ARTICLES

DIVINE AGENTS, MEDIATORS, AND NEW TESTAMENT CHRISTOLOGY

I. REFORMULATING THE QUESTION

ITS preoccupation with its founder has always been one of the distinguishing marks of Christianity, and the New Testament certainly cannot be understood properly without a clear grasp of what it proclaims about Jesus. Far from being merely one of the many topics addressed in the New Testament, Christology is arguably the basis upon which most other crucial issues were approached and settled; in the words of Ben F. Meyer, '[t]he first Christians assimilated great changes in perspective and role and purpose by filtering them through christological reflection'.[1] It is, therefore, not surprising that the origin and development of Christology has remained high on the agenda of the critical study of the New Testament throughout this century.

Yet, this is one of the areas in which a large amount of previous scholarship has recently been called into question and a need for new approaches recognized. For instance, we have long been used to models of christological evolution which emphasize the changes brought about as early Palestinian Jewish Christianity gradually became a movement of Hellenistic Gentiles who brought with them from pagan cultures very different conceptions of what might be attributed to, and expected from, a saviour figure.[2] This sort of analysis, which can be traced back to Wilhelm Bousset, has been undercut by new knowledge of Palestinian Judaism itself and by a more precise understanding of the chronology of early Christianity.[3] Similarly, the long-pursued goal of establishing an understanding of New Testament Christology based on the analysis of christological titles and their antecedents in pre-Christian

---

[1] Ben F. Meyer, *The Early Christians. Their World Mission and Self-Discovery* (Good News Studies 16; Wilmington, Delaware: Michael Glazier, 1986), 23; cf. 20–21.

[2] See, for example, R. H. Fuller, *The Foundation of New Testament Christology* (London: Lutterworth, 1965).

[3] Wilhelm Bousset, *Kyrios Christos: Geschichte des Christusglaubens von den Anfangen des Christentums bis Irenaeus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1913). For the recent critique of Bousset's work, see Larry W. Hurtado, 'New Testament Christology: A Critique of Bousset's Influence', *TS* 40 (1979), 306–317; and 'New Testament Christology: Retrospect and Prospect', *Semeia* 30 (1984), 15–27.

sources has been challenged on methodological grounds as well as on the grounds of its lack of generally acceptable results.[4] Thus, the search for new and more fruitful ways of tackling this complex issue has been accelerating.

One of the most important products of this search is Larry W. Hurtado's *One God, One Lord*.[5] In an effort to overcome weaknesses in christological research such as those just described (particularly the first), Hurtado turns his attention to what he describes as the notion of divine agency in Second Temple Judaism. He argues that many Jews, without compromising their commitment to monotheism, postulated and speculated about one or more other beings who might be considered God's pre-eminent heavenly servants, higher and closer to him than all the rest of creation. Hurtado organizes his survey of the relevant Jewish literature in terms of three general types of beings who appear in this role: personified divine attributes such as Wisdom or the Logos; exalted patriarchs like Enoch and Moses; and supreme angels like Michael.

His presentation demonstrates that Jesus' status in the New Testament is very much akin to some ideas about divine agents expressed in Jewish literature; hypotheses involving the Christian adaptation of non-Jewish conceptions are not required to explain the general characteristics of New Testament Christology. The significant difference in Christianity was that, from the earliest stages we can trace, Jesus was an object of worship; this cannot be demonstrated for any of the Jewish divine agents. It was this 'binitarian shape' of Christian devotion, itself rooted in the visionary and other religious experiences of the early Christians, which prompted the conceptual developments to which most christological study is directed.[6] These developments, however, drew in the first instance on notions of divine agency familiar to Christians of Jewish heritage.

[4] Major exemplars of motif research include O. Cullmann, *The Christology of the New Testament* (trans. S. Guthrie, C. Hall; London: SCM, 1963); Ferdinand Hahn, *Christologische Hoheitstitel* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963); James D. G. Dunn, *Christology in the Making. A New Testament Inquiry Into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1980). For the critique of motif research as a leading approach to the study of New Testament Christology, see Philip G. Davis, 'The mythic Enoch: New light on early christology,' *SR* 13 (1984), 335–336; Leander Keck, 'Toward the Renewal of New Testament Christology', *NTS* 32 (1986), 368–372; D. R. de Lacey, 'Jesus as Mediator', *JSNT* 29 (1987), 101–102.

[5] Hurtado, *One God, One Lord. Early Christian Devotion and Ancient Jewish Monotheism* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988).

[6] Hurtado, 'The Binitarian Shape of Early Christian Devotion and Ancient Jewish Monotheism,' *SBLASP* 1985, 377–391; *One God*, 12, 99–124.

Hurtado's study is a major step forward in locating early Christian thought and practice within the spectrum of first-century Judaism, while at the same time isolating some of the innovations which would, in due course, lead Christianity out of its Jewish matrix. On the other hand, further progress in our understanding of these matters requires a more refined and differentiated approach to the sources than the single category of divine agency admits. Hurtado's definition of divine agency is sufficiently broad as to permit such diverse entities as Wisdom, Enoch, Moses, and Michael to share the same rubric.[7] By bringing some other fundamental issues to bear on the question, we can expect to gain more precision in describing the relationship between New Testament Christology and the various notions of divine agency which appear in Jewish literature.

Divine agency, in Hurtado's usage, is primarily a matter of status; divine agents '... are each described as representing God in a unique capacity and stand in a role second only to God himself, thus being distinct from all the other servants and agents of God'.[8] If we seek to establish more specific correlations between New Testament Christology and certain forms of divine-agent thinking, however, other factors must be brought into play: particularly function as opposed to status.[9] Our task here is a somewhat delicate one: to press beyond the generalities of the divine agency conception without falling into the difficulties associated with atomistic motif research. E. P. Sanders' emphasis on the study of patterns rather than motifs provides a helpful guide.[10] For our purposes, we must ask whether it is possible to identify one or more patterns in the functions attributed to Jewish divine agents on the one hand, and to Jesus on the other.[11]

II. JEWISH PATTERNS OF MEDIATION

Despite the risk of oversimplification, there is some cogency to Joseph Campbell's observation that 'the high function of

[7] Paul Rainbow suggests that Hurtado's definition may be too broad to be useful ('Jewish Monotheism as the Matrix for New Testament Christology: A review Article', *NovT* 33:1 [1991], 84–85).

[8] Hurtado, *One God*, 18.

[9] Compare De Lacey, 'Jesus as Mediator', 103.

[10] E. P. Sanders, 'Patterns of Religion in Paul and Rabbinic Judaism: A Holistic Method of Comparison', *HTR* 66 (1973), 455–478; *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977), 12–18. The appropriateness of Sanders' method to the study of New Testament Christology is suggested in Davis, 'Mythic Enoch', 335–336; Keck, 'Renewal', 372; and Hurtado, *One God*, 10.

[11] This article is based on a paper read to the annual meeting of the Canadian Society of Biblical Studies at McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada,

Occidental myth and ritual ... is to establish a means of relation-ship—of God to Man and Man to God'.[12] New Testament Christology is, above all, the articulation of such a means of relationship, as is well expressed in 1 Tim. 2: 5 (RSV): 'There is one God, and there is one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus.' Jesus was not simply honoured as a being of high status; rather, he was worshipped and served as the one who did and could set human beings right with God. If there is anything typically Christian, it is the insistence that one historical human being, known by name, is the channel through which all others must establish a relationship with God. We should expect, then, that the nearest Jewish analogues to the New Testament Christ figure will be divine agents who are not merely models, examples, or ideal types, but effective mediators in the sense that they are considered to have some real and personal effect on the relationship between God and other people. As de Lacey put it, '[t]he various sorts of mediator, and the ways in which they were seen to operate, need further investigation, and meanwhile we deliberately leave the idea of 'mediation' as vague as possible'.[13] This latter point is essential if we are not to overlook some of the relevant evidence; we must avoid deciding in advance how a genuine mediator must mediate.

