

Jesus, All in One

A CONCEPT OF SOLIDARITY FOR AN
UNDERSTANDING
OF NEW TESTAMENT THEMES

By

Steven E. Beerman

©Steven E. Behrmann (Beerman)

Published 2016

Albany, Oregon

ABSTRACT OF GRADUATE STUDENT RESEARCH

Project

Andrews University

Department of Religion

Title: A CONCEPT OF SOLIDARITY FOR AN
UNDERSTANDING OF
NEW TESTAMENT THEMES

Name of researcher: Steven E. Beerman

Name and title of faculty adviser: Abraham Terian, Th.D.

Dated completed: July, 1981

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface	5
ABSTRACT	9
The Problem.....	9
The Method	10
Conclusions	10
INTRODUCTION.....	15
THE GOSPELS AND ACTS	27
Introduction	27
Jesus and Identity with His Followers.....	28
Jesus and the Teaching of Bloodguilt	31
Jesus as the Servant of God.....	33
Jesus as the Son of Man	41
Jesus and His Body.....	51
The Temple Symbolism.....	54
Peter and The Rock.....	57
SOLIDARITY IN PAULINE THEOLOGY	87
Introduction	87
The Body of Christ	88
The Adam-Christ Parallel	95
The Corporate Christ.....	101
The New Race.....	104
The Nuclear Family	107
CONCLUSION.....	112
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	116

Preface

The following thoughts are the result of research carried out at Andrews University in the form of a master's project or thesis. Though this project was penned many years ago, the author has found that it contains what is in his opinion some very valuable concepts that continue to help him understand the mind and thinking of the New Testament. He has revisited these themes over and over again in his sermons and teaching.

Though certain of these concepts are commonly referred to in Christian thought it still remains apparent that many still misunderstand or misapply New Testament teachings as a result of not understanding the background and form of the New Testament mind. So this is why this short treatise is being reprinted.

A Concept of Solidarity for an Understanding NT Themes

While at seminary and spending numerous hours in library research the author noticed that many thesis works had been bound and published and placed in a section of the James White Library. When not otherwise occupied he would peruse through these valuable works and mourn the fact that they didn't have broader circulation. What wonderful research resides there to inform the interested! And what a monumental amount of work and research is represented among these titles! They represent the blood, sweat, and tears of many. I know.

Years after receiving my degree I revisited the library in hopes that my own thesis might be found on a shelf there. I had held to the private belief that my research was unique and helpful to my church and faith. But the thesis was not found there and I admit I was disappointed. It was not particularly for my own personal glory, but because I sincerely wish to contribute to growth and learning within my faith. For a moment I had naively believed the research contained in this work would elucidate and clarify the NT background of corporate thinking and would aid in correcting certain mistaken views such as are found in the famous Peter and the Rock pericope and in other regards that continue to be controversial. Most of all, my greatest wish was to produce a document that would add greater understanding to the teachings of OUR LORD, for life and learning for me is really all about knowing and understanding Christ Jesus, who is all things in one.

Jesus, All in One

Anyhow, to fulfill somewhat my disappointed ambitions I am having this thesis printed myself, even if I am the only one who ever reads it! Should there ever be another solitary soul or two who ever finds opportunity to read this let me thank them now for doing so. I hope that it provides some clarity on the issues discussed. I thank them graciously, and wish to let them know that it gives me a great moment of present satisfaction to think that all of my work was not wasted, and that the hours spent writing this treatise did more than putting an actually very expensive letter or two after my name.

The thesis was transferred from typewritten text to the present format by the means of optical recognition software. Thinking such a process would expedite the matter and save the trouble of re-typing the author found about the opposite. Many formatting issues turned out to be rather greatly complicated by the process. Therefore, there no doubt remain inconsistencies and errors that were not in the original document and have been overlooked despite some effort to locate and “fix” them. So I guess it is what it is!

Blessings,

Steven E. Behrmann

A Concept of Solidarity for an Understanding NT Themes

ABSTRACT

The Problem

The thought form of the Old and New Testaments is often collective rather than individual. As a result obscurities arise when the Bible is approached by the modern Western mind. Collective thinking has been especially noticed and addressed in Old Testament studies, but it is the proposal of some that similar thought form remains and is approximated and utilized in the New Testament also.

It is supposed, therefore, that a specific lack of understanding of the Hebrew concept of "corporate personality" or solidarity (where one can represent or be equal to many or the reverse), may at times obscure in a certain sense many of the New Testament themes and teachings. A proper understanding of the concept might therefore, enhance and, in part, explain some of these teachings.

A Concept of Solidarity for an Understanding NT Themes

The Method

The study itself was largely limited to the New Testament. The approach was selective rather than comprehensive, choosing only certain major New Testament themes for consideration. The first major endeavor was to examine the Gospels and the Book of Acts to ascertain whether collective thinking was in evidence and whether its proper application could clarify to a degree an understanding of such terms and models as the Servant of God, the Son of Man, the body of Christ, and the temple symbol. The final aim was to investigate the Pauline corpus and to view certain Pauline ideas such as the body of Christ, the Adam-Christ parallel, the corporate Christ, and the New Israel from the perspective of corporate thinking.

Conclusions

The conclusion was reached that the New Testament themes investigated likely demonstrate the principle of solidarity, and that collective thinking underlies many New Testament passages. It was also concluded, however, that the idea of solidarity must be applied

Jesus, All in One

responsibly when attempting to understand those passages addressed. The concept was not used by the New Testament writers to denote literal incorporation but was only metaphorically expressed in this way. The New Testament was found to refine and ennoble the concept using it in a positive sense, to illustrate and enrich the New Testament truth and to idealize a social solidarity.

A Concept of Solidarity for an Understanding NT Themes

Jesus, All in One

Andrews University
School of Graduate Studies

A CONCEPT OF SOLIDARITY FOR AN UNDERSTANDING
OF NEW TESTAMENT THEMES

A Report
Presented in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

by

Steven E. Beerman
July, 1981

A Concept of Solidarity for an Understanding NT Themes

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Preliminary to any discussion regarding the meaning of the title of this paper, it is assumed appropriate to define a few key terms and concepts which will be exercised substantially in the following treatise. Those terms and ideas which will be used to represent in varying degrees the point of the paper are such expressions as "solidarity," "corporate personality," and "collective." Solidarity is described by Webster as a "community of interests, objectives, or standards in a group."¹

Solidarity will thus be employed to express the dynamics of the relationship between the whole and its parts. Similarly, the expression "corporate personality" may perhaps be understood best by initially describing it as the probable creator of the expression, H. Wheeler Robinson does, in terms of a legal

¹ Webster's Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary (1967) , S.v. "solidarity."

A Concept of Solidarity for an Understanding NT Themes

corporation.² He points to the standard dictionary definition which defines a corporation as "a body formed and authorized by law to act as a single person although constituted by one or more persons and legally endowed with various rights and duties including the capacity of succession."³ The word "collective" denotes "a number of persons or things considered as one group or whole."⁴

With some basic terms having been defined secularly, it is now possible to begin to define them theologically. It has been noticed by many recent biblical scholars that the people of the biblical period often thought in a collective, rather than individual, sense. This especially involved the family, the clan, and the nation apprehended as one personality, such as Israel. The collective emphasis is often labeled as a Semitic thought form; though however, some such as C. H. Dodd assert that the sense of solidarity is not limited to Semitic thinking, but may be found in the writings of the Greeks and Latins, and perhaps

² H. W. Robinson, Corporate Personality in Ancient Israel (1964), p. 1.

³ Webster's Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary, 1967, S. v, "corporation."

⁴ *Ibid.*, S.v, "collective."

Jesus, All in One

even today.⁵ It is reported by some that even to this day if one asks an Australian aboriginal for his name that he responds with the name of his tribe.⁶ Notwithstanding, since this is a biblical study, the concept of solidarity shall be referred to as Semitic since the Bible itself is of Semitic origin. In addition, the convenient expressions of "corporate personality," and "solidarity" will be adopted from biblical scholarship to express the concept of the many being represented by the one.

Another dimension, especially as it relates to the concept of corporate personality, is the dimension that it is not enough to conceive of the idea in ancient thought as merely a collective group represented as one. As H. Wheeler Robinson, probably the most forward exponent of this idea, defines it:

The whole group, including its past, present, and future members, might function as a single individual though anyone of those members was conceived as representative of it. Because it was not confined to the living, but included the dead and the unborn, the group could be conceived as living forever.⁷

⁵ C. H. Dodd, The Epistle of Paul to the Romans (1932), p. 14.

⁶ William Barclay, The Letter to the Romans, The Daily Study Bible Series, rev. ed. (1975), p. 79 .

⁷ Robinson, Corporate Personality, p. 1.

A Concept of Solidarity for an Understanding NT Themes

H. W. Robinson demonstrates the principle in numerous ways. Several examples for the sake of illustrating this phenomenon of corporate personality can be supplied from the Old Testament, where often a person's personality is extended beyond himself in time and space.

In Gen 49:29 Jacob¹'s wish is "to be gathered unto my kindred," and he asks, "bury me with my fathers."⁸ To be included with the past among the dead is as important as being comprehended with the living in the future through one's children. To have progeny, especially male progeny is of paramount importance. This, in part, explains Abraham's earnest insistence to have an heir and a son, for an Israelite conceived of himself as living on in his children to a certain degree. Jeremiah describes Rachel weeping for her children at Ramah, a description which Robinson, at least, sees as expressing something more than pure metaphor. In another passage a Tekoan woman, a widow, pleads with King David concerning her only remaining son. The son had murdered his brother and was under the condemnation of death from the rest of the family. She appeals to David that this one

⁸ Ibid., pp. 2-3.

Jesus, All in One

remaining son's life be spared for "thus they would quench my coal which is left, and leave to my husband neither name nor remnant upon the face of the earth." (2 Sam 14:7)⁹

The Decalogue itself provides an example of the principle of solidarity in its continuous, dynamic application. In the second command God is placed under the obligation of "visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children upon the third and upon the fourth generation of them that hate me, but showing steadfast love to thousands (of generations) of those who love me and keep my commandments" (Exod 20:5, 6).

There is a way in which this could be a simple prediction of the natural hereditary and social consequences for these are absolutely inherent. But according to the Hebrew mind it was probably more than this.¹⁰

Probably the best known Old Testament example of corporate personality is when Achan violates the command not to take spoil during the Israelite invasion of Canaan. Achan's sin is blamed as the cause of Israel's ensuing defeat at Ai. Then, in

⁹ H. W. Robinson, The Religious Ideas of the Old Testament (1952), p. 91.

¹⁰ Ibid., pp. 88-89.

A Concept of Solidarity for an Understanding NT Themes

turn, to administer justice for the sin in the camp, Achan's entire family is destroyed with him. The sin of one man was the sin of the entire nation and the sin of Achan was the sin of his whole family.¹¹

Often the kings in the Old Testament are seen as a personification of the whole nation. As the king goes, likewise goes the nation. In addition, the king as the representative of the whole nation is seen as guarantor of right action. If there is no king, justice and righteousness are absent, and every man does what is right in his own eyes (Judges 17:6, 21:25).

A belief in corporate personality leads to a belief in corporate responsibility. In this way a whole city could be placed under interdict for harboring wrongdoers. Bloodguilt could extend from a few to many.

Thus the blood feuds referred to in the Bible and among primitive peoples are an example of solidarity. If a man from a given tribe murders a man from the other, the offended tribe takes the responsibility of blood revenge.¹² David sought God because there was a famine. In reply "the Lord said, 'There is

¹¹ Robinson, Corporate Personality, pp. 1-3.

¹² Barclay, p. 79.

Jesus, All in One

bloodguilt on Saul and his house, because he put the Gibeonites to death" (2 Sam 21:1). The Gibeonites were summoned to name the terms of compensation. The terms demanded were the lives of seven men from Saul's family. Two of Saul's sons and five grandsons were thus handed over. In the passage it is clear that such action is considered just and proper, the necessary expiation to restore prosperity to the land.¹³ The bloodguilt affected the whole land and God could not bless until equanimity was reached and also the dead (Saul and sons) were given proper burial (2 Sam 21:14).

Also in the Old Testament solidarity, as conceived within the context of the family, the tribe, and the nation, is extended to refer to the relationship which exists between Yahweh and His people. This relationship is often described in anthropomorphic terms, or in terms of the basic social relationships of parent and child, husband and wife, king and subject. Thus God relates to Israel as to a son (Gen 6:2, Deut 8:5, Ps 2:7, Hos 11:1). Then according to the marital analogy Israel is a bride, or wife (Isa 54:5, 62:4, 5, Hos 2:9, 10). However, Israel is generally found to be an unfaithful partner,

¹³ Robinson, Religious Ideas, p. 88.

