

CORPORATE RECONCILIATION

IN

THE SCRIPTURES

by

Sister Mary Anne David Carr, B.V.M.

A Thesis submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate School, Marquette University in
Partial Fulfillment of the Re-
quirements for the Degree
of Master of Arts

Milwaukee, Wisconsin
July, 1962

PREFACE

Current textbooks and theological literature generally include two basic notions in regard to the effects of sacramental Penance: reconciliation of the individual with the Church and reconciliation of the individual with God.¹ While these writings clearly indicate the ecclesial significance of the Sacrament, they say little about the more universal concept involved in joining the two effects into one of a continuing reconciliation of the entire community with God. Since it belongs to theology to point out where and how doctrine is contained implicitly or explicitly in the Scriptures,² this study will trace the presence and development of such an idea in certain books of the Old and New Testaments. In order to limit the study to a careful analysis of texts, the method of investigation will be to isolate certain key words: "redeem", "restore," "return," "save," "heal," in passages where they are used in a corporate or communal sense. These texts will then be analyzed in the light of their historical and literary context. Because "the centuries of Old Testament history when God was speaking in incomplete form are part of the same process by which God finally speaks in Christ,"³ we will assemble evidence indicative of the presence and meaning of corporate reconciliation in certain key Old Testament books. The extent to which the idea is retained in the New Testament together with its cumulative and transformed significances will then be examined. Since the central purpose of biblical theology is to discern and evaluate what is found in Scripture on its own terms and within its own categories,⁴ there will be no attempt to go beyond this scope. We hope to show that the doctrine of the Old Testament is that it is as a

people that God redeems Israel and that the concept of corporate reconciliation reaches its summit in the New Testament and is transformed in the Person of Christ. He is the New Israel who reconciled all men to God, continues to redeem in His Body, the Church, and will accomplish the final reconciliation in glory. It is our contention that the implications which are contained in the persistent notion of corporate reconciliation in the Scriptures warrant at least the possibility of a doctrine of sacramental reconciliation of the entire community with God.

I wish to express my gratitude to all who have aided me in writing this thesis; especially to Father Bernard J. Cooke, S.J. for his direction and help; to Father R. J. North, S.J. and Father R. G. Gassert, S.J. for their valuable suggestions; and to my religious Superiors and Sisters who have given me the opportunity to study and to write this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PREFACE.....	1
INTRODUCTION.....	1
I. THE PSALMS.....	7
II. THE PROPHETS. Osee.....	22
Jeremias.....	31
Ezechiel.....	40
Second Isaias.....	49
III. COMMUNITY ATONEMENT.....	59
IV. THE NEW TESTAMENT.....	68
V. THE GOSPELS. The Synoptics.....	73
St. John.....	90
VI. THE EPISTLES. St. Paul.....	101
Epistle to the Hebrews.....	116
CONCLUSION.....	124
NOTES.....	130
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	157

INTRODUCTION

"It was given to Israel to experience the demands and the graciousness of God with equal directness,"¹ and this experience took place within the framework of election and covenant. The election of Israel is the first action by which God comes into contact with His people. In a very real way, the fact of election constituted Israel a people, more than her union through common blood and common soil. It was God's choice that had brought into being His people, the "congregation of Yahweh," a holy nation.² That choice, initiated in the age of the patriarchs, was renewed and deepened at intervals until the great moment of the Exodus salvation, when God called Israel out of Egypt, delivered the people from slavery, and climaxed this saving act by entering into a covenant bond with the nation at Sinai. The covenant, the dynamic reality and pure gift of the presence of Yahweh among His people and their union with Him, was not only an election and bond, but an obedience.³ The response demanded by the covenant-God, however limited in its original scope, involved a moral relationship which was bound to develop with the growth of understanding of Yahweh's personal characteristics. Through the successive phases of Israel's development there was an ever-growing awareness that Yahweh would not abandon His people, that the bond was as between two human beings and was better described by naming Yahweh husband and father.⁴ It was Yahweh Himself who made Israel aware of His tenderest, demanding love and it will be seen that Israel experienced this relationship as a "corporate personality."