To achieve our goal of increased precision in the delineation of Jewish divine agents in the literature of the period and of the sorts of agency attributed to Jesus, we must try to distinguish several different patterns of mediation.[14] While one might think, in the first instance, of concentrating upon specific forms or acts of mediation, these are so many and varied that the resulting plethora of categories would lead us back into motif research. A much simpler way of distinguishing mediators according to patterns which are flexible enough to incorporate numerous motifs in

[12] Joseph Campbell, *The Masks of God: Occidental Mythology* (New York: Viking, 1964), 4.

[13] De Lacey, 'Jesus as Mediator', 104.

[14] I have consulted most of the literature which can be dated reliably to the period between the third century BC and the second century AD: the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha (using J. H. Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, I and II [London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1983–85]), the Dead Sea Scrolls, Philo, and Josephus. I make reference to some documents whose relevance to this period is a matter of debate, notably the 'Similitudes' of Enoch, 2 Enoch, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, and some Tannaitic material, but I have been careful not to argue any case which depends heavily on evidence from these sources. The extra difficulties associated with the Targums precludes them from consideration here.

coherent ways would be to focus on the issue of time. Precisely when was a particular divine agent acting, or expected to act, as a significant mediator? A simple, neutral distinction between the past (both primordial and historical), the present (as the ongoing state of affairs known to the intended readers of the literary sources), and the future (an anticipated change in the state of affairs) makes possible some interesting suggestions about early Christology and its affinities with particular cases of Jewish divine-agent thinking.

Abraham provides a useful illustration of mediation from the past; I say 'from' rather than 'in' to emphasize the idea that his mediating work remained valid for, and binding on, later generations. The themes of election and covenant, circumcision, and the promise of land, progeny, and blessing, all explicitly linked to Abraham in Genesis, reappear with him in numerous texts from both Palestine and the Diaspora. This constellation of themes is properly a matter of mediation because it is Abraham's elect descendants who are recognized as heirs to it all. This biblically based portrait is embellished in several later writings with specific new details. Jubilees attributes to Abraham a large body of teaching, including a number of cultic requirements laid upon his descendants (13: 25–27; 16: 20–31; 22: 1–9). 4 Ezra 3: 14 and The Apocalypse of Abraham picture him as a recipient of eschatological revelation, although only the latter indicates that he passed it on to those who followed. Pseudo-Eupolemus (Eusebius, *Praep. Ev.* 9.17.8) goes so far as to claim that the vaunted wisdom of the Egyptians, including astrology, originated when Abraham sojourned in Egypt and taught it to them.

All of this illustrates the idea of mediation from the past inasmuch as these achievements were assigned to Abraham's historical existence; yet, they continue in effect regardless of Abraham's own status or function after his death. For the sake of convenience, this will be labelled 'the legacy pattern'. The word 'legacy' is intended simply to connote that the work of the individual mediator remained in force for later generations. This sense of ongoing potency is evident in the various claims that God later acted on Israel's behalf for the sake of Abraham, or of all three patriarchs (Sir. 44: 22; Pr. Azar 12; *Mek. Pisha* 16: 165–8; *Mek. Beshallah* 4: 29–30, 52, 58–59; *Mek. Vayassa'* 3: 1–7; *Sifre* Deut. 184; 332). No further activity on the part of these biblical heroes is presumed to account for the divine blessings bestowed in later times; rather, the legacy of God's favour towards them continues in effect long after they have passed from the scene.

Everything attributed to Abraham in the literature under con-

sideration fits this pattern. Even when some Diaspora literature appears to go beyond the bounds of the legacy pattern, closer examination reveals this to be of little consequence. For instance, while 4 Macc. 13: 17 shows Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob receiving martyrs in the next life, the thrust of the work is to present both the biblical heroes and the family of Eleazar as examples of that pious reason which triumphs over adversity and wins the ultimate reward; no genuine mediation belongs within such a framework, and none is seriously suggested. Similarly, while Apoc. Zeph. 9: 5 and 11: 4–6 show the patriarchs interceding for individuals at the final judgment, this work does not attribute decisive significance to their intercession.

The same proves to be true of David. Again, numerous biblical and post-biblical texts bear witness to the ongoing potency of the Davidic covenant of kingship and kingdom. His role in establishing Zion as the holy city seems to have grown with the passage of time; despite the testimony of the Deuteronomistic history, we find that many sources attribute to David the detailed planning of the temple and its cult (1 Chr. 22–28; Sir. 47: 9–10; 3 Ezra 1: 15; 5: 60; 8: 49; Josephus, *Ant.* 7.14.7, 9, §363–367, 375–379; *Mek. Shirata* 1: 25–34; *t. Ta'anith* 3: 2). Several texts cite him as a source of prophetic knowledge (4 Macc. 18: 10, 15; Josephus, *Ant.* 8.4.2, §109–110; *Sifre* Deut. 1).

Most important, of course, is his connection with the monarchy itself. It is his role as founding father of the divinely legitimated dynasty that prompts the idea of David as both model and progenitor of the ideal future king (4QFlor; 4QpIsa[a]; Pss. Sol. 17: 21; 4 Ezra 12: 32; *Mek. Pisha* 1: 54–57). This, again, fits the legacy pattern: David's historical accomplishments ground later developments without presuming any further activity on his part. David himself appears in later literature as a model, a great and/or tragic figure, but nothing further was expected of him personally.[15] His legacy of Zion, kingship, and temple had a life of its own.

We turn now to the notion of mediation in the present; this sort of mediator is one who makes available some form of real interaction between God and living human beings. Such mediation took many different forms in ancient Judaism. Two concrete illustrations are provided by the institutional priesthood on the one hand, and the various charismatics, shamans, and magicians

---

[15] J. Wojcik, 'Discrimination against David's Tragedy in Ancient Jewish and Christian Literature', in R.-J. Frontain and J. Wojcik, eds., *The David Myth in Western Literature* (Lafayette, Indiana: Purdue University Press, 1980), 12–35; J. M. Bassler, 'A Man for All Seasons: David in Rabbinic and New Testament Literature', *Interpretation* 40 (1986), 156–169.

who plied their trade on the other. These are interesting cases both in their own right and in terms of the light they may shed on Jesus' career. Our present focus on post-Easter Christology, however, means that the question of a personal, heavenly mediator is paramount here. The attribution of mediation in this sense appears generally in connection with angels.

Gabriel, for instance, is made available by name twice to the seer in Daniel. On one occasion, Daniel sees the vision of the ram and the goat and overhears an angelic commentary; when he seeks a fuller understanding of these mysteries, it is Gabriel who is sent to explain (8: 15–26). Similarly, when Daniel prays for an explanation of Jeremiah's prophecies concerning a 70-year period of desolation, Gabriel is the one who responds with the famous passage about the 70 weeks of years (9: 20–27). This angel appears several times in 1 Enoch as well. His general duties are described in 20: 7 as the overseeing of 'the garden of Eden, and the serpents, and the cherubim'. In chapter 9 he is one of the angels who successfully appeal to God for action on behalf of the suffering righteous after the depredations of the fallen Watchers and their unholy offspring; he is sent specifically against the latter in 10: 9.