A Concept of Solidarity for an Understanding NT Themes

disposed toward harlotry (Isa 1:21, Jer 3:1-20, Ezek 16:8-22). The Book of Hosea presents the most striking example of where Israel's unfaithfulness is described by this metaphor (Hos 2:1-5, 3:1-5). In addition, Israel is very frequently referred to in God's perspective as "my people," or "thy people" (Deut 9: 26, 29, 26: 15, 1 Sam 2:20, 2 Sam 7:10, Ps 81:11, Isa 1:3, Jer 2:11), or a people called by Yahweh's name (Isa 43:1, 7, Dan 9:19). Such phrases connote kinship as well as possession. Finally, God stands in the place of a king in the early stages of Israel's history, though pure theocracy soon gives way to an earthly kingship (1 Sam 12:12). However, God's sovereign rule remains (Ps 22:28).

Given these examples one can begin to understand on the basis of the Old Testament the presence of the principle of solidarity in Semitic thinking. Lest, however, an improper balance be conjectured here, it must be noted that the Old Testament also recognized, especially in later prophets such as Jeremiah and Ezekiel individual experience. Just because collective thinking is often in evidence, individuality, it must be admitted, is far from being lost. The Lawgiver instructs, "The father shall not be put to death for the children, nor shall the children be put to death for the fathers; every man shall be

Jesus, All in One

put to death for his own sin" (Deut 24:16). Yahweh declares through Ezekiel, "Behold, all souls are mine; the soul of the father as well as the soul of the son is mine: the soul that sins shall die" (Ezek 18:4). But the principle of solidarity acted out in the family, tribe, and nation still flourished, and as is supposed, the vestiges remained and can be found among the individual emphases taught in the New Testament. In essence, what the New Testament writers retained of this principle they accommodated in a positive sense, to illustrate and enrich New Testament truth, and to idealize a social solidarity.¹⁴

The purpose of this study, therefore, is to survey the New Testament and investigate certain passages in which corporate thinking seems to be involved. It is first assumed on the basis of such teachings as the body of Christ, that the concept of solidarity exists in the New Testament as well as in the Old, though in a perhaps more elevated and progressive fashion. Therefore, since the thought form of both the Old and New Testaments is often collective rather than individual as is common today, it is supposed that, therefore, a lack of understanding of the Hebrew concept of corporate personality

¹⁴ Ibid., p. 90.

A Concept of Solidarity for an Understanding NT Themes

or solidarity (where one can represent or be equal to the many or the reverse), may at times obscure in a certain sense many of the New Testament teachings and themes. The aim, therefore, of this study is to demonstrate how a clearer understanding of the concept of solidarity may give a greater modern understanding to such NT themes as the temple, the body of Christ, the Servant, the Son of Man, the Second Adam, the New Israel, the atonement, fellowship, and community.

Certain limitations should be recognized. First the research will be a New Testament study only, providing background from the OT. Secondly, the study makes no pretension of being a complete exposition of the subjects discussed. Such topics as the suffering servant and the body of Christ cannot be developed sufficiently in a paper of this prescribed length. It will be hoped, how in principle here, that by examining some of the parts of this concept one may find a fair representation of the whole. Thirdly, the danger is recognized of making wholesale application of the principle to everything that seems to have affinity with it. Surely, as previously expressed, individuality is not absent from either the OT or the NT. Thus a certain restraint will be attempted in this respect. It can well be remembered that not all obscurities can be

Jesus, All in One

explained and dismissed by the supposed difference between the mind of today and yesterday. For even the disciples of Jesus' day found some of these truths to be "hard sayings" (John 6:60). The approach will be systematic, attempting to pull together key concepts into topical discussions of each. The first task will be to explore the Gospels and Acts. The second endeavor will be to summarize Pauline theology. Since the remainder of the NT books do not contribute as significantly to the development of the concept, they will be referred to only occasionally and will not be dealt with separately, but will be incorporated into the other two major headings as felt appropriate.

A Concept of Solidarity for an Understanding NT Themes

CHAPTER II

THE GOSPELS AND ACTS

Introduction

It is possible to see that the principle of solidarity underlies and pervades the Gospels and Acts. It is especially implicit in some of Jesus' teachings. A note of interest also is that when searching for this concept the hints of it are more evident in Mark, Matthew, and John than in Luke or Acts. One might attempt to explain this in terms of certain books being more topical or philosophical in nature as opposed to those of more narrative quality. But the most plausible reason is evident in the fact that where the idea is most explicit is also where Semitic influence is the most apparent.

Jesus and Identity with His Followers

One of the most definitive illustrations of Jesus' corporate identity with his followers is found in Matt 25:31-45 where the judgment of the nations at the eschaton is described. Here the sheep and the goats are divided and judged on the basis of how they treated the "little ones," or probably more accurately, "the least," from the superlative, elachistos. The theme of Matthew 25 is responsibility during the intervening period while the Master is gone. Thus, whether or not the "least" or Jesus' brethren are to be viewed as the poor and needy, the Christian church, or as Christ's disciples, or those guilty of the sin of omission (neglect of the "little ones"), or those who have been merciful, they all have Jesus as their direct object. Jesus says, "Truly, I say to you, as you did it to one of the least of these my brethren, you did it to me" (Matt 25:45). Jesus does not say to the negligent, "you offended me because you neglected my best friend or brother." He says, "you did it to me." The individual who is hungry is not the least brother, but Christ himself. Christ says, "I was hungry " The language is not one of

Jesus, All in One

close relation but of inseparable identity. Thus some can conclude that this passage is explained by the idea of corporate personality.¹⁵ One may basically understand the metaphor aside from the idea, but that does not explain why the thought is expressed like it is. Modern rhetoric rarely expresses a truth so directly.

Therefore, if Jesus can be viewed as one with his people, then it can be seen how neglect of his followers can be neglect of himself. Likewise, Paul can hear a voice on the road to Damascus say, "Saul, Saul, why do you persecute me?" (Acts 9:4). He can realize that Christ is so solid with his believers that it is not the same as persecuting him, but it is persecuting him.

Jesus, the Gospel writers, and as shall be pointed out later, Paul, conceived of a unity between Christ and His followers so compounded as to transcend at times even an intimate relational ideal.¹⁶ The recurrent oneness motif found

¹⁵ G. Gross, "Die 'geringsten Brüder' Jesu in Mt 25:40 in Auseinandersezzung mit der neuen Exegese, " Bibel und Leben 5 (March, 1964): 172-180.

¹⁶ Sometimes a relational idea is clearly used. In Matt 25 Jesus' sheep are "my brethren" and Jesus is like a Shepherd to the sheep (John 10). Jesus teaches "whoever does the will of my Father in heaven is my brother, and sister, and mother" (Matt 12:50; also Mark 3:35). But even

A Concept of Solidarity for an Understanding NT Themes

especially in the Gospel of John powerfully describes this ideal union, which is not even described at times as intimate - but rather incorporate. Jesus' desire is that "word" believers "may all be one; even as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be in us , so that the world may believe that thou hast sent me" (John 17:21).

this is an example of solidarity as conceived in the family, and Jesus describes a communal oneness that transcends blood. It even transcends the marriage relationship, at least in terms of the problems theoretically encountered as a result of the levirate marriage law in the resurrection (Matt 22:24, Mark 12:19, Luke 20:28). This law is also reflective of the thinking of solidarity.

Jesus and the Teaching of Bloodguilt

It has been aforementioned that blood feuds have occurred over the result of staunch collective identity. In ancient thinking the consequences of feud or friendship were not limited to the lifetime of those involved. Thus guilt or favor could be visited on following generations. Today, one generally does not think that a child is guilty on account of his father's crime, though it is recognized that the children often reap the consequences of such association. Apparently, the unity of family, tribe, and nation was of much greater significance to the ancients.

Jesus reasoned with the scribes and Pharisees saying that they, by repeating the work of their fathers, were thus participating in their guilt (koinonoi en to haimati ton propheton). The scribes and Pharisees maintained that they would not have acted as did their fathers, but Jesus predicts that they will persecute and kill those that will be sent to them and thus prove their own guilt, "that upon you may come all

A Concept of Solidarity for an Understanding NT Themes

the righteous blood shed on earth, from the blood of innocent Abel to the blood of Zechariah the son of Barachiah, whom you murdered between the sanctuary and the altar" (Matt 23:35). Hence, they were in the above case implicated retroactively. The bloodguilt is imposed futuristically when the mob says of Jesus, "his blood be upon us and on our children!" (Matt 27:25) This seems to illustrate the atonement in reverse.

The same concept of corporate guilt was misapplied by the Jewish religious leaders, especially in ironic words of the scheming Caiaphas. It was he who cautioned the Sanhedrin saying, "you do not understand that it is expedient for you that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation should not perish" (John 11:50). With this type of reasoning they crucified the one who could save all of them. What was to serve as a precaution against corporate guilt became the action which corporately condemned them. Indeed it may have been the idea of solidarity extended to racist nationality that led the Jewish nation to reject Jesus, feeling secure in having Abraham as their father and thus having a guaranteed share in his blessings (Luke 3:8, Matt 3:9, John 8:33-40).

Jesus as the Servant of God

The Gospels and Acts, as well as the epistles of Paul and Peter, see Jesus as the Servant of God described in the “servant” passages of Isaiah. Matthew declares that Jesus was a fulfillment of the words: “he took our infirmities and bore our diseases” (Matt 8:14-17; Isa 53:4). In another context Matthew considers Jesus’ life and work typical of the first few verses of Isa 42:

This was to fulfill what was spoken by the prophet Isaiah: Behold, my servant whom I have chosen, my beloved with whom my soul is well pleased. I will put my Spirit upon him, and he shall proclaim justice to the Gentiles. He will not wrangle or cry aloud, nor will anyone hear his voice in the streets; he will not break a bruised reed or quench a smoldering wick, till he brings justice to victory; and in his name shall the Gentiles hope (Matt 12:17-21; Isa 42:1-4).

The citings could be numerous, throughout the Gospels and Acts, and further on to such explicit references as the one in 1 Peter where Christ is the perfect lamb led to slaughter (1 Pet 1:19, Isa 53:7). Therefore, it cannot be denied that the New

A Concept of Solidarity for an Understanding NT Themes

Testament writers saw Jesus as the Servant, the Suffering Servant.

Who the Servant actually was in the primary application is a point disputed at length with several possible conclusions. Traditionally, the Servant was interpreted as speaking of the Messiah and wasn't questioned.¹⁷ But with the arrival of critical methodology there came a tendency to view the Servant as the nation of Israel. This is gathered from the fact that the Servant is referred to as "Israel," or "Jacob," though treated etymologically as one person or entity. An example of this is Isa 49:3 where the Lord says, "You are my servant, Israel, in whom I will be glorified."

Another reference, Isa 41:8 reads, "But you, Israel, my servant, Jacob, whom I have chosen, the offspring of Abraham, my friend " Again in a collective sense God speaks, "You are my witnesses, says the Lord, and my servant whom I have chosen" (Isa 43:10). Similar references are found in chapters 41:9, 42:1, 44:1. In addition, other clear references are made to Israel.

¹⁷ Harold H. Rowley, The Servant of the Lord and Other Essays on the Old Testament (1952), p. 4.

Jesus, All in One

The identification of the Servant as the nation of Israel, however, has not satisfied the whole of biblical scholarship which in recent years has led to the advent of a profuse variety of views which fall into two basic categories: individual theories, and collective or fluid theories.

Some of the individual theories identified the Servant with Zerubbabel, Jehoiachin, Moses, and even the writer of Isaiah himself. But scholarship has failed to arrive at any general consensus in terms of the individual theories.¹⁸ There is no polarity of thought toward anyone historical individual and so the field of individual theories is somewhat fragmented. As for the Servant being the writer of Isaiah, himself, H. H. Rowley observes that it is difficult to accept the idea that the prophet actually conceived of himself as the one who was "to set judgment in the earth, and to see the isles wait for his law" (Isa 42:4), and that his contemporaries would acknowledge that he was the vicarious sin-bearer bruised for their iniquities (53:5) thus bringing justification. If this was the case, Rowley suggests, "he was only a misguided, self-opinionated dreamer,

¹⁸ Ibid., pp. 7-32.

A Concept of Solidarity for an Understanding NT Themes

and not in any sense the mouthpiece of God.”¹⁹ And as A. S. Peake puts it, exemplifying "too extravagant an egotism.”²⁰

The collective theory, especially in the minds of British biblical scholars has been subjected to modifications by many who recognize the Servant as Israel, yet have difficulty envisioning the Servant as the whole of Israel since they do not typify in character the description. Therefore, some have viewed the Servant as best personified in the work of the prophets, the remnant of the true priesthood, who suffer and die as the true servants of God,²¹ or as "the spiritual core of the nation.”²²

That the ideal priesthood could be conceived of in the days of Jesus as the representative of salvation for the nation may be illustrated from the principle of solidarity found in the thinking and writing of the Qumran community. In some of the documents or Qumran scrolls the community saw itself as the source of salvation for the people of Israel. Through

¹⁹ Rowley, pp. 11,12

²⁰ Arthur S. Peake, The Servant of Yahweh (1931), p. 44.