The demands which were concomitant with Yahweh's choice of Israel

were forcibly expressed by the prophet Amos. But the union of love which God sought is seen in the deeper meaning experienced by Osee, who sees Israel as Yahweh's bride (2:19), an image used by Jeremias (2:1-7), Ezechiel (16:23), Second Isaias (50:1), - or as a stumbling child whom God is ready to take into His arms (Os, 2:19). Just as a wife belongs entirely to her husband, Israel is Yahweh's vineyard; she is the flock utterly dependent upon its shepherd.⁵ The fellowship of man which God seeks through moral obedience is the result of salvation by Yahweh:⁶ His demands were too great to be satisfied without His help.

It was as a community that Israel knew of her need and call to "know Yahweh." The many passages in which Israel is treated as a single person seem to imply much more than poetic personification. The nation is truly aware of itself with a sort of personal self-awareness, which helps to explain how God called Israel out of Egypt, loving her when she was only a child (Os, 11:1). This self-consciousness of Israel passed through its phases, but its characteristic hope of future restoration depended on Israel's belonging to Yahweh. As shall be seen, even the new emphasis on individual responsibility and interior submission expressed in Jeremias and Ezechiel never implied the rejection of a very real and living social solidarity. Israel's "corporate personality" in which the influence for good or evil of an individual, king, prophet, or father of a family, affected the nation as a whole, was not an external thing but was based on a pre-existing unity. The individual is a single reality with the group in a dynamic unity which presupposes the special value of the individual, and in which the society achieves self-identity upon the pattern of a dominant individual.⁷

Israel's national faith was based on the Exodus and covenant, Yahweh was the God of Israel and Israel His people especially since the day of the great deliverance. From this faith sprang the dynamic hope

which, in spite of successive calamities, was ever renewed as faith in God's redemptive design deepened. This hope for the kingship of Yahweh makes Israel conscious both of her unworthiness and her security in God's love and forgiveness. Thus the notion of a holy or separated people, corresponding to the holy God, evolves in the later Priestly Code, especially in the Law of Holiness (Lev.17-26) which is similar in inspiration to the principles of Ezekiel (43-46), principles enforced in the restored post-exilic community.⁸ It is in the holiness of God that Israel knows herself as sinful, knows that the real grip of sin on the people involves the social danger of breaking communion with Yahweh. Thus there is the permanent tendency to maintain and restore the holy covenant.⁹

The whole Old Testament is a book about sin, testifies to the terrible reality and seriousness of the fact of sin; and its most profound passages realize that sin is so deeply a part of man that the only hope is that God will Himself make man over. And there is equal or greater witness to the wonder of the fact that somehow God seeks, longs, to forgive. "It was not left for the New Testament to declare that God loves sinners,...the distinction is how much He loves them."¹⁰ As distinct from our view of universal sin in terms of individuals, the Jews regarded Israel as the friend or enemy of God; it is "the people" who must be converted. Israel's covenant which is broken by sin,¹¹ had been designed to make the people God's family, and its Law was an expression of familial piety. Sin against the Law is an obstacle between God and the people, a positive reality which continues to exist: it is one with guilt¹² and so even "sin" committed in ignorance was shared by the community. The realization that all were caught up in the consequences of sin was balanced by the fact that although forgiveness was simply a gift, God's eagerness to save was equally real.

National guilt, as the prophets describe it, is a chilling thought. Such pictures as the wounded man of Isaiah, beaten and bruised from head to foot, ...or the painted harlot, shrieking as she is murdered, whom Jeremiah gave to his people for their thoughtful consideration, are not intended to cheer. This, they say, is you; this is your nation, the people of the Lord... .¹⁴

If God punishes sin within the solidarity of the people, it is also true that He punishes rather a succession of sins, a sinful nation. He is free to act mercifully, but what dominates is His will to establish His kingship, together with the educative aspect of punishment which is intended to set the people on the right path. For to sin is to stray, to stumble on the way, to miss the mark. There is a growing awareness of sin as a personal and moral offense which, while "breaking" the covenant, does not entirely destroy the relationship, because the permanent background is Yahweh's forgiving love; the knowledge that He is always waiting, ready to forgive, inspires Israel to penitence. This is the way God causes Israel to return.¹⁴