Raphael has a similar role in 1 Enoch. In 20: 3 he is cryptically linked with 'the spirits of man'. He has a more elaborate role in the fight against the fallen angels, being assigned to imprison their leader Azaz'el (10: 4–8). Further, he accompanies Enoch on one of the latter's cosmic tours and identifies the tree of knowledge in the garden of Eden. In addition, Raphael appears in Tobit as God's disguised emissary who frees both Tobit from his blindness and Sarah from her demonic lover.

Analogous activities are ascribed in various sources both to other, lesser-known angels and to angels who remain nameless. Anonymous angels intercede with God for the righteous (1 Enoch 89: 76), explain visions (Dan. 7: 16–27), and assist the afflicted (Dan. 6: 22; 1 Enoch 90: 14; Pr. Azar 26; 2 Macc. 15: 22–23; 4 Macc. 4: 10).

What marks these activities as fitting a pattern of mediation different from the legacy pattern is primarily the evident supposition that angelic assistance is not restricted to the primordial past or to the ideal future. Because these beings were presumed to be immortal, claims of angelic intervention on previous occasions would at least raise the possibility of such intervention being available at any time; accordingly, we may label this 'the intervention pattern'. Stories of angelic activity in the past do not always attribute ongoing significance to the acts themselves (although assigning a particular revelation to an angel would enhance its

claim to authority) so much as present a picture of what angels may do at any time.

Such stories are frequent enough to suggest that this possibility was taken seriously in some circles at least. Particularly pertinent is the fact that the reports of angelic involvement in human affairs in 1 Enoch 90 and in 2 and 4 Maccabees, cited above, involved events of the comparatively recent past; the reader is given no reason to suspect that the angels' availability has been withdrawn in the meantime. More broadly, we may refer to Christopher Rowland's persuasive argument for defining apocalyptic literature by its claim to record revelations of divine mysteries (regardless of the content of those mysteries).[16] Rowland concludes that these works reflect some actual religious experiences, rather than being purely literary inventions.[17] If he is correct, as seems entirely likely, then every properly apocalyptic text featuring a particular heavenly agent becomes itself a potential instance of the intervention pattern.

Finally, we turn to cases in which a particular figure is awaited to play a significant role in fulfilling, restoring, or extending God's relationship with his people in the future.[18] Understandably, few named individuals are presented in the literature in such a manner, which we may label 'the consummation pattern'. Elijah is the surest example. He has no canonical book ascribed to him and never appears in the literature under consideration as having established a legacy in our sense of the term. While the story of his ascent into heaven is widely noted, no effective activity is ascribed to him in that setting, and so the intervention pattern does not appear. Rather, the suggestion of his eventual return in Mal. 4: 5 casts him in an eschatological role.

Apart from Sib. Or. 2: 187–189, which note his appearance as a sign of the approaching end, the evidence is confined to literature from Palestine and is, moreover, relatively scant. *Liv. Proph.* 21: 3 mentions him as judging Israel, but perhaps refers only to his historical career. 1 Enoch 90: 31 places him at the judgment, but without any particular duties. In Sir. 48: 10 and *m. 'Ed.* 8: 7, we are told that his major purpose when he comes will be reconcili-

---

[16] Christopher Rowland, *The Open Heaven. A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity* (London: SPCK, 1982), 9–22.

[17] Rowland, *Open Heaven*, 214–247.

[18] Rainbow argues that eschatological figures should be treated as a distinct category ('Jewish Monotheism', 88). The figures he suggests, Enoch and Melchizedek, are arguably more than just eschatological, however; see section IV, below.

ation. As others have shown, there is no Jewish source from this period which pictures Elijah as the forerunner of the Messiah.[19]

Anonymous figures of varying significance are more common in eschatological writings. Unnamed angels, for example, are sometimes shown taking part in the final judgment (e.g., Testament of Abraham, Recension A, chap. 12); frequently, they have kept the records of human deeds upon which judgment is based (1 Enoch 89: 61–64; Apoc. Zeph. 3: 6–9).

What must be noted especially is this: all the passages which are generally treated under the heading of 'Jewish messianic expectation' exhibit the consummation pattern exclusively. In many cases, the awaited mediator and deliverer belongs entirely to the future. In Psalms of Solomon 17, for instance, there is a clear transition in subject matter from past and present desolation to future deliverance at verse 21; the son of David is an object of hope who has not yet made his appearance, much less accomplished anything. The 'chosen one' of Apoc. Abr. 31: 1 is promised but not yet sent.

There are other books which indicate that the awaited deliverer already exists prior to carrying out his duties. 4 Ezra 13: 26 and 2 Apoc. Bar. 29: 1 seem to presume that God is sending an already existing being to enact the final accomplishment of the divine purposes. In the Similitudes of Enoch, the Elect One/Son of Man, though pre-existent, remains concealed until the great eschatological revelation. These cases still fit the consummation pattern insofar as the redeemer figure performs no mediating functions prior to the eschaton. He has established no legacy; no appeals for pre-eschatological intervention are directed to him. Only in a future qualitatively different from the present (imminent though it might be) will he have a bearing on the relationship between God and his creatures.

The examples given so far, complex though some of them may be in matters of detail not treated here, provide clear illustrations of the three basic patterns of mediation. While some of these figures are portrayed as being available in the present, others act only in the past or in the future. These examples have been provided precisely because of their comparative clarity; there remains the possibility of a single mediator figure transcending these distinctions to embody a multiple pattern.

[19] See M. M. Faierstein, 'Why do the Scribes say that Elijah must come first?' *JBL* 100 (1981), 75–86; J. Fitzmyer, 'More about Elijah coming First', *JBL* 104 (1985), 295–296. Contrast D. C. Allison, 'Elijah must come First', *JBL* 103 (1984), 256–258.

III. NEW TESTAMENT PATTERNS OF MEDIATION

In actual fact, when we turn to the New Testament from the foregoing sort of inquiry, we find that the early Christian writers commonly portray Jesus in a way which combines the patterns of mediation which have just been distinguished. From their standpoint, Jesus' role as mediator is one which cannot be confined to one act or period of time. This circumstance can be illustrated from several of the major New Testament authors.

Paul's Christology, for instance, involves the legacy pattern insofar as he saw in Jesus' past work a decisive moment in the continuing relationship between God and humanity at large. As is well known, Paul accepted and taught the personal pre-existence of Christ (Phil. 2: 6) and the importance of the very fact that Christ came into the world (Phil. 2: 7; Gal. 4: 4–5). Jesus' legacy in a narrower sense included his teaching (1 Cor. 7: 10) but was enacted primarily in his death and resurrection (Rom. 5: 6–10, 18–19; Gal. 3: 13–14; 1 Cor. 15: 3; 2 Cor. 5: 14–15).[20] The intervention pattern appears in Paul's claim to his own immediate encounters with the exalted Christ (Gal. 1: 12; 2 Cor. 12: 1–4, 8–9) and in some of his more mystical statements about the indwelling Christ (Rom. 8: 9–11; 1 Cor. 6: 15–17; 2 Cor. 4: 10–11; 13: 3), which evince the belief that a personal power identifiable as Jesus was present in the lives of believers. Finally, Paul looked towards a future in which Christ would play the central role, both for him as an individual (Phil. 1: 23) and for the cosmos (1 Cor. 15, using Christ's past resurrection as a guarantee of the coming consummation; 2 Cor. 5: 10). In terms of our discussion, Paul manifestly exhibits a triple pattern of mediation in his Christology: the saving accomplishments of Christ embrace past, present, and future.

