in which his major themes are rooted and to which they are ultimately oriented, is the apostle's eschatological perspective. Eschatology, therefore, is properly the *first*, not the last, section in an exposition of Paul's theology." Furnish refers in support of his position to H. D. Wendland, "Ethik und Eschatologie in der Theologie des Paulus," *Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift*, 10 (1930), 757 ff., 793 ff.; and Henry M. Shires, *The Eschatology of Paul in the Light of Modern Scholarship* (Philadelphia, 1966). It will be noticed that I, too, have begun to discuss the moral teaching of the New Testament with its eschatology, and particularly with an aspect of that eschatology—that of the new Exodus, a motif to which Furnish pays little attention. So far the emphasis of Furnish is to be accepted. But I immediately went on to assert that the central fact in the moral teaching of the New Testament is the Person of Jesus Christ. This means that even the eschatology of the New Testament and, therefore, its ethic, is subordinate to its Christology. Here I find myself in much sympathy with the position urged by Joseph A. Fitzmyer in a review of his work, which Dr. Furnish himself kindly sent me, published in *The Perkins School of Theology Journal* (Spring, 1969), pp. 113 ff. Fitzmyer writes: "To my way of thinking, such labels as 'the heuristic key to Pauline theology' or 'the fundamental perspective (Furnish, *op. cit.*, p. 214)' should be applied to what Paul himself says: 'we proclaim a Christ who has been crucified' (see I Cor. 1:21–25; cf. Rom. 1:16; II Cor. 4:4). In other words, the starting-point is the preaching of the Christ event, a redemptive christology" (p. 114b). Such an emphasis on the centrality of Christ himself is not new; and it is more likely that his Person, rather than any perspective, should govern our understanding of New Testament theology and ethics. Furnish does allow the importance of the christological motif in the Pauline ethic (p. 216), but not, in our view, its primacy. This has results in the understanding of that ethic as it is related to Jesus' own teaching.

14. See Alan Cole, *The New Temple* (London, 1950); R. J. McKelvey, *The New Temple: The Church in the New Testament* (Oxford, 1969), with excellent bibliographies.

all the significant symbols of Jewish self-identity in terms of Christ, so they reinterpreted the Law. They found "in Christ" a new demand under which they stood, so that—although the precise phrase does not occur—Christ became their Law. I have argued elsewhere that for Paul Jesus took the place of Torah. The demand of Christianity is concentrated in the Person of Christ.[17]

But what precisely does this mean? I think that it has three aspects which are exceedingly difficult to hold in proper balance. First, the moral life of Christians bears constant reference to, or is moulded by, the actual life of Jesus of Nazareth, that is, his ministry of forgiveness, judgment, healing, and teaching.[18] Second, the moral teaching has its point of departure not only in the ministry of Jesus but also in his Resurrection. The Resurrection was the ground for the emergence of the primitive community, as a well-knit and self-conscious group. But the Resurrection was also the immediate inspiration of its morality. The Resurrection was not only a triumph of life over death, it was also a triumph of forgiveness over sin. The Resurrection was an expression, perhaps *the* expression of God's grace in Christ, because the Risen Christ came back to those who had forsaken him and fled, who had slept during his agony. He forgave their failure. The Resurrection as forgive-

See John 1:14; 2:21 f.; 4:21 ff.; 7:37–38; 10:16; 11:52; etc. See especially John C. Meagher, "John 1:14 and the New Temple," *JBL*, 88 (Mar., 1969), 57. For him the community is the locus of the Word, that is, the New Temple, in John 1:14; contrast McKelvey, pp. 60 ff.; II Cor. 6:14–7:1; I Cor. 3:16–17; Eph. 2:19–22; 1 Pet. 2:4–10; Heb. 12:22–24 *et passim*; and Revelation, *passim*. See also Bertil Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament* (Cambridge, 1965).

15. Gal. 4:25, 26; Heb. 12:22; Rev. 3:12; 21:10. Possibly also Matt. 5:14.

16. Heb. 4:9.

17. See *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*; Oscar Cullmann, "Paradosis et Kyrios: Le problème de la tradition dans le paulisme," *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses*, no. 1 (1950), 12 ff.; for the "new torah" in later Judaism, see M. Simon, *Verus Israel* (Paris, 1948), pp. 100 ff. The best critique of the position advocated in *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism* is by P. Démann, "Moïse et la Loi dans la pensée de Saint Paul," *Cahiers Sioniens* (1954), pp. 239 ff. It should be recalled that some have found ideas connected with the Torah applied to Christ in the Prologue of the Fourth Gospel also, see e. g., C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge, 1953), pp. 270 ff.

18. Apart from some such assumption the preservation of the tradition about the works and deeds of Jesus in the Gospels is difficult to understand. Even granted that much of that tradition is a creation of the primitive community, its attachment to the figure of Jesus is itself significant. Cf. Günther Bornkamm, *Jesus of Nazareth*, trans. 3rd German ed. Irene and Fraser McLuskey with James M. Robinson (New York, 1960).

ness emerges clearly in Paul and elsewhere.[19] The Resurrection, which reassembled the scattered disciples to form the church, was founded in the grace of Christ and of God in Christ. It was of a piece with the whole ministry of Jesus, and the morality of the community, like that of his ministry, was to be a morality governed by grace—that is, it was the morality of forgiven men who had known the Risen Lord as a forgiving Lord, and who in gratitude (the most ethical of all the emotions) gave themselves to the good life in his name.[20]

But, third, the mode of the presence of this Risen Lord in the community was that of "the Spirit." There have been attempts to maintain that the Spirit, in the earliest days of the church, had no ethical significance, that it was merely a wonder-working power, mysterious and nonmoral. But these attempts are vain. It was the Spirit that had inspired the greatest teachers of morality, the prophets, who had discerned between the precious and the vile; it was the Spirit that would create a new heart in the new Israel of Ezekiel's vision, and inspire the messianic times with counsel, wisdom and righteousness. And, above all else, the Spirit was the inspirer of the Scriptures. This in itself implied the ethicization of the Spirit, because it was through these that Israel knew the demands made upon it. Through the Resurrection, the Spirit was again experienced.