The ultimate hope of forgiveness, return, and restoration which dominates the unique historical dimension of Israel became more exalted and more spiritual with the passage of time. From a salvation from the forces of nature and from enemies, there develops the notion of the salvation of the people from themselves and from their own infidelity to Yahweh. The concept of a poor and holy remnant to be saved emerges: the anawim are Yahweh's poor in spirit. The complex idea that is messianism is developed in the singular historical unity in which Israel sought the secret of her vocation, in her God-centered national structure, and in her sacred writings.¹⁵ Messianism finally assimilated all the images of hope for restoration: the basic "king" motif, implying the restoration of David's dynasty; the "kingdom" idea which involves the kingship of Yahweh Himself whose sovereignty will go out from Israel to world-wide dimensions; the "Son of Man" who in the book of Daniel re-

ceives a kingdom from the Ancient of Days; the ultimate "Servant" figure who delivers the people by his atoning death.¹⁶ However, Israel herself is a "messianic entity," a covenant society moving toward a consummation in which Yahweh will one day dwell among His people - a redemption to be accomplished through a new Exodus experience.¹⁷ And so the Hebrew notion of salvation is not only a rescue from evil, it is an acquisition of a positive good, of a kingdom of peace, a life of union with the Lord who will dwell among His people, a time of justice, sanctity, and the knowledge of God.

The messianic age will be foreshadowed by a total and shattering destruction effected by the Lord Himself, the "Day of the Lord," for in the Old Testament (with the exception of a few cases) Yahweh alone is "Savior." The concept of salvation is not a Hebrew Utopia; God in His holiness must be the center of the kingdom and not man. This is God's glory and, ultimately, the glory of man.¹⁸ Each trial of Israel then, encompasses the two streams: the Day of the Lord as the punishment of Israel by Yahweh and His restoration of the nation. Each time the returning remnant is the seed or root of the holy people to whom the future is promised, and each redemption is re-entry into the covenant, re-entry into the promised land.

With this glance at the fundamental ideas involved in the relationship of God with His people and the biblical meaning of restoration, we proceed to examine the textual evidence for a community reconciliation with God. It is fairly plain in the early stages of Jewish history. However, as the relationship between God and His people became more personal with the writings of Osee, Jeremias, Ezechiel, and Second Isaias, we will limit our investigation to these prophets. Since the Psalms are the liturgical expression of the life and beliefs

of the people, certain corporate ideas will first be isolated in several of them and then the prophetic clarification of the Psalmic statements will be examined. Finally, we will investigate the meaning of expiatory sacrifice as involved in the community Feast of the Atonement. The ideas of corporate reconciliation which are retained throughout the later prophets and in the liturgical worship of the people until and into the time of Christ will be most significant. For these are the significances and meanings which Christ will ultimately absorb and transform.

I. THE PSALMS

God had transformed the Hebrew slaves of Egypt into a sacred priestly nation, but at no time in her history did Israel so literally fulfill her vocation of being God's worshipping community as during the first centuries after the Exile. Gathered around the Temple and its priesthood, the people established a sacred cultic community which bore witness in its public worship to God's determination from the beginning, to save all men.¹ The worship of the Temple centered in the daily morning and evening sacrifices and it was primarily through this sacrifice for the whole community that Israel approached God; as the worship of the whole year came to culminate in the Day of Atonement, often simply referred to as "The Day," so Israel's daily worship centered here.

The Psalms are the "hymn book of the second Temple" in the sense that many of them are clearly intended for liturgical use, not as in the hands of the worshipping community, but as the choir-books of the Levites, to whom the ordinary worshipper would listen and respond at intervals. Some Psalms, though adapted for public use, may have originated in personal devotion (like the "confessions" of Jeremias), or in a context of a Temple liturgy for an individual sin-offering.² Many of the Psalms are pre-exilic in origin but for the most part, they witness to the worship which centered in the Temple sacrifice after the Exile.