The same is true of Matthew. His nativity story is carefully crafted to show that Jesus' coming into the world was an essential part of God's long-standing plan of salvation. Matthew, perhaps more than any other New Testament writer, highlights the ongoing importance of the teachings of Jesus for the obtaining of salvation (7: 21–27; 28: 19–20) and the life of the Church (18: 15–17). His precise statement of the atoning value of Jesus' death (26: 28) completes the legacy element. The intervention pattern is visible in Matthew's assertions of Jesus' personal presence in the Church (18: 20; 28: 20). Finally, Matthew gives more

---

[20] On the role of Jesus' teachings in Pauline Christianity, see David Dungan, *The Sayings of Jesus in the Churches of Paul* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971).

prominence to the consummation pattern than do the other evangelists with his christocentric portrait of the eschaton (13: 41; 22: 2; 24: 42; 25: 1, 31.)

The elements for a triple pattern of mediation are present in Luke's double work as well, although he may be said to offer less in the way of theoretical teaching than other New Testament writers.[21] The legacy of biblical revelation is portrayed as coming to fruition in the death and resurrection of Christ (Luke 24: 45–47); these past events then serve to ground both the affirmation of the present exalted status of Jesus (Acts 2: 32–36) and the call to take hold of salvation (2: 37–39). In Acts, the heavenly Christ intervenes either personally (9: 5) or through the Spirit which he sent (1: 8; 2: 33). Finally, while expectation of the second coming may be less intense in Luke-Acts than in Matthew, it has by no means disappeared (Luke 21: 27; Acts 1: 11).

The triple pattern is visible in John as well. Again, the legacy element includes the coming of the pre-existent Christ into the world, in the creation of which John shows him involved (1: 1–18); the teaching he leaves in the world (3: 34; 14: 15, 20–24); and his saving death (12: 23–33). The intervention pattern appears in John's statements of the spiritual union between Christ and the believers (14: 18–20; 17: 23) and in Christ's promise of the Paraclete (16: 7). While John's picture of the ultimate events usually differs considerably in detail from that of Matthew, it is no less christocentric (3: 16–21, 36; 5: 25–29; 6: 44, 54; 14: 2–3).

The case of Mark is more difficult. The legacy pattern is easily seen (coming into the world, 12: 6; teaching, 1: 27; saving death, 10: 45), as is the consummation pattern (8: 38–9:1; 13: 26). It is the element of intervention which seems, on a cursory reading, to be lacking in Mark's Christology, depending upon whether the risen Jesus' reunion with his disciples in Galilee (14: 28; 16: 7) is taken to be eschatological or to have been fulfilled after Easter.[22] As I have argued elsewhere, however, Mark uses the title 'Son of Man' to convey, paradoxically, the idea that the human Jesus possessed unique divine authority: he was the man who did what only God can do.[23] Further, Mark's undertanding of discipleship

---

[21] Stephen G. Wilson, *The Gentiles and the Gentile Mission in Luke-Acts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973), 254–255; C. F. Evans, *Saint Luke* (London: SCM, 1990), 64–65.

[22] Ernest Best has argued that Mark's Jesus '...is continually present with the community...', basing the argument only on the two promises of reunion in Galilee and on the inference that Mark's lack of specific resurrection appearances points to an ongoing, unseen presence ('The Purpose of Mark', *Irish Biblical Association Proceedings* 6 [1982], 31).

[23] Davis, 'Mark's Christological Paradox', *JSNT* 35 (1989), 9–11.

is one which entails the transformation of human nature, bringing
it into conformity with the Son of Man himself; the Christian life
is the Christ-like life, defined by the imitation of his threefold
work of ministering, suffering, and judging (3: 14–15; 6: 7–11;
13: 9–13).[24] For Mark, Jesus' ongoing presence and activity in
the world is real enough, though it is visible primarily in, and
through, the activities of those who serve him (particularly the
Church leadership, as portrayed in the Twelve).[25] Such a down-
to-earth perspective on mediation in the present is not surprising
from an author who tends also, in comparison with the other
evangelists, to minimize the significance of supernatural beings
like Satan.[26]

Without belabouring the point any further, it seems fair to say
that a triple pattern of mediation may be characteristic of New
Testament Christology generally; the writers just mentioned,
along with others who have left us enough material to assess,
evidently saw the real saving work of Christ as a multifarious
activity which transcended the limitations of past, present, and
future. They vary in their emphases, as any student of New
Testament Christology knows, but the consistency of the basic
pattern across a variety of sources is impressive.

Here we see clearly why study of Jewish messianic expectations
has never been able to account fully for the shape of New
Testament Christology: it addresses the element of consummation
in isolation from other patterns of mediation, while the major
New Testament sources generally combine all three. We can see,
also, how over-reliance on the differentia of motif research has
tended to obscure for contemporary scholarship the underlying
unity of early Christianity assumed by the Christians themselves.[27]
The basis of that unity was manifestly christological, a circum-
stance we can observe in the pervasiveness of the triple pattern of
mediation.

We must, then, return to the Jewish literature to ascertain
whether a triple pattern of mediation appears in connection with
any of the divine-agent figures known there. The consistency with
which diverse Christian sources display the triple pattern raises

---

[24] Davis, 'Christology, Discipleship and Self-Understanding in the Gospel of
Mark', in D. Hawkin and T. Robinson, eds., *Self-Definition and Self-Discovery in
Early Christianity: a case of shifting horizons* (Lewiston/Queenston/Lampeter:
Edwin Mellen, 1990), 108–111.

[25] Davis, 'Christology, Discipleship', 114–118.

[26] Davis, 'Mark's Christological Paradox', 6–7.

[27] Meyer, *Early Christians*, 174.

the possibility that the pattern itself may not have been a Christian innovation.[28]

IV. THE TRIPLE PATTERN IN JUDAISM

As was mentioned above, Hurtado conveniently distinguishes three categories of divine-agent figures. Personified divine attributes, the first of these, share a feature which brings them into line with the triple pattern of mediation: as divine attributes, they are necessarily eternal as is God himself, operating in past, present, and future. Thus, there is some common ground between the personified divine attributes and New Testament Christology, which is perhaps most easily seen in those passages which evoke the divine Wisdom as they assign to the pre-existent Christ a role in creation (John 1: 3, 10; Col. 1: 15–16; cf. Prov. 8: 22–31; Sir. 24: 5–6; Wis. 8: 4–6).[29] As Hurtado has shown, however, such Jewish sources as those cited, as well as Philo's discussion of the Logos, display a merely metaphorical use of divine-agency language; they do not really posit the hypostatic existence of these entities.[30] Thus, while Christian writers clearly made use of divine-agency language in a way similar to the authors of the Wisdom and Logos passages, the fact that Christianity was founded upon belief in the personal reality of Christ as mediator means that the relevance to our inquiry of the Jewish statements on personified divine attributes is sharply limited.[31]

Our search is more fruitful when we turn to the category of chief angels. A triple pattern of mediation appears in connection with Michael in 'The Book of Watchers' (1 Enoch 6–36) and in the two extant recensions of the story of Adam and Eve, the Latin Vita Adae et Evae and the Greek Apocalypse of Moses. The legacy pattern is not a dominant element, but we see Michael as an agent of revelation with ongoing significance in 1 Enoch 24: 6–25: 7 and Vita 49: 3. The intervention pattern, not surprisingly, is much better attested for this angelic figure. Michael seems to be portrayed as ruling over all of humanity in 1 Enoch 20: 5 and Apoc. Mos. 32: 6, a step up from his better-known role as angelic guardian or representative of Israel (1QM 17: 7; Dan. 12: 1).[32]

[28] See also Margaret Barker, *The Older Testament. The Survival of Themes from the Ancient Royal Cult in Sectarian Judaism and Early Christianity* (London: SPCK, 1987), 242–243.