The coming of the Spirit in primitive Christianity should never be separated from the Resurrection as grace. Like the Resurrection itself, the coming of the Spirit is "an energy of forgiveness." Thus it became the source of morality because gratitude for forgiveness is the ground of Christian being. Love, joy, peace, righteousness, and every victory "in the moral sphere" are the fruit of the Spirit.

19. To connect the Resurrection with morality is not usual. But this is implicit in I Cor. 15:7 ff. It is significant that in I Cor. 15:5 the Risen Lord is said to have appeared first to Cephas who had betrayed Jesus three times, and then to the twelve who had all forsaken him and fled. We must assume that Paul knew the tradition about the betrayals. In the Fourth Gospel Jesus first appears to Mary Magdalene whose sins were well known. It is no accident that in the Sermon on the Mount, the Beatitudes, which are the expression of God's grace, precede the statement of the demands of Jesus, which are thus deliberately set in a context of grace. James T. Cleland in his Th.D. diss., "The Religious Ethic of St. Paul" (Union Theological Seminary, Feb., 1954), deals with the connection between the Resurrection and ethics from another angle; see pp. 196–473, pts. 2 and 3.

20. On this see further *IDB*, E–J, 168; John Knox, *The Jesus in the Teaching of the Church* (Nashville, 1961), pp. 73 ff.

The enthusiasm of the Spirit, much as it was open to more superficial expressions, found its true fruit in love.[21]

When, therefore, we say that for the early church the Law had been Christified, we recognize that the earthly ministry of Jesus, the Risen Lord, and the Spirit—inextricably bound together as they are, so that often what was uttered in the Spirit could be ascribed to the earthly Jesus himself—that all these together became the source of the demand under which the early church lived. Christian morality, in short, always has as its point of reference the life, Resurrection and living Spirit of Jesus Christ. And it is this that determines its manifold dimensions. These can be conveniently gathered under two main heads: its vertical dimensions and its horizontal dimensions.[22]

III

The vertical dimensions of Christian morality

As we have seen, then, the ground on which the early church stood was the life, death, Resurrection and Spirit of Jesus Christ. To put the matter geometrically, it was their relation vertically with the Risen Lord, the participation of the early Christians in the experience of being forgiven by the Risen Lord and the Spirit, that lent to them a common grace wherein they stood. They had been grasped by him and their response was primarily, through the promptings of this Spirit, to him. All Christian fellowship was rooted in a particular event—immediately in the Resurrection and behind this, in the life and death of Jesus, with which the Resurrection, as we have seen, as an expression of grace, was wholly congruous. The ethic of the community is linked to the understanding of an event—the life, death and Resurrection of Jesus. In this the church saw the act of God himself in history.

21. On all this see W. D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*, pp. 215 ff. and references to literature there given. In the Fourth Gospel the Spirit, which is "holy," is to teach and to recall what Jesus had taught: see John 14:25 ff. See also Gal. 5:22; I Cor. 13; John 14:15–17; 15:9–10; 16:8–11.

22. This division of the material, although adopted for the sake of convenience, is not accidental. To some degree at least it corresponds to the distinction which Furnish, p. 279, has rightly emphasized—that between the concrete moral teaching of Paul in ethical warnings, prohibitions, exhortations, etc., and his preaching as a whole, especially to his theological presuppositions and convictions, as constituting the essential problem of the Pauline ethic, although this cannot be pressed.

Now in much of the New Testament, though not in all, morality is understood in terms of the appropriation of this event, the recapitulation of it in the life of the believer. To put it in other words, the moral life is a life "in Christ"; it is the living out in daily conduct what it means to have died and risen with Christ. This is true of Paul and, it is arguable, of Matthew also.[23] For Paul, morality is inseparable from the life, death and Resurrection of Jesus. He divided his own life clearly into two parts: first, his life under the Law when he was a Jew, and second, his life in Christ. The two parts were distinctly separated by his experience on the road to Damascus. The act by which a Christian acknowledged his faith and really began to live "in Christ" was baptism. This act symbolized a death to the old life under the Law and a rising to newness of life "in Christ" or "in the Spirit." By baptism[24] the Christian through faith had died, had risen, had been justified: he was a new creation. And what was now necessary for him was to become what he was. His moral life is rooted in what he *is*—a new creation in Christ. Just as we call on each other to "play the man," so Christians are called upon to "play the Christian"—to be what they are. To use theological jargon—the imperative in Paul is rooted in the indicative. There is a vertical dimension to Christian living—an attachment to the fact of Christ, his life, death and Resurrection.[25]

23. See Davies, *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount*, pp. 341 ff.

24. Rom. 6:3; I Cor. 12:13; Gal. 3:27. But baptism was not universal, Acts 1:14–15; 19:1–7.

25. II Cor. 8:9; 12:1; Phil. 2:5–8; Rom. 8:11; and especially Rom. 6:1–7:6. On the history of the emphasis on what is generally referred to as the "Indicative-Imperative" motif in Paul, see the excellent appendix by Furnish, pp. 242 ff.: "A Survey of Nineteenth- and Twentieth-Century Interpretations of the Pauline Ethic." Like him, I, too, found the work of Maurice Goguel in *The Primitive Church*, trans. H. C. Snape (London, 1964), especially original and provocative. In the discussion at Oberlin, Stendahl objected to connecting the motif of "dying and rising with Christ" with morality, on the grounds that while the tense of the verbs referring to dying with Christ is in the aorist, that of those referring to rising with Christ is in the future. The matter is discussed by Furnish, pp. 171 ff. The future tenses in Rom. 6:5, 8 are important: "We *shall be* united in his resurrection"; "we *shall* also live with him." But, as Furnish also makes clear, the newness of life *is* associated with the Resurrection. Rom. 6:4 reads: "We were buried therefore with him by baptism into death, so that as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, we too might walk in the newness of life." The power of the future life is already at work in the present. The Christian is to walk in the power of that life here and now. Rom. 8:4–5; II Cor. 10:2–3; I Cor. 3:3; Rom. 13:13; Phil. 3:18, etc. See Furnish, pp. 214 ff.; and especially W. R. Schoedel, "Pauline Thought: Some Basic Issues," in *Transitions in Biblical Scholarship*, ed. J. C. Rylaarsdam (Chicago, 1968), p. 279, n. 34. On the understanding of the "indicative-imperative" relation as not only an individual one, I wholeheartedly agree with Ernst Käsemann, who writes in his essay on " 'The Righteousness of God' in Paul," translated by W. S. Montague and W. F. Bunge in *New Testament Questions of Today* (Philadelphia, 1969), as follows:

> In many quarters today we hear the relationship between indicative and imperative in Paul described in terms of the formula 'Become what you are'; while this is certainly not wrong, it is yet, in view of the origin of the formula in idealism, not without its dangers. Paul was not primarily concerned with the Christian in some purely notional individual capacity, much less with the Christian personality. To say that a man only believes as an individual is simply to say that here, as in the case of ministry in the world, he cannot shrug off responsibility. But I find myself totally unable to assent to the view that Paul's theology and his philosophy of history are orientated towards the individual. To understand the righteousness of God exclusively in terms of gift is to ask for trouble: the inevitable result is that the Pauline anthropology is sucked under by the pull of an individualistic outlook. The sense of the parenetic imperative as the logical implication and the verification of the indicative is much better described in terms of the formula 'Abide by the Lord who has been given to you and by his lordship', which constitutes the core of the conception of 'abiding' in the Johannine farewell discourses. This is the way in which the Christian really does become what he is. For Paul sees our existence as determined at any given time by the Lord whom we are serving. If a transformation of our existence is really effected in baptism and if God's Word does posit a new creation, this cannot help but mean a change of lordship. The new Lord cuts us off from what we were before and never allows us to remain what we are at any given time, for otherwise he might be the First Cause but he would not be our Lord in the true sense. In this particular theological context, man is never seen as free in the sense of autonomous. But he does receive—eschatologically—the possibility of choosing between the kingdom of Christ and the kingdom of Satan, and the ordeal of temptation, like the call sounded in preaching, is for ever demanding that the Christian should make this choice anew; thus the Christian life may rightly be seen as a perpetual return to baptism. (pp. 175–76)

Compare my introduction to *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism* (New York, 1965), pp. xii f.

And so, too, in the Fourth Gospel the life of the Christian man is to reenact the self-giving of God in sending Christ into the world. The "love" which exists between the Father and the Son is to be reproduced in the relationship of the disciples to one another. Here again there is a vertical relationship between the believer and Christ and God which determines his relationship with others.[26]

26. This is brought out in C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 418, in his treatment of the Prayer of Christ in John 17:

> We have now to enquire in what precise way this prayer is related to the discourses which preceded it. If we look back on these discourses, we see that they turn upon one central theme—what it means to be united with Christ (with Christ crucified and risen). This theme is treated in a kaleidoscopic variety of aspects. Let us briefly recapitulate a few of them. Jesus washes His disciples' feet that they may "have part with Him" (μέρος ἔχεις μετ' ἐμοῦ, xiii. 8). They are to be bound together with the ἀγάπη which is a reflection, or reproduction, of His

But this vertical dimension of morality in the early church has another aspect which is simpler to understand. Not only the imitation of God's act through dying and rising with Christ, but also the imitation of the Jesus of history (if we may so put it) played a real part in the moral development of the early church. Early Christians looked up to Jesus of Nazareth—so a modern educationist would put it—as their "identifying figure." Part of the reason for the preservation of stories about the life of Jesus, such as we have in the Gospels, was the desire to imitate Jesus in his acts.[27] During his ministry, Jesus had demanded readiness to enter upon his way of suffering: his followers were literally to take up the Cross (Mark 8:34 ff.). In the life of the early church, while persecution (walking the way of the Cross literally) was always a possibility, more often Christians were called upon to imitate their Lord, in the witness of the common way, less spectacular perhaps, but no less arduous, than readiness to die—in love, forbearance, patience, mercy—in messianic grace. Luke's change of Mark 8:34 in 9:23 is significant.[28] The degree to which the imitation of Jesus informed

---

ἀγάπη (xiii. 34). Such ἀγάπη is capable of transcending the separation made by death between Christ and His own: His "return" to them is a realization of ἀγάπη (xiv. 19–24). After He has passed through death they will be united with Him as branches of the true Vine (xv. 1–9), and the fruit which the branches yield is once again ἀγάπη proceeding from the ἀγάπη of God revealed in Christ (xv. 8–10).

27. It has been pointed out that Paul and Peter and other figures in the early church were regarded as "models" to be imitated; see Julius Wagenmann, *Die Stelling des Apostels Paulus neben den Zwölf* (Giessen, 1926), pp. 52–76. The Paul of the Pastorals—who finished his course—was a "model." John 13 makes clear that specific acts in the life of Jesus were "models"; 13:15 reads: "For I have given you an example, that you should do as I have done to you." Moody Smith referred me also to John 14:12 where "imitation" of some kind seems to be involved.

28. Again in the discussion at Oberlin, Stendahl raised the question whether the Cross, as such, was made the ground of an appeal for the moral life in the New Testament. If we exclude all moral considerations from discipleship, such a question might be answered in the negative. If we do not, as is surely more likely, then as Harald Riesenfeld has pointed out, it is significant that discipleship is closely related to the Cross not only in the synoptics, but in the Fourth Gospel. (Compare Matt. 16:21–27 and parallels; John 12:31 ff.). See his *Gospel Tradition*, trans. E. Margaret Rowley and R. A. Kraft (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1970). The obedience of Christ in death (Rom. 5:19; cf. Phil. 2:8) is an "act of righteousness" (Rom. 5:18), and preeminently an expression of God's love (Gal. 2:19 ff.; 5:6 ff.). Christ crucified becomes "wisdom, righteousness, sanctification and redemption for us" (I Cor. 1:30–31). God's love revealed in the Cross forgives, renews and sustains (II Cor. 5:14). See further Furnish, p. 168. It is difficult to divorce the appeal to the Cross from an appeal to the good life.