²¹ William Barclay, Jesus as They Saw Him (1962), pp. 175-186.

²² Rowley, p. 6

Jesus, All in One

membership they (Israel) are to be saved.²³ In a particular passage salvation in the judgment day is promised to those who join the Qumran community. A reference is made to the ten righteous men of Sodom in Gen 18:32.²⁴

Furthermore, attention has been drawn to a possible relationship of concept between the ebed Yahweh (Servant of God) and the "Teacher of Righteousness" written about in the Qumran scrolls. This "Teacher of Righteousness" is described as acting the role of a suffering prophet, voluntarily suffering atonement, though it can't be established whether or not he is pictured as actually dying.²⁵ However, it is evident that early Judaism never clearly advanced to the idea of a suffering Messiah.²⁶ But the concept of one representing the many, or at least a remnant comprehending the whole nation is in evidence in the thinking and writing of the Qumran

²³ Paul Garnet, Salvation and Atonement in the Qumran Scrolls (1977), pp. 112, 113.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 11

²⁵ W. H. Brownlee, "The Servant of the Lord in the Qumran Scrolls," Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research 132 (Dec 1953): 8: 135 (Oct 1954): 33.

²⁶ Oscar Cullmann, The Christology of the New Testament, rev. ed. (1959, 1963), p. 60.

A Concept of Solidarity for an Understanding NT Themes

community. Accordingly, it is possible to see how a representative understanding of the servant could be developed.

Recognizing the fluidity, therefore, which is operative between the collective nation of Israel and the one or the few which represents it provides an explanation of how the New Testament narrows the Servant down to the one--Christ. William Barclay suggests that Jesus can be thus considered as the ultimate "supreme representative" and the one ideal Servant.²⁷ Jesus' sacrifice according to Joachim Jeremias "is the vicarious death of the suffering servant, which atones for the sins of the 'many,' the peoples of the world."²⁸ Inherent in this is a distinct narrowing of the multiple to the one; the nation as a whole constricted to the one who ultimately represents it. H. H. Rowley leans this direction in his interpretation of the Servant's identity, and notices with C. A. North a progression within the Servant Songs of Isaiah themselves from the corporate emphasis of the earlier songs to

²⁷ Barclay, Jesus as They Saw Him, p. 179.

²⁸ Joachim Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus (1966), p. 232.

Jesus, All in One

the individualistic emphasis of the later songs such as Isa 53.²⁹ He frequently avows indebtedness to H. Wheeler Robinson and the view of corporate personality, and offers this as the best explanation for formulating a reasonable solution to the Servant problem. He differs from Robinson's personal interpretation, however, which makes the fluidity of thought oscillate between Isaiah himself and the nation of Israel.³⁰ Instead Rowley sees an oscillation between the nation and its "future (emphasis supplied) representative who should in himself incarnate its mission without making it any less the mission of the nation, and that in the person of our Lord the mission was indeed incarnate fulfilling the hope of the prophet"³¹

However, as pointed out by John L. McKenzie, it is not necessary to conceive of the Servant as a historical figure in the past, or in the future. Through the concept of corporate personality the Servant can be apprehended as an ideal, non-specific yet individual figure who is metahistorical;

²⁹ Rowley, pp. 51-56.

³⁰ Ibid., pp. 40, 49, 56.

³¹ Ibid., p. 56.

A Concept of Solidarity for an Understanding NT Themes

incorporating, recapitulating, comprehending, and reflecting all Israel ever was and was described to be.³² It seems that this view must certainly be close to what the New Testament writers entertained when they refer to Jesus as the ebed Yahweh. The role that Jesus assumed and so accurately fulfilled was that of the suffering servant. Consequently, the principle of the one in the many and the many in the one may provide a helpful and positive solution for the servant problem.

³² John L. McKenzie, Second Isaiah, The Anchor Bible (1968), pp. XXXVII-LV.

Jesus as the Son of Man

Much literature and commentary has been directed toward the significance of the Gospel designation, “Son of Man.” The title is important for several reasons. First, it was Jesus' designated way of referring to himself (65X). Yet the title is not used by the adherents of Jesus to refer to him except in one case where Stephen sees a vision (Acts 7:56). Nor is it used of Jesus in the writings of the early church.³³ George Eldon Ladd classifies this designation as used in the gospels into three distinct yet related categories: (1) The Earthly Son of Man; (2) The Suffering Son of Man, and (3) The Apocalyptic Son of Man.³⁴

The meaning of the Christological title, not unlike the Servant of Yahweh, is the subject of numerous and opposing interpretations. Some scholars have asserted that it can mean

³³ George Eldon Ladd, A Theology of the New Testament (1974), p. 146.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 149-151, 157.

A Concept of Solidarity for an Understanding NT Themes

nothing more than simply "man," since there are Old Testament passages (Num 23:19, Psa 144:3) where this is the significance of the expression, and possibly even NT passages where it also is used in this way (Matt 12:31; Luke 12:10; Mark 2:27, 28).³⁵ Others wish to point out that it is merely a substitute for "I." But the weakness in these arguments is in the fact that they ignore the historical background and significance of the expression which was developed and well known in Jesus' day.³⁶

Segments of critical scholarship have attempted in varying degrees to question the authenticity of this self-designation of Jesus. At the same time as Ladd points out, however, it remains an openly critical stance to approach the sayings of Jesus, accepting them as Jesus' own representations.³⁷ The Son of Man concept is developed particularly in the Book of Daniel; the Similitudes of Enoch, and IV Ezra.³⁸ It is

³⁵ Ibid., p. 146. Also O. Cullmann, pp. 152-155.

³⁶ Ibid. p. 147.

³⁷ Ibid., pp. 151-153.

³⁸ Cullmann, pp. 137-192

Jesus, All in One

admitted by many scholars that Daniel provides the basic background for the Son of Man idea.³⁹

Notwithstanding whether or not this is accepted, Dan 7 remains a key passage for understanding the Son of Man's identity and function. In Dan 7:13, 14 Daniel writes:

I saw in the night visions, and behold, with the clouds of heaven there came one like a son of man, and he came to the Ancient of Days and was presented before him. And to him was given dominion and glory and kingdom, that all peoples, nations and languages, should serve him; his dominion is an everlasting dominion which shall not pass away, and his kingdom one that shall not be destroyed.

Oscar Cullmann in the book Christology of the New Testament discusses the characteristics of the Son of Man as found in Jewish apocalyptic literature such as Daniel, 1 Enoch, and IV Ezra. In such writings he finds the Son of Man personified as (1) a pre-existent, heavenly being, (2) who is now hidden, (3) who will appear at the end of time on the clouds of heaven, (4) will be involved in the eschatological judgment, and (5) who

³⁹ Ladd, p. 147

A Concept of Solidarity for an Understanding NT Themes

will set up the everlasting kingdom or establish the "nation of the saints."⁴⁰ It is these very eschatological functions that Jesus assumes for himself in the Gospel stories.

It remains, however, a necessity to determine what the intrinsic meaning of the term "Son of Man" is, not just what this eschatological figure does. Why is there a "Son of Man" designation at all? It would follow quite naturally, of course, in a study of solidarity that the term can be taken as denoting something of a representative understanding. Many scholars have noticed how the Son of Man in Dan 7:13, 14 is mentioned and then apparently strangely replaced in Dan 7:22 by "the saints of the Most High" who suddenly inherit the right to receive the everlasting kingdom and authority to rule.

Therefore, many biblical authorities like Oscar Cullmann lean toward the point of view that the Son of Man is also to be viewed as representative of the "people of the saints of the Most High."⁴¹ Accordingly, one may notice here another instance of fluidity between the one and the many in mutual

⁴⁰ Cullmann, p 150.

⁴¹ Ibid., pp. 141, 142, 158, 161, 163.

Jesus, All in One

solidarity. It is not safe to press this concept so far that the Son of Man loses his individual identity in the collective "people of the saints of the Most High." The Jews of Jesus' time clearly conceived of the Son of Man as an individual.⁴² But the Son of Man is one who has identified himself with the saints and one who upon receiving dominion in heaven comes to bring the kingdom to the afflicted saints.⁴³

It is perhaps appropriate at this point to return for a moment to the judgment scene of Matt 25 dealt with in brief previous to this section. Here Jesus is envisaging the same figure as found in Daniel 7:13, 14. The Son of Man is presiding at the judgment. As was determined, the sheep and goats are judged on the basis of how they treated the "saints" (who, incidently, typify suffering servants) who are collectivized in Christ. Action against or for the saints is reckoned as for or against Christ, or the Son of Man. Here, impressively then, is found the same configuration of thought as in Daniel 7:21-27. As Oscar Cullmann comments on this point:

⁴² Cullmann, p. 140.

⁴³ Ladd, p. 148

A Concept of Solidarity for an Understanding NT Themes

The Son of Man comprehends all men. Again in view of this passage no choice is-Possible between the individual and collective significance of the Son of Man.⁴⁴

Further argument for the view of the Son of Man as a collectivized representative of man rests within the term itself: Son-of-Man (bar nasha in the Aramaic). Cullmann repeatedly calls attention to the possibility of this. The Son of Man is the man who represents all men.⁴⁵ The equivalent expression in Hebrew is ben adam, a designation for man in his weakness; a term used frequently in the Old Testament.⁴⁶ Cullmann reports that a Second Adam motif is discussed in the Apocryphal and Rabbinic writings, though different in many respects to the Pauline doctrine (1 Cor 15:45-47, Rom 5:14, Rom 5:12-21, Phil 2:5-11). However, Cullmann believes these are parallel strains.⁴⁷ That man (or adam) was created in God's image and fell makes it appear reasonable that "the

⁴⁴ Cullman, p. 158.

⁴⁵ Cullman, p. 140, 141, 163.

⁴⁶ Ibid., p. 163.

⁴⁷ Ibid., pp. 144-152

Jesus, All in One

man" Christ could be the redeemer who represents and restores all men⁴⁸ (Gen 3:15). See Table 1.

Jesus, therefore, in assuming the title of "Son of Man" assumes a Danielic or apocalyptic concept that is alive in Jewish thinking. He represents Himself as an eschatological, heavenly type of Messiah who avoids the popular Jewish messianic sentiments found within other titles He might have used. Yet, Jesus "radically interprets" the concept before His contemporaries by "pouring" into the recognized name the shockingly new dimension of a suffering servant.⁴⁹ In the Gospel of John Jesus uses the title, Son of Man, repeatedly, especially when referring to His suffering and death (John 3:13, 14; 6:53; 8:28; 12:23, 24). With the Danielic Son of Man concept he seems to have combined the Isaianic Servant of the Lord (Isa 52:13-53:12).

⁴⁸ Ibid., p. 142.

⁴⁹ Ladd, p. 157.

A Concept of Solidarity for an Understanding NT Themes

TABLE 1

THE TWO ADAMS: A COMPARISON/CONTRAST

<u>The First Adam</u>	<u>The Second Adam</u>
A miraculous birth; born of spirit (Gen 2:7)	A miraculous birth; born of the Spirit (Matt 1: 18-20)
“From the earth, a man of dust” (1 Cor 15: 45-47, Gen 2:7)	“The second man is from heaven” (1 Cor 15: 45-47)
In the image of God (Gen 1: 26,27)	“The image of the invisible God” (Col 1:15: 48,49)
A son of God (Luke 3:38)	The Son of God (Matt 16:16)
Tempted in Eden and failed (Gen 3)	Tempted in the wilderness and was victorious (Matt 4: 1, 11)
“You will be like God” (Gen 3:5)	“Did not count equality with God a thing to be grasped” (Phil 2:7)
Disobedient (Gen 3:6)	“Was obedient unto death” (Phil 2:8)
Brought death (Rom 5:12, 17)	Brought life (Rom 5:12-21, 1 Cor 15:21, 49)

Jesus, All in One

T. W. Manson in his book, The Servant-Messiah, conceives of the Son of Man as being the servant of the Lord, the ideal Israelite, embodying the whole nation. In addition, through the concept of corporate personality he is the suffering servant as well as the representative of the totality of the people of the "Saints of the Most High."⁵⁰ Thus Christ as the Son of Man is the unique combination of suffering servant, and the eschatological Son of Man (Mark 10:45). William Barclay in describing Jesus' concept of Himself sums it up well:

He knew Himself the divine Son of Man whose triumph was sure;
He knew Himself the Suffering Servant for whom the Cross was the
only and the chosen way. As the Servant of the Lord He was to
suffer for men; as the Son of Man He must in the end be the King of
men. The Son of Man is the title which contains within itself the
shame and the glory of Jesus Christ.⁵¹

⁵⁰ T. W. Manson, The Servant-Messiah: A Study of the Public Ministry of Jesus (1953), pp. 73-74.

⁵¹ Barclay, Jesus as They Saw Him, p. 92.