At the side of the Bible's clear and repeated attestation of private liturgical piety stands a unique and enigmatic chapter of Leviticus on the ceremony of the Atonement Day. Its origin and meaning are controverted but we may say that while the prophets testify that the Exile

forced the individual's awareness of his function and worth, the very fact of the communal, post-exilic Feast of the Atonement certainly proves that the individual remained embedded in the corporate Israel. So it is that the Psalms do not make a distinction, but rather maintain a certain fluidity, between the personal and the cultic, community approach to God. They draw together the two sharply opposed streams of prophetic thought at the time of the Exile: Jeremias' violent reaction to merely external cult which finds expression in the anawim Psalms, and Ezechiel's affirmation of Temple, cult, and liturgical purification.³

The Psalter is fundamentally conscious of God, of access to God and communion with Him. The Psalms are theocentric, purely religious, and are profoundly aware of sin and death, the great barriers between God and man. The holiness of God must be approached by clean hands and a pure heart, and the Psalms fully testify to the sin of the nation. Even the most personal penitential Psalms seem to express a guilty people, a collective guilt.⁴ The Psalms beg for a forgiveness that is the divine good will and favor, and yet God's fidelity is not the object of any "hope" but rather of a faith; men only await the manifestation of it. For the God of the Psalms is the God of the prophets, the God of the covenant: He does not grant favors but is of His nature good, tender, merciful. Within the Psalms, worn smooth by liturgical usage, all the biblical themes are interchangeable, and it is impossible to distinguish the motifs of salvation, covenant, justice.⁵ And the later Psalms are filled with humble confessions of sin, longing for God's mercy and pardon, desire to be clean in His sight, together with repeated expressions of patience in trouble, utter confidence in God's deliverance and gratitude for His mercy. No one can contemplate the devotional piety of early Judaism and imagine that the religion of the Law was at its best an external thing.⁶

In the Psalms there is a wealth of material on the notion of corporate restoration. In order to select a small portion for investigation, the use of some key words was studied. The Greek word for "heal"⁷ as used by Osee, (5:13, 6:1, 11:3, etc.), Isaias, (53:5), and frequently in Jeremias (e.g. 3:22), is found in only one Psalm, 106 (107),⁸ used in a corporate sense.

The Greek word for "save,"⁹ as used in Osee, (1:7, 13:4, 14:4), Jeremias, (23:6, 31:6,8,9), Isaias, (43:3,11, 49:24, 51:14), Ezechiel, (34:22, 36:29), is used in a corporate sense in Psalms 43 (44):3,6,7; 79 (80):2,3; 106 (107):9,13. Connected words of "Savior" and "salvation" are used in Psalms 13 (14):7, 49 (50):22, 84 (85): 5,8.

The important Greek word for "redeem," or "ransom," or "deliver,"¹⁰ used in Osee (13:4), Isaias (41:4, 43:1,14, 51:11, 52:3) and in several Jeremiac passages which we shall not consider (15:21, etc.), is used corporately in Psalms 43 (44):26, 73 (74):2, 76 (77):15, 77 (78):42, 105 (106):2, 135 (136):24.

Finally, the Greek word for "return" or "restore,"¹¹ as used in Osee (5:5,14, 11:5, 14:2,3,8), Isaias (44:22, 49:6), Jeremias (3:10,12, 14,22, 4:1), and Ezechiel (34:4,16) is used in Psalms 13 (14):7, 79 (80): 7,14,19, and 84 (85):4,6,8, with reference to the community as a whole.

Thus we have set apart a group of eleven Psalms in which key words of reconciliation are used in a corporate sense. Some contain a great deal of doctrinal material, some add comparatively little. For this reason we will simply glance at Psalms 13 (14), 78 (79), 105 (106), 106 (107), and 135 (136); then we will analyze more carefully Psalms 43 (44), 73 (74), 79 (80), and 84 (85).