the lives of early Christians has been variously assessed. But it is difficult to deny its presence. Christ is an object of imitation to Paul as Paul expects to be such an object to his own followers (I Cor. 11:1). The apostle holds up certain qualities of the historic Jesus which were to be imitated: he points to Jesus who pleased not himself (Rom. 15:3), to his meekness and gentleness (II Cor. 10:1), and he commands liberality through a reminder of him who was rich and became poor (II Cor. 8:8–9).[29] The description of love in I Cor. 13 which is probably based upon the life of Jesus, is, in short, a character sketch of him. There can be little question that for Paul every Christian is pledged to an attempted moral conformity to Christ. So also is it with the Fourth Gospel (John 13)

Furnish, rightly in my judgment, thinks that Paul's use of the hymn in Phil. 2:5 ff. is at least partly used in a hortatory sense; some have denied that the Cross has moral implications even in Phil. 2:5 ff.: see, for the literature, R. P. Martin, *Carmen Christi* (Cambridge, 1967), pp. 68 ff., 84 ff.

29. On this question, see Johannes Weiss, *Die Nachfolge Christi und die Predigt der Gegenwart* (1895); Edvin Larsson, *Christus als Vorbild* (1962), pp. 29–47; Anselm Schulz, *Nachfolgen und Nachahmen* (Munich, 1962), pp. 270 ff.; W. P. deBoer, *The Imitation of Paul: An Exegetical Study* (1962); Eduard Lohse, "Nachfolge Christi," in *RGG*, 3rd ed., IV, cols. 1286 ff.; D. M. Stanley, " 'Become imitators of Me': The Pauline Conception of Apostolic Tradition," *Biblica*, 40 (1959), 859 ff.; E. J. Tinsley, *The Imitation of God in Christ* (Philadelphia, 1960). For further details, see Martin Hengel, *Nachfolge und Charisma: Eine exegetisch-religionsgeschichtliche Studie zu Mt 8:21f und Jesu Ruf in die Nachfolge* (Berlin, 1968), p. 1, n. 2, and a forthcoming volume on *Imitation and Tradition in Paul* by Donald Williams (Fortress Press). Furnish discusses the matter acutely and with a wealth of bibliographical detail, pp. 217 ff. He speaks of Christ's obedience as "paradigmatic for the believer's new life in Christ" (p. 218), but rejects any reference in this paradigm to "any particular qualities of the earthly Jesus with the insistence that they be emulated" (p. 223). He endorses Dibelius's view that "when Paul speaks of following Christ, he is not thinking first of all of the historical person Jesus of Nazareth, but of the Son of God who emptied himself and lived and died for others (*RGG*, 2nd ed., IV, cols. 395–96)," p. 224 n. It is this so sharp dichotomy which is difficult to accept: it was precisely in Jesus of Nazareth that early Christians saw the Son of God: it was the actuality of his life that lay behind their Christological and Mythological assertions about him. To separate the historical person, Jesus of Nazareth, so sharply from the Son of God or the Kurios is to make the myth govern the history rather than the history the ground of the myth. On the relation of "Jesus" to the "Lord" in Paul, see Davies, *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount*, pp. 341 ff. Furnish writes: "W. D. Davies goes so far as to contend that the preservation of Jesus' sayings and stories about him was due largely to the importance his followers attached to imitating his example" (p. 219). But is this so very different from what is now a common assumption of most New Testament scholars that the needs of the church are reflected in the tradition, except that for some form critics the church, to serve those needs, "created" a tradition and a history while I prefer to think of a "history"—fashioned, indeed, by the church—transmitted by the tradition, that is, given in the ministry of Jesus? I agree with what Furnish affirms, but not with what he denies.

and I Peter 2:2.[30] The life of Jesus is a paradigm of the Christian life.

So far we have noted two aspects of the vertical dimensions of Christian morality in the early church: The Christian is raised up with Christ to newness of life and is to live out his resurrection daily; and he looks to Jesus as an object of imitation. There is a third aspect to this vertical dimension. The Christian is taken up into the purpose of God in Christ. To be a believer was to be directed to and by Jesus of Nazareth as the Messiah. That is, there is always an eschatological reference to Christian living: the Christian shares in the purpose of God in the salvation revealed in Jesus. This comes out most clearly in Paul's understanding of his call to be an apostle. This meant for him that he was taken up by God's grace to share in the redemptive activity of God now at work through Christ in the church. True, the apostolic consciousness of Paul was more intense than that of most Christians and his calling as the apostle to the Gentiles, perhaps, unique. But the whole community also was called, that is, caught up into the large counsel of God. Christians were delivered from futility; they shared in the work of salvation (including their own) inaugurated by Jesus and to be completed in the future. In the light of the redemptive purpose revealed in Christ, they made their decisions, they discerned the things that further and that hinder this purpose, and they became fellow-workers with God.[31] The life of early Christians was a life born of the grace of God in the Resurrection and sustained by the hope of the End: Christian morality is rooted in a "lively hope,"[32] even as it is informed by the earthly Jesus. It is governed by a memory and an anticipation.

Perhaps we differ over what we consider to be historically probable. For a discussion of H. D. Betz, *Nachfolge und Nachahmung Christi im Neuen Testament* (1967), see Hengel, pp. 94 ff. The pertinent texts on "imitation" are discussed by Furnish, pp. 220 ff.

30. See E. G. Selwyn, *The First Epistle of St. Peter*, 2nd ed. (London, 1947), pp. 90 ff., on "The Imitation of Christ and the Atonement," especially I Pet. 2:20b f.: "But if when you do right and suffer for it you take it patiently, you have God's approval. For to this you have been called, 'because Christ also suffered for you, leaving you an example, that you should follow in his steps. He committed no sin; no guile was found in his lips. When he was reviled, he did not revile in return, when he suffered he did not threaten. . . ." See also I Pet. 4:1 ff.

31. See especially on all this Oscar Cullmann, *Christ and Time* (Philadelphia, 1962); Oscar Cullmann, *Salvation in History*, trans. G. S. Sowers *et al.* (London, 1967); Furnish, p. 235, rightly emphasizes that all Christian "discerning" is informed by *agapê*.