Jesus and His Body

When Jesus declares to the disciples at the Eucharistic meal, "This is my body this is my blood ... " (Matt 26:26-28; Mark 14:22-25; Luke 22:17-20), the disciples were not totally unacquainted with the language. Jesus had taught the disciples and the crowd in Galilee declaring:

I am the bread of life I am the living bread which came down from heaven; if anyone eats of this bread, he will live forever; and the bread which I will give for the life of the world is my flesh For my flesh is food indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. He who eats my flesh and drinks my blood abides in me, and I in him ... so he who eats me will live because of me (John 6:35a, 51, 56, 57c).

What Jesus meant by eating His body and drinking His blood has been interpreted severally, from undeviating literalism to weak metaphor. This can only be dealt with here very briefly. Joachim Jeremias has aptly demonstrated that the Last Supper was a Passover meal and that this forms the background to the Lord's Supper which Jesus employs to

A Concept of Solidarity for an Understanding NT Themes

inaugurate the Eucharistic celebration.⁵² The unleavened bread at the Passover meal (and the other elements such as the cups, bitter herbs, etc. had significance also) was conceived of as the bread of affliction reminiscent of the Passover in Egypt. (Pes. 10.5)⁵³

In the case of the Last Supper it must be maintained that the body and blood are representative and are not literally His body and blood anymore than the contemporary Jew actually experienced the Exodus. Jesus was with the disciples in body when He gave the Eucharist. However, Jesus is illustrating a significant teaching. Thus Jeremias, argues that through the bread and the wine Jesus refers to Himself as a sacrifice; a Passover sacrifice. For flesh and blood are the elements of sacrifice.⁵⁴ Then on the basis of table fellowship, "by eating and drinking, He gives them a share in the atoning power of His death."⁵⁵

⁵² Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, pp. 60-61.

⁵³ Ibid., p. 58.

⁵⁴ Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, p. 222.

⁵⁵ Ibid., p. 233.

Jesus, All in One

But a careful look at Jesus' teaching elucidated by the development of tradition and New Testament theology indicates there is more in the Eucharist than a celebrated sacrifice. It is indeed the creation of a corporate body in Christ. It is the internalizing of the food of eternal life (John 6:51). It is like partaking of the tree of life. The union formed by the many partaking in the one body is the body of Christ.

There is no surprise then that the apostle John places Jesus' teachings of unity, the vine and the branches, the love commandment, and the prayer for oneness, all within the framework of the Last Supper (John 13-17). Jesus was leaving the disciples in body. How was His presence to be maintained with them? Jesus' body and blood were to be disseminated like the five loaves and two fishes to His followers. The transforming digestion of His words by the many of faith would form one body in Christ, animated by His Spirit.

The Temple Symbolism

Attention will now be given to the New Testament treatment of the temple symbol. In the temple symbolism the Christian community is conceived of as being built up into a Spirit-filled house, around the "chief-cornerstone" Jesus Christ.

In the Gospels and Acts one finds a puzzling fascination for representing Jesus as the rejected cornerstone which miraculously became the head of the corner (Ps 118: 22, 23). All three synoptic accounts quote Ps 118:22, 23 as applying to Jesus (Matt 21:42, Mark 12:10, Luke 20: 17). Peter, on the day of Pentecost, refers to Jesus as the rejected stone which in metaphor His contemporary Jewish counterparts rejected (Acts 4:11).

In the Pauline epistles (1 Cor 3:16, 6:19, 2 Cor 6:16, Eph 2:20-22), and in 1 Peter (1 Pet 2:4-7), the temple idea is developed. The temple symbol, therefore, stood as a symbol to illustrate the concept of individual believers being built into a corporate structural unit upon the foundation of Christ, the apostles and prophets (1 Cor 3:11). As a result, there was created a building

Jesus, All in One

where God is pleased to dwell. Again, one may find here a positive application of the one in the many and the many in the one. There is idealized one building or church formed by the placing together of many constituent stones.

Bertil Gärtner in his work of comparing the Qumran texts with the New Testament argues that the oscillation from individual to collective is definitely seen in the temple illustration.⁵⁶ C. F. D. Moule also observes that the Temple-figure fits well into the scheme of corporate personality.⁵⁷ J. A. T. Robinson, however, points out that even though there is a collective concept in the temple symbolism, yet there are some important differences from other corporate models such as the body of Christ. The temple is always referred to in terms of its relationship to God or the Holy Spirit. It is the Temple of the Spirit or the Temple of God, but never the "Temple of Christ." The reason for this is perhaps two-fold. First the symbolism is

⁵⁶ Bertil Gärtner, The Temple and Community in Qumran (1965), pp. 123-142.

⁵⁷ C.F.D Moule, The Phenomenon of the New Testament (1967) , pp. 27, 28.

A Concept of Solidarity for an Understanding NT Themes

not intimate enough. Secondly, it is not as richly dynamic or as productive a figure as the body of Christ.⁵⁸

⁵⁸ John A. T. Robinson, The Body: A Study in Pauline Theology (1952) , pp. 64-65.

Peter and The Rock

The New Testament appears to be quite unanimous in declaring that Christ is the Rock upon which the church or the Temple of God is founded. However, numerous expositors spanning the Christian centuries have cited one exception found within the famous confession of Peter at Caesarea Philippi (Matt 16:13-20). In this passage Christ tells Peter:

I tell you, you are Peter, and on this rock I will build my church, and the powers of death shall not prevail against it. (Matt 16:18)

Because of this one text, yoked with a tradition of primacy for Peter, many have taken the position in spite of the overwhelming New Testament evidence that Peter is the rock on which the church is built. Many scholars, even among conservative Protestants, have gravitated toward this viewpoint. Others, like John Calvin have adopted the view that the "rock" was Peter's confession. This second school of thought has also received a large following. Then, of course, many have held fast to the doctrine that Christ only is the

A Concept of Solidarity for an Understanding NT Themes

"rock." Luther is probably the most famous exponent of this interpretation.

The words of Matt 16:18 which seem to clearly identify Peter as the rock upon which the church is built continue to be baffling. The Gospel of Mark which is related to Matthew has an abbreviated parallel of the confession (Mark 8:27-30). It is believed that elsewhere Mark reveals a Petrine emphasis, yet strangely the parallel passage leaves out the investiture, but retains the rebuking of Peter. The Pauline epistles which are considered to be written earlier argue plainly that Christ alone is the Rock:

"For no other foundation can anyone lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ" (1 Cor 3:11).

Even where the "apostles and prophets" are referred to Christ remains "the chief cornerstone" (Eph 2:20). Therefore, Matt 16:18 seems to contradict more than support the remainder of the New Testament.⁵⁹ How must one account for this? The first step by way of an attempted explanation is to examine

⁵⁹ The Interpreter's Bible, Matthew; Mark, George Arthur Buttrick, ed., 12 vols., (1951), 7:450.

Jesus, All in One

what Peter himself says. Peter on the day of Pentecost speaking of Jesus tells the throng, "This is the stone" (Acts 4:11).

If Peter is the rock, it is indeed a surprise that he identifies Christ as the rock. Another surprise comes in 1 Peter 2:4-8. This passage has Peter expressing himself again. He says:

Come to him, to that living stone, rejected by men but in God's sight chosen and precious; and like living stones be yourselves built into a spiritual house, to be a holy priesthood, to offer spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus Christ. For it stands in scripture:

'Behold, I am laying in Zion a stone, a cornerstone, chosen and precious, and he who believes in him will not be put to shame. To you therefore who believe, he is precious, but for those who do not believe, The very stone which the builders rejected, has become the head of the corner, and, a stone that will make men stumble, a rock that will make them fall.'

It is an enigma of the highest sort that Peter, of all the people in the entire Christian Church would say this if he himself had been exclusively designated as "The Rock." How is this fascination with Christ as a stone and stumbling stone to be explained? And especially why is Peter so taken in by it?

A Concept of Solidarity for an Understanding NT Themes

To attempt an answer for this it is necessary to reconstruct as far as possible a stone-motif that is in evidence and existed in the traditions of the Jews (and other ancient peoples as well). This threads itself throughout the Old Testament. Peter's quotations above are a composite of Isa 28:16, Ps 118:22, and Isa 8:14. Isa 28:16 and Ps 118:22, 23 are both thought to refer to the temple foundation stone. The Rabbis applied these passages to the Messiah as well, for the temple stone had Messianic implications.⁶⁰

According to tradition, while Solomon's temple was being constructed, stones were brought pre-cut from the quarry (1 Kings 6:7) to the building site. Among them was a large stone that for much of the preliminary stages of building lay unused and annoyingly in the way (thus a stumbling stone). When the builders came to a specific strategic location of need, however, several stones were tested but failed. At last the rejected stone was tested, successfully, and moved into place. It providentially was a precise fit.⁶¹

⁶⁰ Joachim Jeremias, "lithos," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, (1964), 4:272.

⁶¹ Ellen G. White, The Desire of Ages (1898); pp. 597, 598.

Jesus, All in One

It is debatable what position in the structure this stone actually took. Interpretations vary from a typical cornerstone that joins two rows of foundation stones to the keystone of an arch. The latter has been the explanation of Joachim Jeremias (i.e. from the LXX and NT usage of akrogoniaios; keystone).⁶² Rabbi Eliezer, a principal writer of the Rabbinic Pseudepigrapha flatly equates the keystone and the foundation stone in a quote that shall be referred to later.

One may well ask how appropriately the figure of cornerstone would apply to Christ, since there would need be at least three other stones of equal importance to complete a building. It never says of Christ: "one of the cornerstones." Christ is always the chief cornerstone.

In Ps 118:22 the reading is:

אבן אבן בחך פנת יקלתמוסד מוסד

⁶² W. Mundle, ^{γωνία}, The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology (1976), 3:388-390.

A Concept of Solidarity for an Understanding NT Themes

(MT: (MT יִקְלַחְמוּסָד מִן־פִּנָּהּ בְּחֵן אֶבֶן אֶבֶן לֵרֹאשׁ = l^ero's
pinnah;

LXX eis kephalēn gōnias) "head of the corner."

In Isa 28:16 the reading is:

'aben 'eben bōhan pinnat yiqrat musād mussād; LXX:
lithon polytelē eklekton akrogoniaion entimon eis ta
themelia)

Thus: "for a foundation a stone, a tested stone, a
precious cornerstone, of a sure foundation."

A suggested translation of "foundation stone" rather than
"cornerstone" may seem more accurate as shall subsequently
be pointed out.

Might there be a richer significance of the word translated
"corner?" The cornerstone of Ps 118: 22 is translated by the
LXX as kephalen gonias (from lero's pinnah), or "head of the
corner." But it may perhaps also be translated "first," or "chief

Jesus, All in One

of the corner." The akrogoniaios (keystone) likewise might be interpreted as the "highest," or "most important" of the corner.

At least one place in the New Testament the word "corner" takes on a resultant meaning. Paul tells Festus concerning the effect of Jesus' ministry, "this was not done in a corner," (Acts 26:26) that is, in secret.⁶³ A corner is in nature an out-of-the-way, unfrequented, private, or secret place. And so a hypothetical construction could be "chief (stone) of the secret place." Support for such a twist on the word "corner" (pinnah) is indeed scanty, especially since the expression doesn't appear with significant frequency (28X).⁶⁴ A hint of the "corner" being equated with a sacred place might be evident where Ahaz is said to have "made himself altars in every corner of Jerusalem" (2 Chr 28:24). Argument for a "private" type of nuance of meaning may also lie in the "better to dwell in the corner of the housetop" (pinnah) counsels of Solomon (Prov 21:9, 25:24). But this is inconclusive. The expression "cornerstone" could more likely represent "a principal stone," the foremost of the important stones. This is strengthened in

⁶³ Mundle, p. 389.

⁶⁴ Robert Young, Analytical Concordance to the Bible (1964) , p. 35 of "Index-Lexicon to the Old Testament."

A Concept of Solidarity for an Understanding NT Themes

light of the metaphorical usage of pinnah for "principal men" (Isa 19:13, 1 Sam 14:38, Judg 20:2).⁶⁵ The suggestion on the whole then is simply, could the "cornerstone" refer adjectivally to one specific foundation stone placed according to tradition under the Most Holy apartment of the temple? And could akrogoniaios also be construed to give similar sense?

Jewish tradition as found in The Zohar offers some interesting material. Admittedly, The Zohar is a cloudy and doubtful source and the speculations found therein are amazing indeed. Yet it may reflect some rabbinical thinking that is helpful on the given subject. When commenting in midrash form on the sapphire stone in Ezekiel 1.26 the drift of the commentary has this stone taken as an allusion (this is fanciful for sure!) to the "foundation stone" which is considered to be the central point of the universe, and is to be found under the Holy of Holies⁶⁶ (see Job 38:6). The Jews considered this stone to be the navel of the earth,⁶⁷ as in near Eastern thought the world was

⁶⁵ Encyclopaedia Biblica (1899), S.v. "Cornerstone," 1:913.

⁶⁶ The Zohar, trans. By Harry Sperling and Maurice Simon, 5 vols. (1933), 1:242-244.