[29] Hurtado, *One God*, 41.

[30] Hurtado, *One God*, 36–37; cf. de Lacey, 'Jesus as Mediator', 111.

[31] Cf. Rainbow, 'Jewish Monotheism', 84.

[32] Rowland offers a cogent case for equating the 'one like a son of man' in Dan. 7 with Michael (*Open Heaven*, 181–182).

1 Enoch 24: 6 and Vita chapters 13–15 present him as leader of the angels as well. 1 Enoch 9 shows Michael among the angels who intercede with God for the suffering, while Vita 47: 3 has him in charge of Adam's soul for the duration of ordinary time. Finally, the consummation pattern appears in 1 Enoch 10: 11–22, where Michael appears as an agent of judgment and salvation (again, with similarities to Dan. 12: 1 and 1QM 17: 6–7). According to Vita chapters 41–42, he has custody of the 'oil of the tree of mercy' which will be available to humanity only at the eschaton. Since Michael is a major character in these particular books, this evidence for a triple pattern of mediation is to be taken seriously. It does not, however, recur in Diaspora literature, where Michael is described according to the intervention pattern alone, as are most angels.

A triple pattern of mediation appears in connection with an angelic being in another group of texts: the Angel of Light in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Essene dualism emphasized the immediate effects of the Spirits of Light and Darkness, with the result that the Spirit of Light's dominion over the Sons of Light fits the intervention pattern. He protects them and fosters righteousness and peace in them; this is why he was created, according to 1QS 3–4 and 1QM 13. The element of consummation is evident in the fact that salvation is for those who belong to the Spirit of Light (1QS 4) and in the probability that the heavenly deliverer named Melchizedek in 11QMelch is interchangeable with or identical to the Angel of Light, as Michael appears to be in 1QM 17: 6.[33] The legacy element is somewhat more difficult to identify, but the Damascus Document holds that Moses and Aaron arose through the Prince of Lights (CD 5: 18), and the Scrolls' heavy emphasis on the ongoing Mosaic covenant (1QS 1: 3; 5: 8; 8: 15, 22; CD 15: 8; 1QDM; 11QTemple) makes this a telling assertion.

Turning finally to the exalted patriarchs, can we see a triple pattern of mediation in any of these human figures? The two leading candidates are Moses and Enoch, whom Hurtado has already identified as objects of divine-agency thinking. Moses certainly exhibits the legacy pattern. The widespread recognition

---

[33] See Geza Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Qumran in Perspective* (London: Wm. Collins & Sons, 1977), 184, and P. J. Kobelski, *Melchizedek and Melchiresa'* (CBQMS 10; Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1980). G. Bampfylde accepts the equation of the Spirit of Light and Melchizedek but argues that Michael is a subordinate being in 1QM, just as he is evidently subordinate in Daniel to the Prince of the Host (8: 11–17), the 'man clothed in linen' (10: 2–21; 12: 5–13) ('The Prince of the Host in the Book of Daniel and the Dead Sea Scrolls', *JSJ* 14 [1983], 129–134).

that the Exodus and Sinai events still held decisive significance is sufficiently attested by the Jewish festal calendar, which called for major celebrations of these events every year. The importance of Moses as agent of the covenant and recipient of vital revelation is displayed in a vast array of literature: apocalypses, Wisdom books, histories, and prayers, as well as the Qumran literature and rabbinic sources. The trappings of a culture hero are added to the portrait of Moses by Eupolemus (Eusebius *Praep. Ev.* 9.26.1), while Aristobulus (Eusebius *Praep. Ev.* 13.13.4) and Josephus (*Ag. Ap.* 2.17 §168, 40 §281) present him as the source of whatever truth is contained in Greek philosophy.

It appears, however, that Moses' significance as mediator is limited to the legacy pattern. In Palestinian sources there are fairly frequent references to Moses' high status and importance, even to the point of making him 'equal in glory to the holy ones' (Sir. 45: 2; it should be noted that ben Sirach praises many others with similar exuberance); it is this ascription of status which makes Moses a divine agent by Hurtado's definition. Nonetheless, there is little sign of any widespread idea that Moses' role as mediator continued beyond his historical career. *Liv. Proph.* 2: 19 claims that Moses and Jeremiah are presently together, but ascribes to Moses no practical activity. As. Mos. 12: 6, which is only partially preserved, seems to connect Moses somehow with the forgiveness of sins, but in the following verses Moses plays down his personal role and emphasizes the need for individuals to obey God on their own account. Beyond this, we find only the minority opinions recorded in *Sifre* Deut. 355 and 357, which held that Moses did not die, carries out a cultic ministry in heaven, and will be present with the scholars in the world to come. Glorious as Moses was, his practical significance is essentially confined within the limits of the legacy pattern.

Diaspora sources on Moses present us with a more complicated and difficult situation which, while requiring comment, cannot be explored fully here. Several of the sources speak of Moses in highly exalted terms, sometimes conferring upon him a super-human, nearly divine, status. Thus, Ezekiel's *Exagoge* 74–75 shows Moses being given God's sceptre, crown, and throne, while Josephus refers, though hesitantly, to a belief that Moses did not die (*Ant.* 4.8.48 §326). The most dramatic examples are found in the writings of Philo, where Moses seems to be not only the historical source of the Pentateuch but also the guardian of the divine mysteries (*Plant.* 26) and the embodiment of the divine Logos (*Quis. Her.* 205–206). Such references have led some to suggest that Philo's Judaism was akin to a Hellenistic mystery

religion with Moses as the immortal saviour figure.[34] This, clearly, would mean attributing to Moses certain mediating functions which go well beyond the bounds of the legacy pattern.

While this subject will bear further exploration, it appears at this juncture that such attribution cannot be demonstrated in a way which satisfies our requirements here. It is not high status *per se* which marks a mediator in our sense of the term, but an effective role in linking the divine with the human. This is precisely what the extant Diaspora references to Moses lack, apart from their recognition of his legacy. Neither Ezekiel nor Josephus ascribes any practical mediating functions to the exalted Moses in his surviving statements.

In the case of Philo, several things must be borne in mind. First, he sometimes denies that even Moses achieved full knowledge of God (*Post.* 169; *Fug.* 165). Second, Moses' status is one which is, in principle and perhaps in fact, open to others.[35] This seems to indicate that here, as elsewhere, Philo's Moses is more of a symbol or model than a real intercessory mediator.[36] Finally, Moses' relevance as a mediator is still bound up primarily with his authorship of the Pentateuch (*Op.* 1–3; *Mig.* 23). To be initiated under Moses probably means to enter into a full understanding of his scripture (*Cher.* 49, wherein Philo also refers to himself as a disciple of Jeremiah with a citation from that book). As S. Sandmel has suggested, Philo's glorification of Moses '...is in reality his way of portraying his veneration of Scripture'.[37] This would mean that Philo's Moses still conforms to the legacy pattern.