32. Explicitly expressed in I Pet. 1:1, but implied throughout the New Testament.

The horizontal dimensions of Christian morality

So far, in describing the moral life of early Christianity, I have emphasized what I have called its vertical dimension—its attachment to the Risen Christ who was one with the Jesus of history; its contemplation of him in imitation and its participation in the Divine purpose in him. But the early Christians were not exclusively oriented to these vertical realities, and early Christian morality contains an horizontal or, if I may put it, a human, societary dimension: it is the morality of a community born of the grace of the Resurrection. The New Testament knows nothing of solitary religion and it knows nothing of an individual morality: it points to a community with a life to live. This community was not to luxuriate in grace, absorbed in irrelevant, vertical privileges. As a community of grace, it took practical steps to give expression to grace in its life. How was this achieved? We may summarize the answer to this question under two main heads.

The emphasis on the Christian community. First, there was a constant concern among early Christians for the quality of their common life. This it was that led to the experiment usually referred to as the "communism" of the early chapters of Acts.[33] This experiment of having all things common was the natural, spontaneous expression of life in the Spirit with which the neglect of the poor was incompatible. This appears from the naiveté of the experiment. Owners sold their property and handed over the proceeds to the apostles, who administered a common fund from which the needs of the poor were met, presumably in the form of common meals. The contributions to the common pool were voluntary (Acts 5:1–11). The experiment failed, not to be repeated in this form; but it witnessed to the societary or communal morality of the primitive community in its realism and its impracticability. That experiment took place in the light of an absolute demand for love informed by the intensity of the church's experience of forgiveness and, therefore, of grace.

And the emphasis on the communal nature of the Christian way persists throughout the New Testament. It is rooted in a communal emphasis found in the ministry of Jesus himself who gathered the

33. See C. H. Dodd, "Communism in the New Testament," *Interpreter*, 18 (1921).

Twelve as the representatives of the new community of Israel to follow him.[34] It is from this probably that there developed Paul's "Christ-Mysticism" which issued not in "a flight of the alone to the Alone"; but in the building up of the church, the new community.[35] Along with rationality[36] and the recognition of personal integrity[37] Paul sets forth as the criterion of Christian action the building up of the church.[38] Similarly, in the Johannine literature one finds the love of the brethren as the mark of the church. "If you love not your brother whom you have seen how can you love God whom you have not seen?"[39]

But the same impulse which led to the experiment in communism, the awareness of the horizontal significance of the life in grace, in part at least, led to other developments:

The emphasis on specific moral teaching. (a) At first, in the awareness of its resources in grace, the church attempted to live in the light of the absolutes, in messianic license, as Stendahl has characterized this. The absolutes constitute the peculiarity, though not the totality, of the teaching of Jesus. For certain elements in the early church, the commandments of Jesus in their absolute form were guides for conduct. But under inevitable pressures, it became necessary for the church to apply these absolutes to life. There began that process which tended to transform the absolutes into practical rules of conduct, Christian casuistry.[40] The classic example is the way in which the prohibition of divorce was made practicable by the addition of the exceptive clause: "except on the ground of unchastity" (Matt. 5:32 ff.). Because it is Matthew that reveals this best, it has been claimed that the words of Jesus as such played a significant part in the moral development of the church only in Jewish Christian circles. But this is not so. The Pauline letters also appeal to the words of Jesus as authoritative. These words were at least one source for Paul's moral teaching. The extent to which the Pauline letters are reminiscent of the tradition as represented in the synoptics has been insufficiently recognized. The matter has been the subject of acute debate and continues to be so.

34. I find no reason to reject the historicity of the Twelve; see Wagenmann.

35. This is one of the important insights of Albert Schweitzer, *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle*, English trans. W. Montgomery (London, 1931), pp. 105 ff. But for the caution necessary in accepting Schweitzer, see *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*, 2nd ed., pp. 98 ff.

36. Thus knowledge is placed by Paul as the second of the gifts of the spirit, after wisdom (I Cor. 12:8). In I Cor. 14:13 ff. the importance of "rationality" is clear as in I Corinthians 14. The necessity of the renewal of the mind is recognized, Rom. 12:2. In the Fourth Gospel emphasis on "the truth" of the witness to Christ is frequent, 10:41; 19:35; 21:24, etc. Rationality is included in this truth although it does not exhaust it. Compare I Pet. 3:15; II Tim. 1:27.

37. Cf. Philemon, 15, 16.

38. For Paul the criterion of love among the brethren is normative; Rom. 14:21; I Corinthians 12–14. See also Eph. 4:1–16. H. A. A. Kennedy, *The Theology of the Epistles* (London, 1923), p. 145.

39. I John 4:20; John 17, *et passim*.

40. I have dealt with this at length in *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount*, pp. 366–93, where I refer to the crisis character of material from Q and the *gemaric* character of much in Matthew.

Two factors emerge clearly: first, Paul interweaves words of Jesus almost "unconsciously," as it were, into his exhortations, which suggests that these words were bone of his bone. The following parallels are clear:

Rom. 12:14 Bless those who persecute you; bless and do not curse them.	Matthew 5:43 You have heard that it was said, "You shall love your neighbor and hate your enemy."
Rom. 12:17 Repay no one evil for evil, but take thought for what is noble in the sight of all.	Matthew 5:39 ff. But I say to you, Do not resist one who is evil. But if any one strikes you on the right cheek, turn to him the other also;
Rom. 13:7 Pay all of them their dues, taxes to whom taxes are due, revenue to whom revenue is due, respect to whom respect is due, honor to whom honor is due.	Matthew 22:15–22 Render therefore to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's. (22:21b)
Rom. 14:13 Then let us no more pass judgment on one another, but rather decide never to put a stumbling block or hindrance in the way of a brother.	Matthew 18:7 Woe to the world for temptations to sin! For it is necessary that temptations come, but woe to the man by whom the temptation comes!