⁶⁷ R. J. McKelvey, The New Temple (1969), p. 203.

Jesus, All in One

represented as a living body, its center being called the navel.⁶⁸ Thus the rock in the Most Holy place was the ... “foundation of heaven and earth.”⁶⁹

The Babylonians thought of the city of Babylon as the navel of the earth also.⁷⁰ The famous temple-tower completed by Nebuchadnezzar was called E-teman-en-ki, translated: "house of the foundation of heaven and earth" representing the cosmic mountain.⁷¹ This was because the earth was conceived of as a "hemispherical mountain with gently sloping sides."⁷² This all suddenly pulls into sharper focus a better understanding of the stone in Dan 2:34, 35 which becomes a great mountain that fills the whole earth, and which can hardly be identified with any other than Christ or the Messiah Himself.⁷³ Thus it might be reasonable to conclude that the Messiah-Christ

⁶⁸ Thomas Fawcett, Hebrew Myth and Christian Gospel (1973) , p. 238.

⁶⁹ R. E. Clements, God and Temple (1965) , p. 62.

⁷⁰ Fawcett, pp. 170, 174.

⁷¹ Siegfried H. Horn, Seventh-day Adventist Bible Dictionary (1960) , S. v. "Babel," p. 105.

⁷² L. W. King, Babylonian Religion and Myth (1899) , p. 868.

⁷³ Desmond Ford, Daniel (1978) , p. 85, 86.

A Concept of Solidarity for an Understanding NT Themes

would fit well into the figure of the foundation stone of the temple, the salvific center of the universe, and upon whom the church's foundation is laid.

Jesus is equated with stones or rocks elsewhere. Paul in 1 Cor 10:3 points out that Israel “drank from the supernatural [*pneumatikos*=spiritual] Rock which followed them, and the Rock was Christ.” John hints at this phenomenon in John 4 (cf. 7:37-39) where Jesus is the source of living water (running water; Ps 78:16).⁷⁴ The rabbis had determined that this Rock had followed Israel by comparing Exod 17 (the rock is in Rephidim) and Num 20 (the rock is in Kadesh). But Paul in 1 Corinthians gives this rock a messianic twist.⁷⁵ The “spiritual” rock may then be best understood not so much as a spiritual, ethereal rock, as much as an animated, breathing (*pneuma*=spirit, breath, wind) rock. The tradition of animated, living stones is referred to when John the Baptizer warns, “God is able of these stones [*abnaia*] to raise up sons [*benai*] unto Abraham” (Matt 3: 9, Luke 3:8, cf. Isa 51:1, 2).⁷⁶ In

⁷⁴ George A. F. Knight, “Thou Art Peter,” Theology Today 17 (Feb 1960) : 172.

⁷⁵ W. Mundle, “petra,” The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology (1976) , 3:383.

⁷⁶ Knight, p. 179.

Jesus, All in One

another place Jesus answers the Pharisees, "I tell you, if these were silent, the very stones would cry out (Luke 19:40)."

Likewise, because stones were regarded as the sacred abode of deity,⁷⁷ for Moses to irreverently strike the rock in the wilderness (which was Christ, 1 Cor 10:3) is serious.

Consequently, there may stand behind what is considered mere homiletical reflection more than is commonly realized.

With this background in mind, the New Testament temple symbol is more apprehendable. It is possible to extrapolate and pull together a picture of a temple building composed of "living stones 'built upon the' living stone" Jesus Christ (1 Pet 2:4).

Accepting temporarily the foregoing conclusions, it is time to return to Peter's confession itself in Matt 16 and examine it more closely in order to risk an explanation as to why Peter is called the Rock by Jesus contrary to the otherwise uniform New Testament teaching. This requires a systematic working of the entire passage (Matt 16:13-20). At the outset the suggestion is made that scholars and churchmen have been

⁷⁷ Lewis Bayles Paton, "Baal, Beel, Bel," Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics (1913) , 2:287, 288.

A Concept of Solidarity for an Understanding NT Themes

concentrating on the wrong part, that is, they have heavily concentrated on verses 17-19, wringing them dry, while ignoring, to a degree, Peter's confession itself and the immediate and greater context.

In verse 13 Jesus asks His disciples, "Who do men say that the Son of man is?"⁷⁸ They answer in references to eschatological or prophetic figures, John the Baptist (recently martyred; Matt 14:2), Elijah, Jeremiah, or one of the prophets (Matt 16:14). When asked to speak for themselves, Peter, speaking for all the disciples says, "You are the Christ, the Son of the living God" (Matt 16:16). Then follows the famous "investiture" of Peter, who is considered extremely fortunate for being the avenue of divine revelation, and therefore honored in a way that is rare for man.

⁷⁸ In Greek, the word "τις," "who," is identical with the neuter "τινα" (plural, nominative and accusative) "what things." Taking the latter would indicate current speculations concerning the identity of the "son of man" in general. The disciples reply in like correspondence with several observations. Or might it be a subtle hint for the disciples reflected in the neuter "what things," the possible significance of which will be dealt with shortly? The contextual evidence would seem to indicate, though, that it probably should be taken as it generally reads, "who."

Jesus, All in One

Admittedly, this is a high point in Matthew's gospel. Yet what is made out to be clever deduction to us hardly seems so. If all Christians must come to the same conclusion as Peter on the basis of an exclusive revelation how is it that the Gospel story has sufficed for millions. In addition, it seems it has taken Peter too long to arrive at this conclusion for others apparently had arrived at it before him, yet Peter gets the prize. Previous to this in Matt 14:33 "those in the boat worshipped Him saying, "Truly you are the Son of God." To the blind man in Matt 9:27 Jesus was the "Son of David" or "the Messiah." Andrew first finds his brother, Simon, saying, "We have found the Messiah" (John 1:41). It has been deduced that the confession of Peter is well along in the ministry of Jesus. What phenomenon has Peter noticed that is "special revelation." Whence this homily of praise from Christ?

The phrase "Son of the living God" (οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζώντος) is an unusual statement. This particular configuration of words appear nowhere else in the NT. (The KJV has mistranslated John 6:69, it is actually "the holy one of God"). Once in the OT Hosea 1:10 prophetically speaks of Israel as "sons of the living God." It has been generally purported by scholars that verbal Aramaic stands behind Matt 16:13-20

A Concept of Solidarity for an Understanding NT Themes

because several Aramaisms show through. This fact, for the most part, cannot be controverted. But this would not be necessarily true if the subject was lifted directly from the Hebrew scriptures or described as an Old Testament phenomenon. In addition, of course, there are words that are common to both languages.

It has already been noticed from 1 Pet 2:4 that Christ is a "living stone." Add to this the possibility of a word play on the Hebrew words, ben=son, and 'ebhen=stone, and a new thought emerges.

This particular word play of son/stone is one of the oldest word plays in the Scriptures.⁷⁹ One instance of this has already been referred to in Matt 3:9 (Luke 3:8). Taking this hypothesis Peter would say, "You are the Messiah, the Son/stone of the living God." In this vein then PETER WAS FIRST CALLING CHRIST THE ROCK. Can additional evidence be marshalled for this?

⁷⁹ Ford, p. 86. Also Matthew Black, "The Christological Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament," New Testament Studies, 18 (1971-72): 12.

Jesus, All in One

Obviously, if there was clear and abundant evidence this passage would not be a battleground. But a few points are offered here:

First, one might raise the objection that it is doubtful that the word 'ebhen (stone) would have been used. George A. F. Knight has correctly observed, however, that a lot of fluidity exists in the use of the different words for rock, or stone. In Peter's composite quotation in 1 Pet 2 Knight sees Peter equating rock and stone. The word lying behind two of the given passages is 'ebhen (Isa 8:14, Ps 118:22) where in Isa 28:16 tsur is used.⁸⁰ He also points out that even the noun 'ebhen (stone) (feminine) was equated with tsur (rock) (masculine) in the very same verse (Isa 8:14).⁸¹ Secondly, one must be ready to identify with the thinking of the rabbis and early Christians who in their fascination with the stone-motif recognized an affinity between all stones, a perhaps superstitious solidarity. The "rocks" in their national history took on significance, and were considered sacred. The evidence for sacred stone worship in the heathen religions is profuse in

⁸⁰ Knight, p. 176.

⁸¹ Ibid., p. 174.

A Concept of Solidarity for an Understanding NT Themes

both literature and archeology. Gods of stone, or baals of stones are well known. Sacred stones exist to the present day (black stone, Mecca, for instance).⁸² Apparently, Israel approximated this thinking within the traditions of the "spiritual" rock and the "rejected cornerstone."

Early Christianity apparently also found this a fruitful theological field. Cyprian writes a treatise entitled "That Christ also is called a Stone." He teaches that Christ was the rejected cornerstone, the rock on which Moses sat during the battle with the Amelekites, the rock on which the ark was set when the oxen returned it on a cart, Samuel's "Ebenezer" stone, the stone with which David slew Goliath, and the stone of Daniel 2.⁸³

Fanciful as this spiritualizing may be, it offers some interesting material. It is of special note that when the stone is discussed Jacob also appears. To quote:

Cyprian:

⁸² Paton, p. 287-288.

⁸³ The Treatises of Cyprian, The Ante-Nicene Fathers (1957), 5:522, 523.

Jesus, All in One

This is the stone in Genesis, which Jacob places at his head, because the head of the man is Christ; and as he slept, he saw a ladder reaching to heaven, on which the Lord was placed, and angels were ascending and descending.⁸⁴

In the passage previously referred to in The Zohar the sapphire stone of Ezek 1:26 is (dreamily) equated with the foundation stone, the central point of the universe under the Holy of Holies. Again one will find Jacob. He is described as on a throne. The "foundation stone" is Jacob's standing stone (Gen 28:10-22), upon which he slept and dreamed of the ladder to heaven. Discussion follows in the rabbinical way, because a problem becomes apparent by virtue of the fact that the standing stone of Jacob was located in Bethel and not Jerusalem. One rabbi suggests that that night the whole land was folded up beneath Jacob, and apparently in this way the temple stone in Jerusalem was placed immediately beneath him.⁸⁵

The rabbinical pseudopigraph Pirkê de Rabbi Eliezer attributed to a rabbi of the late first century and early second

⁸⁴ Ibid., p. 522.

⁸⁵ The Zohar, pp. 242-244.

A Concept of Solidarity for an Understanding NT Themes

century provides a similar vein. Describing the Genesis story of Jacob's dream after Jacob has set up the stone for a pillar and poured oil on it, the rabbi declares:

What did the Holy One, blessed be He, do? He placed (thereon) His right foot, and sank the stone to the bottom of the depths, and He made it the keystone of the earth, just like a man who sets a keystone in an arch; therefore it is called the foundation stone, for there is the navel of the earth, and therefrom was all the earth evolved, and upon it the Sanctuary of God stands, as it is said, 'And this stone, which I have set up for a pillar, shall be God's house.'⁸⁶

Such dreamy excursions cannot be warranted, but one cannot but wonder if there might be reflected a well-known and lingering tradition. Again in The Zohar there is to be found an interesting departure on the basis of 1 Kings 6:7 which attempts to describe how Yahweh accomplished a miraculous cutting of the stones at the quarry for the first temple. The description seems far from any real grip on reality yet an expression of interest appears. Apparently, the building of the temple is explained as being miraculously accomplished by the thought of Yahweh translated into words that issue forth from him. To continue:

⁸⁶ Pirkê de Rabbi Eliezer (1971) , p. 266.

Jesus, All in One

When the thought, after its expansion, comes to rest in that place, it is called Elohim hayyim (living God). It then seeks to spread and disclose itself still further, and there issue from that spot fire, air, and water, all compounded together. There also emerges "Jacob, the perfect man," symbolic of a certain voice that issues and becomes audible.⁸⁷

Notice that again Jacob is mentioned, the context of thought is the quarrying of the stones for the first temple (1 Kings 6:7), and particularly the place called "living God," the place from which Jacob emerges. Even granting the reputation and the nature of the source it is an alluring temptation to equate some obvious thoughts here. The stone is not called "living God" in Genesis 28:10-22, but Jacob's reverence toward the rock is to be noted. He pours oil upon it saying, "Surely the Lord is in this place.... This is none other than the house of God, and this is the gate of heaven." And "He called the name of that place Bethel" (Hebrew="house of God") (Gen 28:16,17, 19). This "house of God" would have readily been considered in effect the first Jewish temple.

Therefore, if one might accept that Peter calls Christ the Son/stone (ben, 'ebhen) of the living God an interesting

⁸⁷ The Zohar, p. 252.

A Concept of Solidarity for an Understanding NT Themes

complex emerges. Peter makes a clever word play and deduction, and Christ returns it, or uses it. Peter's observation prompts Christ's counter-observation.