---

[34] For discussion of some passages in which Philo seems to attribute virtual divinity to Moses, see R. Williamson, 'Philo and New Testament Christology', *ExpTim* 90 (1979), 361–365; J. D. Tabor, 'Returning to the Divinity': Josephus's Portrayal of the Disappearances of Enoch, Elijah, and Moses', *JBL* 108 (1989), 235–236. These passages deal with Moses' status rather than his function as mediator. The treatment of Philonic Judaism as a mystery religion is best exemplified by E. R. Goodenough, *By Light, Light* (London: H. Milford, Oxford University, 1935) and W. A. Meeks, *The Prophet-King. Moses Traditions and Johannine Christology* (NovTSup xiv; Leiden: Brill, 1967).

[35] L. K. K. Dey, *The Intermediary World and Patterns of Perfection in Philo and Hebrews* (SBLDS 25; Missoula: Scholars, 1975), 66; S. Sandmel, *Philo of Alexandria* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979), 75.

[36] Hurtado, *One God*, 60–63. M. Canevet suggests that, in the *Vita Mosis* at least, Moses' role as 'un modèle pour l'homme universel' eclipses his role in Israel's history ('Remarques sur l'utilisation du genre littéraire historique par Philon d'Alexandrie dans la *Vita Moysis*, ou Moïse général en chef-prophète', *RSR* 60 [1986], 204).

[37] Sandmel, *Philo*, 52.

With Enoch, however, we encounter a genuine triple pattern.[38] Enoch is credited with mediating functions of all three categories in parts of 1 Enoch and in Jubilees, and various claims in these books are echoed in less comprehensive form elsewhere. We see the legacy pattern emerge in Enoch's role as channel of revelation. Various sections of 1 Enoch purport to be either products of his authorship (1: 2; 12: 3; 72: 1; 92: 1; 106: 1; 108: 1) or records of his oral teaching (83: 1; 91: 1); similarly, most of 2 Enoch is written in the first person. Jubilees, though presented as a revelation to Moses, names Enoch as the first to acquire knowledge and wisdom and to pass these on to others (4: 17–19). His role as source of divine knowledge is mentioned also in Sir. 44: 16 (Hebrew) and several of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs.

As is well known, the content of Enoch's revelations included information on heavenly occurrences like the fall of the Watchers, cosmological and astronomical affairs, the course of future events, and the eschaton. Such revelations fit the legacy pattern because they were not merely informative but normative. Jubilees pointedly describes Enoch's teachings as commandments (7: 38–39; 21: 10). 1 Enoch not only upholds standards of moral and ritual purity found in the Pentateuch (10: 11; 96: 4) but presents the astronomical teaching and its calendrical implications as equally a matter of divine law (72: 1–2) and equally definitive of righteousness (82: 4). Enoch's words are the words of truth (104: 9–11) from which the righteous learn the way of salvation (99: 10; 104: 13). In 2 Enoch, the patriarch writes down at angelic direction 'everything that it is appropriate to learn' (23: 2); these are the books which provide the surest guide to salvation (47: 2; 48: 8–9), and again astrological and calendrical norms are combined with moral and cultic strictures (e.g., chapter 19).

The intervention pattern appears in those episodes when Enoch, already removed from the everyday world into his exalted state, remains active and influential, and is even accessible to specific individuals. Such is the case in 1 Enoch 12–16, where Enoch is chosen to take messages between God and the fallen Watchers (compare Jubilees 4: 22; 4Q227). Enoch is actually sought out by human beings for consultation in 1 Enoch 107: 7–19 and in two Qumran documents, 'The Book of Giants' and 'The Genesis Apocryphon'. His personal intervention appears to have made possible Noah's survival of the flood (1 Enoch 83: 8; 84: 5–6). Finally, Jubilees makes the interesting assertion that Enoch burns 'the incense of the sanctuary' in Eden. No explanation is provided,

---

[38] See also Davis, 'Mythic Enoch', 337–341.

but the role of incense in the cultic laws of the Pentateuch (Exod. 30: 7–10; Num. 16: 46–48) encourages the inference that Enoch is here said to be performing an ongoing activity of intercession and atonement.

Turning to the consummation pattern, we find that Jubilees assigns a specific and vital eschatological role to Enoch: he is the divinely appointed scribe who records the deeds of human beings so as to provide decisive testimony at the last judgment (4: 23; 10: 17). Hints corroborating this notion appear in 1 Enoch 12: 4 and 15: 1, where Enoch is addressed as 'scribe of righteousness' following his exaltation and in the course of his pronouncing the divine judgment on the Watchers. In the same vein, Milik has filled the lacunae in the damaged Aramaic text of 1 Enoch 92: 1 from Qumran to read, '[Enoch the scribe of distinction and] the wisest of men and chosen of the sons of [earth to judge their deeds...].'[39] The role of Enoch as scribe and witness at the consummation is more clearly stated in 2 Enoch 50: 1, and 64: 5 suggests that he not only reveals but 'carries away' sins. Were we more confident of their early origin, of course, we could certainly invoke the Similitudes at this point to expand Enoch's eschatological significance; their description of the heavenly Elect One/Son of Man comes to a climax with the revelation that this exalted figure is none other than Enoch himself (1 Enoch 71: 14).

In Enoch, then, we have a figure who is arguably the nearest analogue in Jewish literature to the Christ of the New Testament. In both cases, a triple pattern of mediation is ascribed to a particular human being. Indeed, to be more specific, we can say that each of these individuals is presented as a decisive revealer, making known to humanity all the requirements of righteousness and the coming eschatological events; each is said to have been removed from the world in miraculous freedom from death; each is taken to be in a position to intercede actively with God; and each is to have a decisive influence on the last day.

As with Michael, the triple pattern appears in Palestinian literature only. In fact, Diaspora sources ascribe no serious mediating functions to Enoch whatsoever. They know the story of Enoch's ascent (Philo *Post.* 43; *Mut.* 38; Apoc. Zeph. 9: 4; Josephus *Ant.* 1.3.4 §85) but do not suggest that this makes him accessible or useful to the living. His legacy of revealed knowledge is conspicuously absent—strikingly so in the Greek version of Sir. 44: 16, where the Hebrew phrase 'a sign of knowledge' has been replaced

---

[39] J. T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976), 260; see also J. C. Vanderkam, *Enoch and the Growth of an apocalyptic Tradition* (CBQMS 16; Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1984), 173–174.

by 'an example of repentance'. *T. Abr.*, Recension B, 11: 5–10 show him avoiding ultimate responsibility for the last judgment!

Thus we see that, while ideas of divine agency in various forms were widely known in Second Temple Judaism, only a specific few approximate the general shape of New Testament Christology.

V. OBSERVATIONS

These findings entail several observations worthy of further consideration, involving both the phenomenon of Christology itself and the larger question of early Christianity's place within the broad spectrum of first-century Judaism.