The dating of the Psalms is based on complex factors which result in fair assurance for the general period of some Psalms, but a range of several hundred years in which other might have been written. Therefore

no study can be based on an a-priori chronological arrangement of the whole Psalter. Rather, the ideas themselves often indicate the origin of a part of a Psalm, and the development of doctrine is suggestive of a time sequence.

Although the poetry of the Hebrew Psalms has strong affinities with Egyptian and Ugaritic poetry,¹² they are utterly different in spirit. Some of them go back to the time of David, as the global authorship of the Psalter implies; many are at least pre-exilic. But it will be our contention that the collective expression of that penitential spirit peculiar to the anawim is prominent chiefly in the Psalms originating after the ministry of Jeremias, therefore during and after the Exile.¹³

The canon of the Psalms seems to have been closed by the time of the Maccabees, and in its completed form is the book of prayer of the second Temple, the Temple rebuilt by Zorobabel (521-515 B.C.). Of the Psalms we are considering, all but four are songs of national supplication, according to Drijvers' classification.¹⁴ The others include a Psalm against the impious, 13 (14), a thanksgiving Psalm, 106 (107), and two pilgrimage Psalms, 49 (50), 77 (78).

Psalm 13 (14), practically the same as Psalm 52 (53), "The fool says in his heart..." goes from an individual sense to a corporate sense, and is reminiscent of Osee (4:6-9) in referring to the corruption of the covenant: sin is the stumbling or straying of children, "my people" are referred to by the Psalmist as having failed to call upon the Lord, and from the terrible picture of sin and evil, the prophet prays for the restoration of his people:

O that out of Sion would come the salvation of Israel!
When God restores the well-being of His people
then shall Jacob exult and Israel be glad (v.7).

"Restore" here expresses the Hebrew word which, before the return from

the Exile was classic to mean the restoration of the time of primeval happiness,¹⁵ and it recurs in Psalms 84 (85) and 49 (50). Sion is referred to as the perfection of beauty from which God shone forth, linking the technical term for salvation with Yahweh Himself, in a Psalm which is cosmic in scope. The Lord who created by His very word (v.1) makes a covenant by sacrifice with His people, His saints. Their sin consists in the emptiness of their present sacrifices, as Jeremias will describe them. In a theophany, Yahweh judges His guilty people while all creation watches,¹⁶ yet He promises to deliver His people if they offer a worthy sacrifice (v.15); He will thus "correct" them (v.21). In declaring God's "justice" the Psalmist means that Yahweh is faithful to His covenant promises, and not simply that He punishes men who deserve it. Justice therefore is saving, dynamic; it is an activity rather than an attribute of Yahweh, the only one who can rescue (v.22).

Psalm 78 (79) is a prayer for vengeance against the nations. It is a Psalm of national supplication, occasioned by the fall of Jerusalem in 587 B.C., and may have been used in a special ritual on fast days or at other times of national humiliation. It is Jerusalem, the city, which is mourned as the "devouring of Jacob," (v.7) and Yahweh is begged to deliver the people and forgive their sin for His name's sake. Thus the people see their own sin as the cause of the disaster. However, they remind Yahweh that they are His people, "the flock of His pasture" (v.13) when they ask forgiveness.

Psalms 76 (77), 106 (107), and 135 (136), although they are different types, have in common the theme of remembrance of past redemption of the people. Yahweh had redeemed His people by His power (76:15), led His people like a flock (v.20). In a ceremony of group thanksgiving in Psalm 106 (107), He is thanked for His wonderful redeeming deeds; He has rescued (v.2), delivered (v.29) His people, and His very word has healed

them (v.20). It was the needy whom He exalted and "made His families like a flock" (v.41). He is praised in a hymn in Psalm 135 (136) which recounts Yahweh's wonderful acts in creation and in leading Israel, His people into the wilderness in a corporate rescue from foes (v.24). The refrain, "for His kindness is everlasting," recurs after each line, praising and thanking the saving God. So is it seen that the theme of corporate salvation runs throughout each type of Psalm. Though many of them are intensely personal and individual prayers, the corporate reconciliation of the people is their enduring background.