The petros/petra wordplay in verse eighteen has received much attention with interpretations that cannot be fully explicated here. Max Wilcox has noticed a possible word play on son/stone for Christ's reply to Peter in verse eighteen, but strangely never lifts his eyes to verse sixteen, and relates it instead to the Parable of the Householder five chapters later. He points out a son/stone motif apparent in Matt 21:33-43. Here the son (ben) is rejected in the parable. This is immediately followed by Jesus quoting to the Jewish leaders the passage about the rejected stone ('ebhen) from Ps 118:22, 23. The evidence seems to demand yet another very effective use of this same word exercise and one can agree with Wilcox at least as far as granting an existing connection by way of similar thought-form and "Matthean interest." Wilcox reconstructs hypothetically the Aramaic saying of Jesus in its pristine state as follows:

את הוה אבנא רעל אבנא הדא אבנא איבני כנישתי

or:

Jesus, All in One

“You are a stone ('ebhen) and upon this stone ('ebhen) I will build (construction of 'ebhen; from banah=to build) my church (בניך) instead?).

This seems to be a reasonable construction except for the fact that Wilcox seems to ignore the Greek change of gender-- petros to petra, as well as maintaining that Peter is the rock.

It is the contention of this author, as well, that the “and” given in “You are a stone, and....” is not a typical “and” but is probably what is known in Greek as an “adversative *kai*.” Thus it would say, “You are a stone, but upon *this* stone, I will build my church.”

It has long been felt that kepha, Aramaic for “Cephas” stands behind the Greek petros of verse eighteen. Wilcox's suggestion would seem to indicate that a feminine noun ('ebhen) stands behind the masculine petros. So in this case the feminine noun would either be masculinized by the Greek editor or writer, or taken as understood. This is close to the thinking of Oscar Cullmann, who, however, unlike Wilcox, stays with the traditional placing of kepha behind petros. He points out that kepha in Aramaic is without final -s, which is characteristic and necessary for the Greek form of the name “Peter” (petros). Thus the Greek translation elects the masculine form, petros,

A Concept of Solidarity for an Understanding NT Themes

and beyond this he believes there is "no essential difference between Petros and Petra."⁸⁸

There may be, however, another possible reason for the change in form and gender. The Greek writer or translator may be aware of a certain distinction in his own mind. Assuming that Jesus used kepha rather than 'ebhen one can continue to identify the name "Cephas" with "Petros," since according to the Aramaic, the gender for this word has no differentiation of form.⁸⁹ But the feminine noun petra may reflect the proposed 'ebhen of verse sixteen. Consequently, petros equates with kepha, and 'ebhen (vs 16) with petra, because 'ebhen is correspondingly feminine.

It is well attested that Jesus surnamed Peter "Cephas" (Mark 3:16, John 1:42, Luke 6:14, Acts 10:18, 32). If this took place when he was chosen as a disciple (and it must have been an intimate thing between Jesus and Peter) it seems strange that it would not be mentioned per se and capitalized on in such an event as this. And even if Peter did not receive his surname at the call this would be the highest and most appropriate

⁸⁸ Oscar Cullmann, Peter: Disciple, Apostle, Martyr (1953), pp. 18-19.

⁸⁹ The Interpreter's Bible, p. 451.

Jesus, All in One

moment to receive it. However, there seems no reason to press this issue. Either way could give sense.

In any event, "this rock"⁹⁰ which in gender is feminine (petra) equates well in translation with 'ebhen which is also feminine. "This rock" would then have verse 16 as its antecedent.

To place too much emphasis on strict and precise a meaning on such words as petra and petros as signifying a large stone versus a small or "rolling" stone is perhaps unjustified to a degree. As Knight pointed out previously there is evidence of fluidity and easy transition made between the various words for rock.⁹¹ Some have objected to the existence of Cephas as a name. As for this the name "Kephas" has been found in a document dated ca. 416 B.C. In addition, the common noun

⁹⁰ "This rock" may be an echo of Ps 118:22. Peter has this passage well in mind later (Acts 4:11, 1 Pet 2:7), therefore, why couldn't this passage be shared by the minds of both Peter and Jesus in this encounter also? The LXX translated would read: "The stone which the builders rejected, this (οὐτὼς) (stone) has become the head of the corner." Matthew adopts the LXX translation in Matt 21:42, and likewise Mark, Luke and 1 Peter.

⁹¹ Knight, pp. 174, 176.

A Concept of Solidarity for an Understanding NT Themes

"kepha" has recently been read in several Qumran texts where it yields the sense of "rock," or "mountain crag."⁹²

To paraphrase further then, Christ says in effect to Peter, "You are a rock, like I am a rock. It takes a 'rock' to know a 'rock.' We are the same substance, mutually recognized. Your recognition of me as the stone of the living God indicates that you are a kindred spirit, a living stone that along with other living stones shall be built into a 'spiritual' temple. Because of your keen observations, revealed by the Father, you identify with me. You are solid with me."

Whether the gates of death will not be able to prevail against "this rock" (Christ) or against the church is not certain. Both "this rock" and "my church" could agree in gender with the feminine pronoun (autēs). The figure of Christ breaking out the tomb (gates to which were stone), these gates unable to restrain and hold him in, is a compelling resurrection figure and easier to conceptualize than an entombed church or building breaking loose, or even being beaten down by warring gates or gatekeepers. . In effect Jesus was saying, "I will rise

⁹² Joseph Fitzmyer, "The Aramaic Language and the Study of the New Testament," Journal of Biblical Literature 99 (March 1980) : 11.

Jesus, All in One

again, there's no power on earth can keep me back." But the church, since it is a corporate unity in Christ is necessarily included. Perhaps there is a double entendre here.

The keys may best be understood as passwords (ekklesia="called out ones," kleis=keys, derived from καλεω (*call-le-ho*) rather than the physical keys which are their successors. It is through preaching Christ's words, and confessing (calling out) that Jesus is the Son of God that entrance to the kingdom is gained (Matt 10:32, Luke 12:8, Rom 10:9, Phil 2:11):⁹³

"Whoever confesses that Jesus is the Son of God, God abides in him, and he in God" (1 John 4:15).

What Jesus promises to give Peter and the disciples in this passage is the Gospel. In this passage may be found Jesus' pre-existence as the God of Israel, His messianic role, His death, burial, resurrection, and glorification. The emphasis must shift from church administration to the proclamation of Christ's Sonship, which indeed is the subject of the famous confession.

⁹³ This may be calling to mind the traditional use of passwords that were required to gain entrance at city gates.

A Concept of Solidarity for an Understanding NT Themes

When a stone-motif is recognized in this passage, the surrounding passages also surrender supporting possibilities. Jesus does an arresting parley on the word, "stumbling stone" (skandalon) taken from (and by now this is no surprise) Isa 8:14. On one hand Christ is the stumbling stone of the Jewish people by whom He will suffer and be killed, yet on the other hand Peter becomes Christ's stumbling stone (Matt 16:21-23).

John P. Meier in his commentary on Matthew recognizes a twist on the word "man" in Jesus' introductory question in verse thirteen where he asks, "Who do men say the Son of man is?"⁹⁴ Furthermore, the designation of Son of man may have a richer significance in light of Peter's famous remark.⁹⁵

To relate the previous two or three episodes to the confession pericope seems a formidable task until one realizes that the label "evil and adulterous generation" which Jesus places on

⁹⁴ John P. Meier, Matthew, New Testament Message (1980), pp. 179-180.

⁹⁵ The son/stone word play may stand behind the expression "Son of man" itself in the Gospels, and in Daniel (cf. Desmond Ford, Daniel, p. 86; Matthew Black, "The Christological Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament,"p.12), and the expression may even point back to Jacob and his God. John 1:51 reads, "Truly, truly, I say unto you, you will see the heaven opened, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of Man." The imagery of Jacob's dream apposite with the expression "Son of Man" is significant.

Jesus, All in One

the sign-seeking Pharisees and Sadducees in Matt 16:4 is probably taken from the Song of Moses (Deut 32:1-43) where the principle feature is The Rock (verse 4 and onward). Deut 32:5 identifies those who "have dealt corruptly" with the Rock as a "perverse and crooked generation."

On first appearance the following warning concerning the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees would appear to not even have a remote relationship to the rock motif. But simply entertain the possibility of a confusion resulting from the Hebrew word for leaven, (seor), שֹׁר and the word for rock in the Song of Moses, (tsur) צוּר, and that impasse may be breached. Jesus warns the disciples to beware of the "rock" of the Pharisees and Sadducees (that is, their stubborn traditionalism that demands a sign before it will change). The disciples are not as dense as it appears, but their faithlessness does interfere with their understanding of Jesus clever entendre. They immediately thought of the bread they had forgotten. But Jesus says, "How is it that you fail to perceive that I did not speak about bread?" (Matt 16:11) (artos).

Theodore H. Robinson bemoans that because the leaven in this passage is the "teaching" of the Pharisees and Sadducees while

A Concept of Solidarity for an Understanding NT Themes

in Luke 12:1 the leaven is "hypocrisy" it can never be known for sure what Christ really meant.⁹⁶ But maybe this hypocrisy finds a closer parallel in the "crooked and perverse generation:" that stubbornly is as unchangeable as rock, has a "heart of stone," and who at the same time influence, like leaven, the unwary.

Following the possible identification of certain. word manipulations in this context one tends toward piecing together some sort of midrash idea employed here chiefly on the basis of a son/stone and bread/stone nuances. Word puns are apparently a "Matthean interest" for they can be uncovered several times. The bread/stone motif probably underlies the first temptation of Jesus (Matt 4:3), and stands clearly behind such phrases as the one in the Great Sermon where Jesus inquires, "What man of you, if his son asks him for bread, will give him a stone?" (Matt 7:9). Likewise then, in Matt 16 Matthew develops somewhat an oscillating pattern. The first inference identifies Jesus as the wilderness Rock of Israel. Yet the Pharisees and Saducees are in a negative sense also rock. Next, Christ is the "Rock of the living God," but Peter is also a "rock." Lastly, Christ is

⁹⁶ Theodore H. Robinson, The Gospel of Matthew, The Moffatt New Testament Commentary (1951) , p. 139.

Jesus, All in One

inferentially the stumbling stone of Isa 8:14, yet on the other hand Peter is Christ's stumbling stone. Finally, therefore, on the basis of such, the writer solicits the possibility of a rock-motif throughout Matt 16 to lend support to the foregoing exegesis of Matt 16:16 and its immediate environs.

Summary

In summary, this section has entertained how the temple-figure, and especially the Peter and the Rock episode might be seen as an unilaterally consistent example of solidarity. Solidarity is evident in a number of ways. Believers in Jesus as the Son of the living God are built into a "temple of the living God" (2 Cor 6:16) (emphasis supplied). Christ is the basement "Rock," and those who confess his Sonship, are "rocks" (living stones) built upon the foundation of Christ, and their confession of Christ is "rock-like" as well. There is found an oscillation between the one and the many and the many and the one. The many are built upon the one who is the sure foundation; the bedrock upon whom the "wise" man builds (Matt 7: 24- 27) .

A Concept of Solidarity for an Understanding NT Themes

CHAPTER III

SOLIDARITY IN PAULINE THEOLOGY

Introduction

It soon becomes a conviction that when studying the writings of Paul the principle of the one in the many and the many in the one is an interpretational key to much of Pauline theology, whether found in Romans, Galatians, Corinthians, (Hebrews) or practically any of the rest. The direction this endeavor will now take is to examine the following as samples of solidarity: The discussion will begin with the brightest example first, the body of Christ, then look at the Adam-Christ parallel in Romans 5, the corporate Christ constructions, the new race, and touch in the process some less significant examples before arriving at some conclusions for understanding the concepts of atonement and community in the Pauline corpus.

The Body of Christ

H. W. Robinson has suggested that the most explicit rendering of the relation of groups and individuals is the “body of Christ.” Christ's followers in faith are presented as an essential unity responsible socially to one another in Christ.⁹⁷ The greatest expositor of this doctrine is the apostle Paul and the most advanced rendition occurs that an understanding of his body of Christ theology is in a certain sense a key to the entire canon of Paul's writings.

Opinions vary as to the source of Paul's advanced concept of the body of Christ. It is tendered here that it is directly related to Christ and the Eucharistic celebration⁹⁸ which he claims to have "received from the Lord" (1 Cor 11:23), and that it is an "extension of his Christology."⁹⁹ The

⁹⁷ H. W. Robinson, Corporate Personality, p. 33.

⁹⁸ J. A. T. Robinson, pp. 56-68.

⁹⁹ Ibid., p. 49.

Jesus, All in One

association of Paul's body theology and the Lord's Supper is seen most clearly in 1 Corinthians.

Throughout the epistle Eucharistic allusions and terminology are found woven into the body of Christ pericopes. Paul asks the Corinthians:

The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a participation in the body of Christ? Because there is one bread, we who are many are one body, for we all partake of the one bread" (1 Cor 10:16, 17).