Rom. 14:14 I know and am persuaded in the Lord Jesus that nothing is unclean in itself; but it is unclean for any one who thinks it unclean.	Matthew 15:11 not what goes into the mouth defiles a man, but what comes out of the mouth, this defiles a man.
1 Thess. 5:2 For you yourselves know well that the day of the Lord will come like a thief in the night.	Matthew 24:43–44 But know this, that if the householder had known in what part of the night the thief was coming, he would have watched and would not have let his house be broken into. Therefore you also must be ready; for the Son of man is coming at an hour you do not expect.
1 Thess. 5:13 and to esteem them very highly in love because of their work. Be at peace among yourselves.	Mark 9:50 Salt is good; but if the salt has lost its saltness, how will you season it? Have salt in yourselves, and be at peace with one another.
1 Thess. 5:15 See that none of you repays evil for evil, but always seek to do good to one another and to all.	Matthew 5:39–47 But I say to you, Love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you. . . . (5:44)

In addition to these clear parallels there are many other possible or probable ones. The evidence for these is given elsewhere.[41]

Second, there is also clear evidence that there was a collection of sayings of the Lord to which Paul appealed (Acts 20:35; I Cor. 7:10; 9:14; 11:23 ff.; 14:37; I Thess. 4:15–16; see especially I Cor. 7:25). Not only in matters of a legislative character does Paul find guidance in the words of Jesus, but also in more personal matters

41. See my *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism.*

(Romans 7), where possibly his discovery of the supreme importance of motive goes back to Jesus. In I Cor. 7:25 he refers to a word of Christ as a commandment; in two places, once explicitly and once implicitly, he uses the very words "the law of Christ"[42] where the reference is, in part at least, to the teaching of Jesus. This is no declension on Paul's part to a primitive legalism, but the recognition of the fact that his exalted Lord was never, in his mind, divorced from Jesus, the teacher, that the Spirit is never divorced from the historic teaching of Jesus. And, although in the Fourth Gospel the moral teaching of Jesus as such plays little part, the function of the Spirit is to recall the words of Jesus.[43] The same emphasis appears in I John, where there is constant appeal to the commandments of the Lord and frequent echoes of them.[44]

42. Explicitly in Gal. 6:2 and implicitly in Rom. 8:2. I Cor. 9:20–22 reads:

> To the Jews I became as a Jew, in order to win Jews; to those under the law I became as one under the law—though not being myself under the law—that I might win those under the law. To those outside the law I became as one outside the law—not being without law toward God but under the law of Christ—that I might win those outside the law. To the weak I became weak, that I might win the weak. I have become all things to all men, that I might by all means save some.

Furnish points out that there is only one certain rabbinic reference to "the Law of the Messiah," that from Midrash Qoheleth 11:8 (52a). But it is surely implied in other passages. See *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount*, pp. 172 ff. And, in the recently discovered *Targum Yerushalmi to the Pentateuch* of the *Codex Neofiti I* of the Vatican Library, the contents of which have been traced by Diez Macho to the second century A.D. at least, Isa. 11:3 reads:

> Behold, the Messiah who is to come
> shall be one who teaches the Law
> and will judge in the fear of the Lord.

On the *Codex Neofiti*, see A. Diez Macho, "The Recently Discovered Palestinian Targum: its Antiquity . . .", *Supplement Vetus Testamentum*, 7 (1960). In Diez Macho's view Codex Neofiti shows that the Palestinian Targum is of pre-Christian origin. There is no New Torah in the D.S.S.; see my *Sermon on the Mount* (Cambridge, 1966), p. 63. Contrast Norman Perrin, *The Kingdom of God in The Teaching of Jesus* (Philadelphia, 1963), pp. 76 f.

43. John 14:25–26.

44. On this see C. H. Dodd, *The Johannine Epistles*, Moffatt New Testament Commentaries (London, 1946), p. xxxviii. The whole problem is dealt with by Furnish, pp. 51 ff., and by F. W. Beare, "Sayings of the Risen Jesus in the Gospel Tradition: An Inquiry into their Origin and Significance," in *Christian History and Interpretation: Studies Presented to John Knox*, ed. W. R. Farmer, C. F. D. Moule, R. R. Niebuhr (Cambridge, 1967), pp. 161–82; see also his article, "Concerning Jesus of Nazareth," *JBL*, 87 (1968), 125 ff. Furnish finds only eight convincing parallels to the materials in the synoptic Gospels in the whole of Paul (he regards Colossians, Ephesians, II Thessa-

Nevertheless, there is a difference of emphasis (but only of emphasis) in Matthew and Paul, as over against the Johannine literature. The words of Jesus appear in the former two over their wide range. But even there they are summed up in one word, *agapê*.

---

lonians, the Pastorals as deutero-Pauline: he does not consider his omission of these as significant; *op. cit.*, pp. 11–12). The other "allusions" usually cited he does not find persuasive. He dismisses the work of Alfred Resch, *Der Paulinismus und die Logia Jesu in ihrem gegenseitigen Verhaltnis untersucht in Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur* (1904), vol. 27, as "imaginary" (p. 59), as he criticizes C. H. Dodd's treatment of the phrase *Ennomos Christou* in *Studia Paulina* (1953). Furnish's treatment is salutary; but it does not convince me that the words of Jesus were not highly significant for Paul if not "his primary" source for moral teaching. Does Furnish deal justly with the richness of the oral tradition which prevailed in the early church and which finally coalesced, in part, in the Gospels? Here the method employed by H. Riesenfeld, in his articles, "Parabolic Language in the Pauline Epistles," and "Paul's 'Grain of Wheat' Analogy and the Argument of 1 Cor. 15," and "The Parables in the Synoptic and in the Johannine Traditions," all to appear in a forthcoming volume, *The Gospel Tradition* (Fortress Press), is more appropriate or sensitive in dealing with tradition. The detection and dismissal of allusions are not as simple as Furnish suggests, particularly in a milieu where the reception and transmission of tradition were so living. The work of A. M. Hunter, *Paul and His Predecessors* (London, 1940), and P. Carrington, *The Primitive Christian Catechism* (Cambridge, 1940), Furnish refers to only in bare footnotes. See pp. 38 n., 261 n. A very useful and balanced discussion by David L. Dungan under the title *Logia Kyriou and Community Regulations* is forthcoming under the imprint of the Fortress Press. As for the imperative participle the evidence of the Scrolls demands more attention than is given to it, see p. 39, n. 33. The role of Jesus as moral teacher is less difficult to understand in the light of the recent brilliant work of L. Finkelstein, *New Light from the Prophets* (London, 1969). Dr. Finkelstein writes that "to the magnificence of the poetry of the Prophets and the inspiration of their rhetoric, must now be added the greatness of their academic teaching which raised disciples who became teachers of succeeding generations of teachers" (p. 1). They are the precursors of the Sages of Israel (*ibid.*). His work should warn us against thinking that the prophetic, charismatic, eschatological aspects of Jesus's ministry precluded his role as patient teacher. See *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount*, pp. 415 ff. Rudolf Bultmann recognized Jesus as rabbi, in *Jesus and the Word* (New York & London, 1934). This is questioned by M. Hengel in his fascinating study, already cited, n. 30, pp. 41 ff. But he does recognize a continuity between the teaching of Jesus and that of the early church. He writes:

> Die Diagnose 'Gemeinde-bildung' musste so im Munde des Forschers nicht unbedingt immer nur im Sinne eines grossen Abstandes zum historischen Jesu verstanden werden. Die darin sichtbar werdende, vom prophetischen Geist geleitete, Freiheit der Gemeinde könnte auch ein Ausdruck dafür sein, dass diese sich selbst in ihrer missionarischen Verkündigung ihrem Ausgangspunkt, dem Handeln des historischen Jesus, besonders nahe wusste. Diese Linie liesse sich bis zu Paulus ausziehen. Wenn dieser 1 Cor. 3:9 von sich und Apollos sagt: *θεοῦ γάρ ἐσμεν συνεργοί* oder auch pointierter 2 Cor. 5:20: *ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ οὖν πρεσβεύομεν ὡς τοῦ θεοῦ παρακαλοῦντος δι' ἡμῶν* so steht er bewusst oder unbewusst—direkt in der Linie jenes Geschehens, das Jesus durch seinen Ruf in die Nachfolge und seine Jüngeraussendung eingeleitet hatte. [p. 93]

See further C. H. Dodd, "Some Johannine 'Herrenworte' with parallels in the Synoptic Gospels," *NTS* 11, 2 (Nov., 1955), 75 ff., and A. Schlatter, *Die Parallelen in den Worten Jesu by Johannes und Matthaus* (Gütersloh, 1898). See *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount*, appendix xiv, pp. 463 f. The whole matter is bound up with the question of the relation between Jesus and Paul which is surveyed by Furnish in *The Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, 47, no. 2 (Mar., 1965), 342, in "The Jesus–Paul Debate: From Baur to Bultmann." I remain unconvinced that Paul was not interested in the historical Jesus: it does not seem to me that the interpretation of II Cor. 5:16 and Gal. 1:11 f. and the argument from silence appealed to, demand such a conclusion.

Thus the climax of the Sermon on the Mount at Matt. 7:12 is the Golden Rule. And Paul and John, like the synoptics, emphasize the centrality of "love" (Rom. 13:8–10; I Cor. 8:1; 13; Col. 3:14; John 13:34–35; I John 3:1; 2:7–10; 4:7–16). The meaning of *love* has again to be carefully noted. Partaking more of active good will than of emotion, it can be commanded, as emotions cannot. In I John it is used in a "down-to-earth" manner as involving willingness to share one's goods (I John 3:17). For Paul it is the fulfillment of the Law and the principle of cohesion in the Christian community. The expression of love is multiple (I Cor. 13), but its essential nature is revealed in Christ's dying for men. It is this kind of act that is demanded of those who love.[45]

(b) The necessity which led to the application of the absolutes of Jesus to life led the church to take over for its own use codal material whether from Hellenism or from Judaism or both. Most of the letters reveal a twofold structure: a first part, dealing with "doctrine," is followed by a second, dealing with "ethics." Romans is typical. Chapters 1–11 deal with doctrine, 12:1 ff. deals with ethics, and it is casually connected with chapters 1–11. The ethical sections of the various letters reveal a common tradition of catechesis, which may have been used in the instruction of converts, especially at baptism (cf. Rom. 12:1; Eph. 4:20–6:19; Col. 3:8–4:12; Heb. 12:1–2; James 1:1–4:10; I Pet. 1:1–4:11; 4:12–5:14).[46] This common tradition must not be regarded as having a fixed pattern, but the similarity in the order and contents of the material in the above sections is too marked to be accidental. The presence in them of the imperative participle (e. g., Rom. 12:9–19), a form found, but not common, in Hellenistic Greek but familiar in Hebrew legal documents, suggests that Paul, and other Christian writers, drew upon codal material, such as is found in the Dead

45. On all this see *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount*, pp. 401 ff., where James, and the Johannine sources are considered. See the monumental study of C. Spicq, *Agape dans le Nouveau Testament: Analyse des Textes*, 3 vols. (Paris, 1958, 1959).

46. See Carrington and Selwyn.

Sea Scrolls (The Manual of Discipline, 1:18 ff. actually has the imperative participle), Mishna Demai and Derek Eretz Rabba and Zuta.[47] There are also parallels to the tradition in Hellenistic sources. The church probably took over much pagan moral convention from the Jewish Diaspora. Whatever the exact source of the material, the church found it necessary to borrow from non-Christian sources. It not only domesticated the absolutes of Jesus; it also took over domestic virtues from the world.[48]

This brings us to the last aspect of New Testament moral teaching with which we shall deal here. That the church was able to draw upon moral teaching from Judaism and Hellenism means that there was a continuity between the moral awareness of Christians and of the non-Christian world. Wherein did this continuity lie? It lay probably in the doctrine of creation which the early church held. It cannot be overemphasized that creation and redemption are congenial in the New Testament, as indeed in Judaism. The messianic age had cosmic dimensions for Judaism. So too in the New Testament the Creator and the Redeemer are one. It is this that explains the ease with which Jesus can discover redemptive, spiritual truth in the natural order as in Matt. 5:43–48 and in his parables; it explains how Paul can find in Christ the wisdom—the creative agent—of God, and how John and Hebrews can find in him the Word by which all things were made. For the New Testament writers the good life is the truly natural life. Morality is rooted in creation.[49]

47. See *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*; S. Wibbing, *Die Tugend und Lasterkataloge im Neuen Testament* (Berlin, 1959).