As we have seen, Hurtado defined the 'Christian mutation' as being the innovation of worshipping the divine agent; while belief in divine agents is widely attested in Jewish literature, he argued, the worship of such figures in Jewish circles is not verified in the surviving evidence. In attempting to account for this innovation, Hurtado gave most of his emphasis to the post-Easter religious experiences of the early Christians. He pointed especially to visions of Jesus as not merely exalted but installed in the very presence of God; such religious experiences, he suggested, could have generated specific Christological convictions.[40] Paul Rainbow, on the other hand, has challenged this claim for the priority of experiences over conceptualization. He argued that human beings always interpret their experiences according to 'schemata' already present in their minds. In this case, the historical Jesus' application to himself of Jewish beliefs about eschatological figures could have provided the schema necessary to account for later Christology.[41]

The results of our study suggest a fuller way of answering Rainbow's question. It should be noted, first of all, that recent studies of religious experience indicate that the relationship between experience and conceptualization is quite complex. In the words of Nicholas Lash, 'the relationship between experience and interpretation is dialectical in character, is a matter of "mutually critical correlation".'[42] Caroline Franks Davis provides a more detailed description of the manner in which concept formation results from the mutual influence of experienced events and pre-existing 'mental models' and the like. Further, she shows that many ordinary experiences, as well as religious experiences,

[40] Hurtado, *One God*, 117–122.
[41] Rainbow, 'Jewish Monotheism', 86–90.
[42] Nicholas Lash, *Easter in Ordinary. Reflections on Human Experience and the Knowledge of God* (London: SCM, 1988), 248.

involve 'incorporated interpretation': perceptual sets and mental models help us to screen and select sensations and perceptions, and to order them into a useful and consistent body of knowledge.[43]

Rainbow's quest for a 'schema', then, is a critical issue; bald experiences do not even explain themselves, much less account for the growth of a body of doctrine. Moreover, worship of their divine agent was not the only innovation of the early Christians; as Ben F. Meyer has noted, their 'thematization of truth' was, in that context, equally remarkable.[44]

As we noted before, however, studying Jewish teachings on eschatological figures has not given us what we need to explain the shape of New Testament Christology; the discovery of triple-pattern mediators in certain quarters of Judaism brings us much closer. It is likely, for instance, that triple-pattern mediation would provide a mental model within which worship of the divine agent is possible. The heirs of monotheistic Judaism would have been accustomed to the worship of an eternal, living God.[45] A divine agent whose actual mediating functions were limited in time and extent would hardly prompt binitarian devotion, whereas this outcome is conceivable for one who, like God himself, was active and available throughout all time. Obviously, the ascription of a triple pattern of mediation did not ensure that the mediator became an object of worship, but the existence of this pattern of mediation within the bounds of Second Temple Judaism may have been a precondition for such a development.

Interestingly, most of the Jewish occurrences of the triple pattern involve heavenly beings such as Michael and the Angel of Light; this is not surprising, since immortality and superhuman power would seem to be logical prerequisites for such a mediating role. In the one case where the triple pattern is ascribed to a human being, Enoch, his mortality must naturally be cancelled; it is, however, only in sources of late or uncertain date that any report of a fuller transformation or revelation of his being is extant (1 Enoch 71: 14; 2 Enoch 22: 9–10; 3 Enoch 4: 2). It remains the

---

[43] Caroline Franks Davis, *The Evidential Force of Religious Experience* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1989), 145–155.

[44] Meyer, *Early Christians*, 192.

[45] The centrality of monotheism to Second Temple Judaism is cogently underscored by Rainbow, 'Jewish Monotheism', 81–83. As Rowland points out, even exalted angels or patriarchs in the surviving Jewish texts derive their glory from the one God (*Open Heaven*, 94–111). To his examples we may add 2 Enoch: even though Enoch is changed into angelic form (22: 10) and stands before God for all eternity (67: 2), the practical outcome is that Enoch's revelation is to attest to the uniqueness of God himself (33: 8).

case, however, that the triple pattern of mediation by its very nature cannot be ascribed to an ordinary human being. Indeed, we may go further. Other scholars have already noted a certain fluidity in the distinction between God and his chief agents in some texts, including even Pentateuchal references to the angel of the LORD.[46] By the same token, when that agent is a human being, there might arise some fluidity in the distinction between the divine and the human in that particular case.[47] Thus, even though there are no strict parallels, there is a context in Palestinian Judaism within which the early Church's high Christology (once thought to be the invention of Hellenistic Jewish or Gentile Christians) was an understandable development.

This leads us to the larger question of Christianity's place within the spectrum of Second Temple Judaism—a place it would not hold for long. It is an axiom of historical scholarship that Christianity began as a Jewish sect, even though there is a recognized difficulty in applying modern categories such as 'sect' to ancient movements.[48] Nonetheless, as E. P. Sanders has shown, we can indeed speak of a '"normal" or "common" Judaism' involving priests and people, temple and Torah;[49] and we can distinguish from it those particular movements which were peripheral in the sense that they represented neither a majority of the Jewish population nor a generally recognized elite, but lived at more-or-less conscious variance with both.

From the 'inside', the early Christians saw themselves in full and direct continuity with biblical revelation, in part rooting their claim to legitimacy in this continuity; at the same time, they recognized a radical distinction between themselves and the vastly

---

[46] De Lacey, 'Jesus as Mediator', 106–107. See also Rowland, *Open Heaven*, 94–95; Hurtado, *One God*, 79–82.

[47] Barker argues that just such a fluidity existed in the pre-exilic royal cult in Jerusalem (*Older Testament*, 41, 113).

[48] See Ferdinand Dexinger, 'Die Sektenproblematik im Judentum', *Kairos* 21 (1979), 273–287; Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 267–268, 425–426, and the sources cited there. Of related interest is the famous debate in *Journal for the Study of Judaism*: N. J. McEleney, 'Orthodoxy in Judaism of the First Christian Century', *JSJ* 4 (1973), 19–42; D. E. Aune, 'Orthodoxy in First Century Judaism? A Response to N. J. McEleney', *JSJ* 7 (1976), 1–10; Lester L. Grabbe, 'Orthodoxy in First Century Judaism?' *JSJ* 8 (1977), 149–153; McEleney, 'Orthodoxy in Judaism of the First Christian Century', *JSJ* 9 (1978), 83–88.

[49] Sanders, *Judaism: Practice and Belief 63 BCE–66 CE* (London/Philadelphia: SCM/Trinity, 1992), particularly chaps. 5, 8, and 13. See also Wayne O. McCready, 'The Sectarian Status of Qumran: The Temple Scroll', *RevQ* 11 (1983), 184; Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism* (London: SCM, 1985), 192–195.

more numerous non-Christian Jews.[50] From the 'outside', then, the early Christians' place was on the periphery. The closest analogues to their high Christology appear in literature which is customarily considered either sectarian or idiosyncratic: the Enoch literature, the Adam and Eve books, and the Dead Sea Scrolls.[51]

Christianity's affinities with such literature extend beyond the issues of mediation and Christology. An ambivalence, if not hostility, towards the cult of the Second Temple surfaces in the relevant Jewish literature (Aramaic Levi; 1 Enoch 89: 73; 90: 28–29; the 'Apocalypse of Weeks', 1 Enoch 93: 3–10 and 91: 12–17, wherein the Second Temple is conspicuously absent; 1QS 8–9; 11QTemple).[52] Hints of such an attitude are not lacking in the New Testament (Mark 14: 58; Acts 7: 48; Rev. 21: 22). In addition, both sectarian Jewish and Christian sources offer a correction, supplementation, or replacement for the Mosaic Torah (1 Enoch 19: 3; 104: 10–13; 2 Enoch 48: 6–9, which state that the Enochic revelation is the complete and necessary one; 11QTemple as a pseudepigraphon of Moses; Matt 19: 3–9; 2 Cor. 3: 7–11; John 1: 17).