Thus, Christian believers are considered one body because they partake of the one loaf (heis artos). The question naturally arises, however, where the transition took place in the thinking of Paul from the body as simply a sacrifice of Christ being shared in the bread and wine to the view of Christ's body as the corporate Christian community. J. A. T. Robinson suggests an impressive possibility at least in part for this in referring to Paul's Damascus road experience, an event which certainly must have held a profound influence over him for his entire life. The glorified Christ at that time spoke to him asking, "Saul, Saul, why do you persecute me" (Acts 9:4). As a result of persecuting the church Paul was ipso facto persecuting Christ himself. Therefore, Robinson suggests that "the appearance on which Paul's whole faith and apostleship

A Concept of Solidarity for an Understanding NT Themes

was founded was the revelation of the resurrection body of Christ, not as an individual, but as a Christian community.”¹⁰⁰

Some have explained that it is reasonable to conclude that the principle of solidarity probably underlies this question of Christ's.¹⁰¹ Certainly, as has been observed by Emile Mersch, it must have been that from that time forward whenever Paul looked into the face of a believer in Jesus, he would be compelled to see looking back on him Christ's own gaze.¹⁰²

Accordingly, the body of Christ could be seen as "the extention of the life and person of the incarnate Christ beyond his resurrection and ascension." Therefore, "as the Christian community feeds on this body and blood, it becomes the very life and personality of the risen Christ.”¹⁰³

¹⁰⁰J. A. T. Robinson, pp. 56-58.

¹⁰¹ Colin Brown, "Present," The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology (1976) , 2:920.

¹⁰² J. A. T. Robinson, pp. 58.

¹⁰³ Ibid., p. 57.

Jesus, All in One

The literalism of the figure of Christ's body deserves notice. The church as the body or the bread is not referred to in analogy as like Christ's body, but metaphorically it is Christ's body. The Body of Christ is not a group of believers, but Christ himself. They are the "risen organism" of Christ's being. They are "corporeal" and not "corporate."¹⁰⁴

Therefore, the Incarnation can find an application in two ways. Not only did the divine Christ become incarnate with humanity, but humanity in metaphor is invited through faith and the sacraments to become one with Christ in His body. And so, by participation in the body man can be saved through the death of Christ and freed from the condemnation of law, from sin, and from death. The union is so consolidated and literal, that whatever Jesus experienced in His body is repeated and actualized through the Christian now.¹⁰⁵

Pauline examples of this could compose a lengthy list. A few are given for example:

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., pp. 50-51.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., p. 47.

A Concept of Solidarity for an Understanding NT Themes

As Christ was baptized into death (Mark 10: 38), those who were "baptized into Christ Jesus were baptized into His death. 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 newness of life" (Rom 6:3, 4). "One has died for all; therefore all have died" (1 Cor 5: 14). Paul says, "I have been crucified with Christ II (Gal 2:20). He exhorts, "you have died to the law through the body of Christ" (Rom 7:4). And again, "For you have died and your life is hid with Christ in God" (Col 3:3).

The question arises how literally this corporateness of the believer in Christ's body is to be understood by the contemporary Christian. R. H. Gundry in his excellent book, Sōma in Biblical Theology, provides a balanced approach which preserves the individual dimension. His thrust is that to take the arguments of J. A. T. Robinson would necessarily lead toward a physical literalism, an extreme which is as unacceptable as the Bultmannian end of the spectrum which would existentially demote the body of Christ theology to "theological insignificance."¹⁰⁶ In other words, Christ and his

¹⁰⁶ Robert H. Gundry, Sōma in Biblical Theology (1976) , p. 244.

Jesus, All in One

followers are one, not with physical corporeality, but are only depicted as such in this metaphor "drawn from the physical realm."¹⁰⁷ To over-literalize would present impossible paradoxes. For example, Paul teaches that the resurrection follows physical death (2 Cor 4:7-18),¹⁰⁸ and Christ's intimate union with the church (Eph 5:21-25) certainly cannot be viewed as physical and sexual, but as figurative.¹⁰⁹ Gundry would try to keep the idea of individuality in perspective, as he believes the people of Paul's time understood it.¹¹⁰ The representation of the many in the one must not blur the distinct identity and function of Christ's members.

Therefore, rightly understood, the body of Christ theology as developed by Paul provides a colorful, living metaphor portraying the social unity of believers in Christ. Hence, the principle of corporate or perhaps more accurately "corporal" personality is illustrated in that the many members are

¹⁰⁷ Robert H. Gundry, p. 232.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid., p. 233.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid., p. 234.

¹¹⁰ Ibid., pp. 217-222.

A Concept of Solidarity for an Understanding NT Themes

united in the *one Christ* and the benefits of His salvation (Heb 10:10) are diffused from Christ to the many of faith.

The Adam-Christ Parallel

“Therefore, as sin came into the world through one man and death through sin, and so death spread to all men because all men sinned--- If because of one man's trespass, death reigned through that one man, much more will those who receive the abundance of grace and the free gift of righteousness reign in life through the one man Jesus Christ” (Rom 5:12, 17) .

Again it must be reiterated that thorough exegesis of this passage and its context cannot be attempted here. Therefore, a brief attempt to demonstrate the one and the many in the Adam-Christ parallel follows. The appearance is that Paul is trying to explain how Christ's life and death are to be made effective for all sinners.¹¹¹ It is also suggested that the principle of solidarity may provide the clearest understanding of this pericope.

¹¹¹ C. H. Dodd, p. 79.

A Concept of Solidarity for an Understanding NT Themes

It has been long debated whether the union between Adam and all men and Christ and his own is to be viewed as "realistic," or "federal."¹¹² According to the federal idea, Adam, like Christ, is to be viewed as the head or the first of humanity, and as one of them, is representative of them. This would make Adam "one among all" rather than "all in one." A "realistic" unity of all in one seems to more accurately reflect Paul's thought for several reasons, some of which are given here:

1. Adam's sin is called the sin of all, and Christ's act is the acquittal of all (Rom 5:12, 17, 18). According to Herman Ridderbos the "union of all with and in the one is the governing idea of this pericope."¹¹³

That a solidarity in sin is meant for Adam and his descendants is illustrated by C. H. Dodd. He points out that Paul is reiterating the mode of current rabbinical thinking that all men became sinners through the fall of Adam (2 Esd iii. 21-22. iv. 30).¹¹⁴ The point is not

¹¹² G. C. Berkouwer, Sin (1971) , pp. 512-18.

¹¹³ Herman Ridderbos, Paul: An Outline of his Theology , trans. By John Richard de Witt (1975) , p. 96.

¹¹⁴ Dodd, p. 79.

Jesus, All in One

how sin was propagated, but how all men are sinners in Adam and can all be saved through the one Christ. The possibility for such thinking becomes evident in the Jewish Talmud.

Reports Cohen:

That the human being was created in the image of God lies at the root of the rabbinic teaching concerning man. . . . This fact gives the human being his supreme importance in the economy of the universe. 'One man is equal to the whole of creation.' (ARN xxx i) . 'Man was first created a single individual to teach the lesson that whoever destroys one life, Scripture ascribes it to him as though he had destroyed a whole world; and whoever saves one life, Scripture ascribes it to him as though he had saved a whole world' (Sanh. Iv. 5).¹¹⁵

2. The name of Adam (ΑΔΑΜ), ἀδάμ, is often used in Scripture generically for "mankind" and seldom used

¹¹⁵ A. Cohen, Everyman's Talmud (1949) , p. 67.

A Concept of Solidarity for an Understanding NT Themes

as a proper name. Thus, all men are incorporate in Adam.¹¹⁶

3. The most direct parallel passage in 1 Cor 15:22 uses incorporate language in describing the same idea. (en to Adam. . . en to Christō).

That the idea of solidarity underlies this passage is quite widely attested by biblical scholars. William Barclay says that the passage must be understood "realistically" and in this way.¹¹⁷ This is basically the thinking of C. H. Dodd,¹¹⁸ G. C. Berkouwer,¹¹⁹ and C. F. D. Moule who concurs freely that Adam in Romans, chapter five is an "inclusive personality" for the human race.¹²⁰ George Eldon Ladd believes that 1 Cor 15:21 and Rom 5:12 express the Old Testament idea of "human solidarity."¹²¹ Herman Ridderbos extends the all-in-one

¹¹⁶ H. Seebass, "Adam," The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology (1976), 1:84.

¹¹⁷ Barclay, Romans , pp. 79-81.

¹¹⁸ Dodd, p. 79.

¹¹⁹ Berkouwer, pp. 512-18.

¹²⁰ Moule, p. 29.

¹²¹ Ladd, p. 403.

Jesus, All in One

principle to the baptism of Romans 6:2, the teachings of the old and new man (Rom 6:6, Gal 5:24, Eph 2:15, 4:13), and the putting off and the putting on of the same (Eph 4:22, Col 3:9), making the corporate idea of being one in Adam or in Christ apply in several different ways.¹²²

Therefore, as in Adam all men are sinners, in Christ all men are acquitted. By putting off the old man (Adam) one can put on the new man (the second Adam). The atonement, similarly may be conceived of as "incarnational." Christ's union with His followers is more than "intimate," but is rather "incorporate." By becoming solid with man and man becoming solid with Him, Christ is able to accomplish the restoration of the image of God. This does not mean that man becomes God, but rather is made in His image. The concept does not intend to lead one to the same thinking as Lucifer (Isa 14:13), or Eve in Eden (Gen 3:5). The lifegiving fullness is in Christ and issues forth from Him. While Christ has been the substitute in every experience of man's life, His atonement is not purely substitutionary since the believer by faith in Christ experiences in His Body the baptism, the sufferings, the death, burial, and resurrection of

¹²² Ridderbos, pp. 62-64.

A Concept of Solidarity for an Understanding NT Themes

Christ. This experience of unity effects the spiritual transformation of man, which is the keynote of Paul's theology.

The Corporate Christ

The body of Christ teaching and the Adam-Christ parallel consequently add a definite significance to the "in Christ" statements in the Pauline epistles. According to John B. Nielson, the specific term, "in Christ" (en Christō) occurs thirty-three times in the writings of Paul, and there are numerous related expressions. "In Christ" appears only three times outside of Pauline literature, and all of these are located in 1 Peter.¹²³ J. Christiaan Beker asserts that the "in Christ" formula "belongs to the language of incorporation and derives basically from the concept of corporate personality."¹²⁴

The union with Christ inherent in this expression is described in a carefully balanced way in the chapter, "The Corporate Christ" in C. F. D. Moule's book The Phenomenon of the New Testament. He states that though Paul did see Jesus as one who related to his followers individually, he did not view Jesus

¹²³ John B. Nielson, In Christ (1960) , pp. 32, 33, 42.

¹²⁴ J. Christiaan Beker, Paul the Apostle: The Triumph of God in Life and Thought (1980), p. 273.

A Concept of Solidarity for an Understanding NT Themes

"as a mere individual but rather as an inclusive personality; one in whom Christians are incorporated by baptism."¹²⁵ In other words, the greatest emphasis is not Christ in man, but man in Christ.¹²⁶

Statements that say that Christ is *in the believer* are very rare. Such references as Col 1:27 "Christ in you the hope of glory," and 2 Cor 13:5 "Do you not realize that Jesus Christ is in you?" can be translated "among." Christ, though, is described as "dwelling in you" (Rom 8:10), and "dwelling in the heart" (Eph 3:17). A most notable case is: "it is no longer I who live, but Christ lives in me" (Gal 2:20). Other inferences of this regard are 1 Cor 12:6, 2 Cor 13:3, Gal 2:28, Eph 3:20, Phil 2:13, Col 1:29, 3:16.¹²⁷

But even though the equation goes at times both ways, by far most of the emphasis is on the many in the one and not the reverse. There is an imaginary fusion of many into the one corporate Christ. It is as a Fr. Thornton has excellently stated,

¹²⁵ Moule, p. 27.

¹²⁶ E. Best, One Body in Christ (1955), p. 9.

¹²⁷ Moule, p. 24,25.

Jesus, All in One

"We are in Christ, not as a pebble in a box, but as a branch in a tree."¹²⁸ It is difficult to improve on that illustration (John 15:5).

¹²⁸ J. A. T. Robinson , p. 62.

The New Race

Those who are in Christ are together with Christ in a new race (Rom 7:4, Gal 3:28, 29) and are a new personhood or creation (2 Cor 5:17, Rom 6:4). In Gal 3:16 Paul exercises the word "seed" (spermati). Paul says, "Now the promises were made to Abraham and his offspring. It does not say, 'And to your offspring,' referring to many; but, referring to one, and to your offspring, which is Christ."

Paul, no doubt, understands well that Genesis (12:3, 15:6, 22:18) is using a collective noun. But he is able to see Christ in the seed of Abraham distinctly, perhaps much as the tribe of Levi can be seen as "still in the loins of his ancestor Abraham when Melchizedek met him" (Heb 7:10).¹²⁹ In any case, the true remnant seed of Abraham is narrowed down to the one-Christ. Then in the conclusion in verse twenty-nine it again reverts back to the collective, including those who are joined to Christ in His body and in His Abrahamic racehood. Regardless

¹²⁹ Beker, p. 273.