48. See B. S. Easton, *The Pastoral Epistles* (New York, 1948), p. 98; Martin Dibelius, *Die Pastoralbriefe* (1931). On conscience in the New Testament, see my article in *IDB*.

49. I have dealt very briefly with this theme in the companion lecture, "The Relevance of the Moral Teaching of the Early Church," in *Neotestamentica et Semitica: Studies in honour of Matthew Black*, pp. 35 ff. Here it can only be touched upon; see the especially rich contribution of N. A. Dahl, "Christ, Creation and the Church," in *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology: Studies in honour of C. H. Dodd* (Cambridge, 1956), pp. 422 ff., and the bibliography on p. 423, n. 1. See also W. R. Schoedel, pp. 272–75, especially p. 274, n. 22. That the Christian life can be regarded as the truly natural life may not sound as strange as it once did to judge from much in modern biology. These are the words of a recent writer, Robert Ardrey, in *The Territorial Imperative* (New York, 1966): "The portrait of life being painted by the new biology bears small resemblance to that natural world of anarchistic instinct and relentless self-interest which, depressed a Tennyson, inspired a Freud, perturbed a Darwin, and confused a century. It is a world of order and ordained self sacrifice to greater and longer goods. . . ." But Ardrey has another emphasis which seems to contradict this. In *African Genesis* (New York, 1961), p. 316, he claims that "man is a predator whose natural instinct is to kill with a weapon." Man like the animal has an innate compulsion to gain and defend his property—this is the major motif of his work, *The Territorial Imperative*. For this emphasis he has been severely criticized by M. F. Ashley Montagu in "The New Litany of 'Innate Depravity' or Original Sin Revisited" in *Man and Aggression*, ed. M. F. Ashley Montagu (New York, 1968), pp. 3–16. Montagu takes an even more sanguine view of man than is implied in the first quotation given above from Ardrey: "It is not man's nature, but his nurture, in such a world (overcrowded, highly competitive, threatening) that requires our attention" (p. 16). See further H. Loewe, *The Rabbinic Anthology*, selected by C. G. Montefiore and H. Loewe, p. lxix: "What is true in nature is true in religion: what is false in science cannot be true in religion. Truth is one and indivisible. God is bound by His own laws. . . . It is indeed ironical to note that the unity of the 19th Psalm has been impugned by some people for the very reason that it asserts, first, God's supremacy alike in the natural and in the religious spheres and, secondly, the congruence of those spheres. The sun, in going forth on its daily round, is fulfilling Torah as much as is a human being who worships God, as much as is a Jew when he performs the commandments, which are 'pure and enlightening to the eyes.' Ps. 19.8." He refers to *Sifre Deut.* on 32:1 §306; see *The Rabbinic Anthology*, p. 208. I recognize that there is in the New Testament something of an antinomy: there is on the one hand the belief that through the fall, creation itself has been affected, and on the other, the belief that in creation is visible "the eternal power of God." Cf. J. Weiss, *The History of Primitive Christianity*, trans. four friends and ed. F. C. Grant (N. Y., 1937), 2: 597. Both views are native to Judaism. Stendahl reminded me that there is a certain "unnaturalness" in the operations of grace in the parables of Jesus, as when the seed in the parable of the Sower increases a hundredfold. But, in fact, this is not so much "unnatural" as "the natural enhanced, or intensified." I suggest in my companion essay that it is the understanding of creation that provides a bridge between the moral teaching of the church and the world. See *Neotestamentica et Semitica*, pp. 35 ff. The work of Teilhard de Chardin and, before him, of C. E. Raven, who have both emphasized the cosmic continuities in Christian theology may be connected with this. The danger in the position of both is a possible neglect of the sense of the transcendent and of the antinomy to which I have referred above. See Christopher F. Mooney, *Teilhard de Chardin and the Mystery of Christ* (New York, 1966), p. 207, who notes that while the *concept* of the transcendent is never absent in Chardin's work, the *sense* of it gets lost; and my critique of Raven in *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*, p. 190, and the reply to it in Raven's Gifford Lectures. The rich words of Donald M. Mackinnon, *Borderlands of Theology and Other Essays*, ed. G. W. Roberts and D. E. Smucker (New York, 1968), pp. 44 ff., on the significance of Raven and Chardin, deserve serious consideration. On Law and Nature in Plato and Hellenistic Judaism, see H. A. Wolfson, *Philo*, 2: 170 f.; for Philo the law of nature and the Mosaic law, being derived from the same source—God—are in harmony. Wolfson, 2: 192. This is why God put the creation of world as preface to his laws in Genesis. Note that in Philo *πρόνοια* ("Providence") and *νόμος τῆς φύσεως* are interchangeable. Philo's sense of the Law and order of nature is keen (Mos. ii. 48). He commands living according to

In the above I have sketched in very broad strokes the context, center of gravity and dimensions of the moral teaching of the early church; its context in primitive Christian eschatology; its center of gravity in the life, death and Resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth, the Christ; its dimensions both in its vertical concentration in

Christ, the Risen Lord, and in its horizontal concern with the community and its cosmic affinities. We have not touched upon the relevance of this teaching to the life of the world outside the church, but that theme is dealt with elsewhere in a lecture which, as previously indicated in the first footnote, presupposes this, and to which the reader is referred.

---

nature: *πρὸς τὸ βούλημα τῆς φύσεως* (*Op. Mundi.* 3). For the Stoic root of these ideas, see Diogenes Laertius vii. 87 in *Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta*, ed. H. F. A. von Arnim (Leipzig, 1903–1924), 1: 262. On eschatology and creation as illuminating the meaning of the Law in Matthew, see Bornkamm, "Enderwartung und Kirche im Matthäusevangelium," pp. 222–60.