Particularly interesting is the phenomenon noted above: the prominence of visionary religious experiences in both the various strata of the Enoch literature (1 Enoch 1: 2; 13: 8; 14: 8–22; 37: 1; 71: 1; 83: 3; 85: 3; 93: 2; 106: 13; 108: 4; 2 Enoch 3) and the New Testament (e.g., Jesus' baptism; the Transfiguration; Luke 10: 18; Acts 7: 56; 10: 10–16; Paul's conversion; 2 Cor. 12: 1–4; Revelation).[53] Major claims in both bodies of literature are linked to reports of individuals who see into heaven or are taken up into the presence of God. A movement's openness to sacred knowledge derived from these experiences is itself an important datum, since it is not equally evident in all religious traditions.[54]

---

[50] On Christians' consciousness of continuity with the biblical heritage, see Meyer, *Early Christians*, 42–43, 183; on their awareness of discontinuity with their Jewish contemporaries, see Meyer, 17–18, 182.

[51] Michael E. Stone, 'Enoch, Aramaic Levi and Sectarian Origins', *JSJ* 19 (1988), 164, 166.

[52] On Aramaic Levi, see Stone, 'Enoch, Aramaic Levi', 168–170. On 1QS 8–9, see McCready, 'Sectarian Status', 184–185. On 11QTemple, see Johann Meier, *The Temple Scroll. An Introduction, Translation & Commentary* (JSOTSup 34; trans. R. White; Sheffield: JSOT, 1985), 59.

[53] For recent comments on the importance of visionary experiences in Jewish apocalyptic and early Christian literature, see Rowland, *Open Heaven*, throughout; Hurtado, *One God*, 117–122; Meyer, *Early Christians*, 174–181; Barker, *Older Testament*, 27, 32, 120, and *The Lost Prophet. The Book of Enoch and its influence on Christianity* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1989), 49–64.

[54] Rowland argues cogently that, despite the literary device of pseudepigraphy, real visionary experiences underlie at least some Jewish apocalypses (*Open Heaven*,

These matters of mediation, temple, Torah, and visions are not likely to be isolated issues; they may well be coherent parts of a world-view shared, at the level of presuppositions, by the early Christians and other peripheral Jewish groups.[55] It is easy enough to see a logical connection between a favourable disposition towards visionary experiences and allegiance to a triple-pattern type of mediator who exists beyond time and serves as the source and/or content of the visions. Such an orientation could easily coincide with the relativization or even rejection of existing institutions like the Second Temple and the Mosaic Torah in certain circumstances.[56]

As for mainstream Judaism, Sanders, among others, has shown how central the idea of covenant was to Jewish self-definition in this period.[57] The covenant was understood to be a binding relationship between God and his people, inaugurated and amplified by acts of God at specific historical moments, especially in the call of Abraham and the cluster of events associated with Moses. Those episodes changed things, not just for the immediate participants, but for all who would follow; the inner logic of covenantal religion would, therefore, foster the understanding of mediation which I have labelled the legacy pattern.

A complete survey of the literature would show, in fact that the legacy pattern is the most common pattern of mediation in Jewish literature by quite a wide margin. The presupposition that God continued to exist and to act would mean that other patterns of mediation were compatible with (to use Sanders' term) covenantal nomism as a pattern of religion, but they were not necessary or fundamental to it. To put it another way, the covenant itself was the centre of gravity in the predominant forms of Palestinian Judaism; generally, mediators were significant not in themselves

---

214–247). He notes, on the other hand, that some literature closer to the mainstream of Judaism contained warnings against the seeking of such experiences and the knowledge conveyed therein (75–77). The New Testament, on the other hand, stands out from Jewish literature for both the frequency of visions and the high number of reported recipients.

[55] Despite her espousal of an untenable conspiracy theory centred on 'the Deuteronomists', the intriguing aspect of Barker's books for the study of Christology is precisely her thesis that such a world-view, including virtually the entire constellation of New Testament Christological themes, was characteristic of the pre-exilic royal cult and survived in certain circles long enough to surface again in the form of Christianity.

[56] Cf. Rowland, *Open Heaven*, 446.

[57] Sanders, 'The Covenant as a Soteriological Category and the Nature of Salvation in Palestinian and Hellenistic Judaism', in R. Hamerton-Kelly and R. Scroggs, eds., *Jews, Greeks and Christians: Studies in Honor of W. D. Davies* (Leiden: Brill, 1976), 11–44; *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 422–423.

but because of what they mediated, namely, the covenant relation-
ship with God. The attested variety in patterns of mediation
appears precisely because the issue of mediation was secondary
and could vary according to the interests of particular authors.

In the New Testament, however, we find the reverse: the triple
pattern of mediation is fairly constant, while the patterns of
religion (or, in more traditional terms, soteriologies) vary. In
Christianity, Jesus the mediator himself tended to eclipse or
absorb the substance of what he mediated.[58] In Phil. 3: 4–8, for
example, Paul contrasts the elements of the Jewish covenant not
with Christianity but with Christ; John 14: 6 expresses a similar
outlook. Personal loyalty to Christ was the essential thing, as the
very word 'Christian' reflects. Beyond that, the requirements for
salvation could be presented in very different terms: as obedience
to Christ's law (Matt. 5: 19–20; 7: 17–27; 28: 20a); as confessed
belief in him (Rom. 10: 9–11); or as spiritual union with him
(Rom. 6: 3–8; John 6: 53–56). All these formulations are emphatic-
ally Christocentric, but they characterize the saving relationship
in a variety of specific ways.[59] From the earliest New Testament
literature onwards, Christianity's centre of gravity was quite
different from that of mainstream Judaism.

VI. CONCLUSION

The goal of this article has been to put into effect a manner of
investigating the Jewish context of early Christology which would
prove more enlightening than traditional research on individual
motifs or Jewish messianic expectations. We have found that
individuals could be portrayed as mediators between God and
humanity in a variety of different ways in ancient Judaism, ways
which are easily distinguishable on the basis of whether they
operate in the past, present, or future with respect to the writers
of the literature in question and their intended audiences. The
legacy pattern, mediation from the past which shapes the present
and future, can be seen in Abraham, Moses and David. The
intervention pattern, according to which active mediation might
be expected in the present, is characteristic primarily of angels.
The consummation pattern, in which a decisive act of mediation
in the future is awaited, describes the expectations associated with
Elijah and the various messianic figures. Only rarely are the three
patterns combined in surviving Jewish literature: for Michael in

[58] De Lacey, 'Jesus as Mediator', 107.
[59] For an extensive survey of the different ways in which Paul alone could
thematize his soteriology, see Meyer, *Early Christians*, 114–147.

'the Book of the Watchers' and the Adam and Eve story; for the Spirit of Light in the Dead Sea Scrolls; and for Enoch in the literature associated with him.

Strikingly, this triple pattern of mediation is virtually a constant in the New Testament, applied to Christ by writers who differ from each other on numerous other matters. Attributing decisive significance to Christ's past work, his present accessibility, and his future return appears to be one of the unifying features of early Christian thought. Further, it appears from both Jewish and Christian sources that there may be a connection between allegiance to a triple-pattern mediator and a reserved or even critical attitude towards the Second Temple and the Mosaic Torah.

In its basic contours, then, Christology was not a phenomenon without context or precedent in Palestinian Judaism, and it makes historical sense as a product of that environment. On the other hand, the pervasiveness and centrality of the triple pattern of mediation, reflecting as they do a general Christocentricity, show that early Christianity had, at the core, a different dynamic from most other forms of Judaism; its subsequent career as a separate religion which could attract only a small minority of Jews thus makes sense as well.

P. G. Davis