Jesus, All in One

of the earthly nationality believers "are all one in Christ Jesus" (Gal 3:28c). Paul adds, "And if you are Christ's then you are Abraham's offspring, heirs according to promise" (Gal 3:29). Thus, the oscillation in this passage of the many to the one and the one to the many may best be explained by the principle of solidarity.¹³⁰

The new "Israel" does not abandon ethnic Israel and the covenant promises given to them (Rom 9-11).¹³¹ There are a faithful remnant (Rom 9:6, 27, 11:5) who are distinguished by Paul from the whole of Israel.¹³² The concept of such a remnant is well-developed in the Old Testament.¹³³ This remnant is represented by the olive tree with branches broken off and grafted in, showing a continuous solidarity with the past.¹³⁴ The New Testament church is therefore rooted in the Old Testament church.¹³⁵

¹³⁰ Ridderbos, pp. 61, 393

¹³¹ G. C. Berkouwer, The Return of Christ (1972), pp. 323-358.

¹³² Ladd, p. 538.

¹³³ Gerhard Hasel, The Remnant: The History and Theology of the Remnant Idea from Genesis to Isaiah (1974).

¹³⁴ C. H. Dodd, Romans. Dodd finds reference to the principle of solidarity in the teaching of the remnant, especially in Rom 11:16, "If the dough offered as first fruits is holy, so is the whole lump; and if the

A Concept of Solidarity for an Understanding NT Themes

The teaching of the "new Israel" is probably one of the places in the NT where the principle of solidarity is employed in its highest sense. No longer are found geographic and ethnic restrictions inherent in the family, the tribe, and the nation. Now there is a universal people (the church), with one national father, Christ. "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is neither male nor female; for you are all one in Christ Jesus" (Gal 3:28).

root is holy, so are the branches," and also in Rom 11:28 where Paul says, "as regards election they are beloved for the sake of their forefathers" pp. 178, 179.

¹³⁵ Ladd, p. 538.

The Nuclear Family

One more particular matter will be referenced as indicative of corporate thinking in the New Testament. This is the consideration of the “family,” or the family unit.

The family has been previously considered in a sense in the preceding pages as found in a tribe or nation, and also in other ways. But the intimate and local sense of the corporate family unit itself deserves further comment. The family is actually a supreme example of “solidarity” in the New Testament.

The collective nuance in the concept of family is perhaps more subtly presented in the New Testament perhaps.

Nevertheless many examples pervade the New Testament, and are found behind many of the words of Jesus and in the writings of Paul. The idea is very much resident.

A Concept of Solidarity for an Understanding NT Themes

Christological Family

In the teachings of Jesus the family inferences are many. Jesus infers such in the fact that he compares the “oneness” of his relationship with his father and uses the same language to describe the marital bond.¹³⁶

The most conspicuous teaching in this regard is found in the principal titles applied to Christ: “The Son of God,” “The Son of Man.” The Father/Son designation was used consistently by Jesus and demands that we look at Jesus’ words and teachings as indicating that he desired that relationships with the divine being to be thought of in terms of “family.” Even in the “Lord’s Prayer” Jesus taught that believers were to pray: “Our Father.”¹³⁷ The powerful inference is thus provided in this that each individual believer is not only seen as solid with the divine, but that each believer is considered as a brother and sister to Christ himself, and thus a member of the divine family.

¹³⁶ Matthew 19:4-6; John 17:22.

¹³⁷ Matthew 6: 8-13.

Jesus, All in One

Pauline Writings

In the writings of Paul the teaching of the corporate family unit continues. In Romans the suppliant is enjoined through the Spirit to say: “Abba,” “father.”¹³⁸ The idea is that the Christian believer has been adopted into the divine family, and thus “we are the children of God: And if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ. . . .”¹³⁹

Another idea, found also in the OT as well is the idea of taking the family name after that of the father figure. As a wife typically through history has taken her husband’s name as an example of solidarity with him in creating a family unit so this practice is applied to adoption into the divine family.

Paul writes in Ephesians: ¹⁴⁰

¹³⁸ Romans 8:15

¹³⁹ Ibid., vs. 16b, 17a.

¹⁴⁰ Ephesians 3: 14,15.

A Concept of Solidarity for an Understanding NT Themes

"For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named."

The family name is here applied to the wife and children of the kingdom. In the Old Testament are several uses of the family name concept. In Isaiah God says:

"Fear not: for I have redeemed thee, I have called thee by thy name; thou art mine."¹⁴¹

The claim that the believer is designated by a "father" God as: "mine," suggests a family intimacy, for it was the paternal prerogative to name the child, most often--if male, after himself. The naming ceremony was very important in near Eastern culture. Thus the Lord speaks to Solomon:

"If my people, which are called by my name, shall humble themselves, and pray, and seek my face, and turn from their evil ways; then will I hear from heaven, and will forgive their sin, and will heal their land."¹⁴²

¹⁴¹ Isaiah 43:1,2.

¹⁴² 2 Chron 7:14.

Jesus, All in One

Therefore the family is a powerful and appropriate corporate symbol in the New Testament and accords with the teaching of solidarity as found there. While it may not be a symbol of absolute incorporeteness, it still is an example of collective solidarity, as “bone of bone” and “flesh of flesh.”

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION

The preceding survey has touched on a few key New Testament themes which demonstrate solidarity. It is the conclusion that this principle indeed underlies many of the passages considered. There are others that could be considered, and the ones that were could give way to much greater depth.

There is a note of caution, however, that is to be given here. The intention of this study was not to teach an idea of "literalism" as an application of this principle in order to exclude the fact that many of the figures discussed are simply metaphors. For many of the Gospel teachings must be viewed as symbolic. The intent was to show how this concept can be recognized as a possible reason that the truths were expressed in the manner they were and thus lead to an understanding of them.

Jesus, All in One

In summary, the application of the principle has led to several specific conclusions. In the Gospels and Acts it was noticed that Jesus identity with His "saints" is an incorporate one, exemplified best perhaps in Matt 25 in the Parable of the Sheep and the Goats. Also, the principle of solidarity was seen standing behind the New Testament teaching of bloodguilt. In addition, the study sought to establish Jesus as the one, ideal, Servant of God, the one in the many. Likewise, the Son of Man title may also may be seen as denoting a representative significance. The study dealt briefly with how Jesus incorporates believers through His sacrifice and through the symbolism of the Eucharistic celebration.

In the last major heading within the Gospels and Acts, the temple symbolism was examined, conveniently anticipating some of the Pauline teachings and the teachings of 1 Peter on this subject. A trial explanation was proffered as to how the temple symbolism could be found as a consistent illustration (including Matt 16), with Christ as the foundation rock of the temple/church.

In Pauline theology there was a look at the corporate symbol of the body of Christ as one of the highest examples of collective thinking. This led to the interpretation of the

A Concept of Solidarity for an Understanding NT Themes

Adam-Christ parallel in Romans 5 to be understood in terms of "realistic" incorporation also. Also applied was the new nation and family in Christ.

In a similar vein, the corporate Christ constructions were examined. At last, the idea of a new Israel formed under the banner of Christ was investigated, and the study saw another oscillation from the one to the many apparent, especially in Galatians. The New Testament was seen enobling and refining the concept of collective solidarity into its most elevated expression.

Jesus, All in One

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Barclay, William. The Letter to the Romans. The Daily Study Bible Series, rev. ed. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1975.

_____. Jesus as They Saw Him. Grand Rapids: William Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1962.

Beker, J. Christiaan. Paul the Apostle: The Triumph of God in Life and Thought. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980.

Berkouwer, G. C. Rapids: 1971. Studies in Dogmatics: Sin. Grand William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company,

_____. The Return of Christ. Studies in Dogmatics. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1972.

Best, E. One Body in Christ. London: SPCK, 1955.

Black, Matthew. "The Christological Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament," New Testament Studies 18 (1971-71): 1-14.

Brown, Colin. "Present." The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1975. 2: 886-935.

Brownlee, W. H. "The Servant of the Lord in the Qumran Scrolls." Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research 132 (Dec 1953): 8-15; 135 (Oct 1954): 33-38.

Jesus, All in One

Clements, R. E. God and Temple. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1965.

Cohen, A. Everyman's Talmud. New York: Schocken Books, 1949.

Cullmann, Oscar. Peter: Disciple, Apostle, Martyr, trans. by Floyd V. Filson. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1953.

_____. The Christology of the New Testament. rev. ed., trans. by Shirley C. Guthrie and Charles A. M. Hall. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1963.

Dodd, Charles H. The Epistle of Paul to the Romans. The Moffatt New Testament Commentary. London: Hodder and Stoughton Limited, 1932.

Encyclopaedia Biblica. "Cornerstone." London: Adam and Charles Black, 1899. 1:913.

Fawcett, Thomas. London: Hebrew Myth and Christian Gospel. StM Press Ltd., 1973.

Fitzmyer, Joseph. "The Aramaic Language and the Study of the New Testament." Journal of Biblical Literature 99 (March, 1980): 5-21.

Ford, Desmond. Daniel. Nashville, Tennessee: Southern Publishing Association, 1978.

Garnet, Paul. Salvation and Atonement in the Qumran Scrolls. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1977.

Gärtner, Bertil. The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series I. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965.

A Concept of Solidarity for an Understanding NT Themes

Gross, G. "Die 'geringsten Brüder' Jesu in Mt 25:40 in Auseinandersetzung mit der neueren Exegese." Bibel und Leben 5 (March 1964): 172-180.

Gundry, Robert H. Sōma in Biblical Theology: With Emphasis on Pauline Anthropology. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.

Hasel, Gerhard. The Remnant: The History and Theology of the Remnant Idea from Genesis to Isaiah. Berrien Springs, Michigan: Andrews University Press, 1974.

Horn, Siegfried H. Seventh-day Adventist Bible Dictionary. S . v. "Babel." Washington, D. C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1960.

Jeremias, Joachim. "ἁθος." Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, ~964. 4:268-280.

_____. The Eucharistic Words of Jesus. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966.

King, L. W. Babylonian Religion and Mythology. Books on Egypt and Chaldea, vol. IV. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trobner & Co., Ltd., 1899.

Knight, George A. F. (Feb 1960): "Thou Art Peter." 168-180. Theology Today 17

Ladd, George Eldon. A Theology of the New Testament. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1974.

Jesus, All in One

Manson, T. W. The Servant-Messiah: A Study of the Public Ministry of Jesus. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953.

McKelvey, R. J. The New Temple. Oxford University Press, 1969.

McKenzie, John L. Second Isaiah. The Anchor Bible. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1968.

Meier, John P. Matthew. New Testament Message (A Biblical Theological Commentary). Wilmington, Delaware: Michael Glazier, Inc., 1980.

Moule, C. F. D. The Phenomenon of the New Testament. Naperville, Ill.: Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1967.

Mundle, W. "ᾠνία." The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1975. 3:388-390.

_____. "πέτρα." The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1975. 3:383.

Nielson, John B. In Christ. Kansas City, Missouri: Beacon Hill Press, 1960.

Paton, Lewis Bayles. "Baal, Beel, Bel." Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics. James Hastings, ed. 12 vols. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1913. 2:287-288.

Peake, Arthur S. The Servant of Yahweh. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1931.

Pirké de Rabbi Eliezer. trans. by Gerald Friedlander. New York: Benjamine Blom, Inc., 1971.

A Concept of Solidarity for an Understanding NT Themes

Ridderbos, Herman. Paul: An Outline of His Theology.
Translated by John Richard de Witt. Grand
Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1975.

Robinson, H. Wheeler. Corporate Personality in Ancient
Israel. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1964.

_____. The Religious Ideas of the Old
Testament. London: Gerald Duckworth & Company, Ltd.,
1952.

Robinson, John A. T. The Body: A Study in Pauline
Theology. Studies in Biblical Theology, no. 5. Chicago:
Henry Regnery, 1952.

Robinson, Theodore H. The Gospel of Matthew. The Moffatt
New Testament Commentary. London: Hodder and Stoughton,
Ltd., 1951.

Rowley, Harold H. The Servant of the Lord and Other Essays
on the Old Testament. London: Lutterworth Press, 1952.

Seebass, H. "Adam." The New International Dictionary of
New Testament Theology. Grand Rapids: Zondervan
Publishing House, 1975. 1:84-87.

The Interpreter's Bible. vols. New York: George Arthur
Buttrick, ed. 12 Abingdon Press, 1952.

The Treatises of Cyprian. The Ante-Nicene Fathers. Vol. 5
Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company,
1957.

The Zohar. trans. by Harry Sperling and Maurice Simon. 5
vols. London: The Soncino Press, 1933.

Jesus, All in One

White, Ellen G. The Desire of Ages. Mountain View, California: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1898, 1940.

Wilcox, Max. "Peter and the Rock: A Fresh Look at Matthew XVI. 17-19. 'I New Testament Studies 22 (1975-76): 73-88.

Young, Robert. Analytical Concordance to the Bible. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1970.