Psalm 106 (106) has been called the confiteor of the nation and serves as an introduction to the Psalms we will examine more closely. It involves a confession of the corporate sins of Israel during the Exodus experience, which explains why Yahweh became angry and "loathed His heritage" (v.40), a theme to be picked up in the supplication Psalms. Still He is merciful to them in their trouble, will heed their cries, and deliver the people by gathering them from the nations. The whole theme is one of Yahweh's fidelity, His permanent will in regard to the covenant.¹⁷

Psalm 43 (44) is a Psalm of national supplication and the four classic elements of invocation, lament, supplication, and motives for God's granting the prayer¹⁸ are immediately evident. The recalling of the saving deeds of the past,

O God, our ears have heard,
our fathers have declared to us...(v.1)

bespeaks the importance of tradition in Israel, for the Law demanded a recounting of God's actions upon His elect people. Here it is Yahweh (Elohim) who Himself makes Israel to be (vv.1-3), choosing the nation by His pure graciousness. Now they are rejected, scattered as sheep (v.12). The theme of the vine appear (v.2) and the reminder of the covenant (v.17) serves as a background for the plea for Yahweh to awaken (v.24), be moved

by the oppression of the people, and redeem "for your kindness sake" (v.27).

In the image of the vine we find the figure used by Osee and the important allegory of Isaias 5:1-7. God had planted Israel as a true vine in the land which He had cleared. The same figure is used in Psalm 79 (80), where (vv.8-9) the meaning is clearer. The branches extend from the Mediterranean to the Euphrates, that is, the idealized boundaries of the messianic kingdom of David. The "vineyard of the Lord of Hosts" is always Israel and the figure of the new shoot growing out of the old stock is common for the Messiah.¹⁹

This Psalm has affinities with Psalm 78 (79), another related text which employs the words we are tracing. Both Psalms tell of God's saving mercies of the past, and Israel's perennial waywardness and final rejection. Psalm 77 (78) recounts the story of God's continued love and forbearance and of Israel's consistent failure to keep the covenant. So God seems to reject the northern kingdom, His Israel (vv.59-64), for Juda. The people as a whole were wayward. The choice of Juda is linked closely with the deliverance of the people from Egypt or from the trials of the desert, and thus the reason for God's choice of the people in this Psalm is because they were sons of those whom Yahweh had led in the Exodus. In Psalm 43 (44), on the other hand, the people express another reason, the true reason: Yahweh is reminded that He chose them "in your love for them" (v.3). It was an utter grace. The Hebrew root (ratsah) has to do with the supreme generosity of God's nature; the "full forgiveness which He freely grants...stands for God's pardon and ...consequent restoration of fellowship with Him."²⁰ When the verb is used, as in Is. 40:2, the meaning is that Jerusalem has paid the penalty for her sin and, being converted to God in full repentance, she is received back into her original relationship with God. The root is generally used in

the context of God's "appreciation" of sincere efforts towards reconciliation with Him. And so it would seem that a key doctrine for the Psalmic statements regarding corporate restoration is the emphasis on God: His original choice of the people and His restoration of them after sin are realities only because God loves Israel.

We had briefly mentioned Psalm 77 (78) in reference to a lesser answer to the question of why God chose Israel. This Psalm again recalls the saving deeds of Yahweh, the repeated infidelities and returns of the people to God, their Rock, their Redeemer. This is a didactic pilgrim Psalm²¹ and the corporate ears of the people are told to listen (v.1) to the long history of grace and falls. However after this chastisement of Israel (vv.59-64) and the apparent choice of Juda (v.68), two new themes are added. Yahweh chooses David, His servant (v.70) to tend and lead His flock.

And He chose David, His servant,
and took him from the sheepfolds;
From following the ewes He brought him
to shepherd Jacob, His people,
and Israel, His inheritance.

The deep historical roots of Davidic messianism as well as the eschatological theme of the land are fused.²² Guillet points out that the shepherd of sheep becomes the shepherd of men, charged with a flock that does not belong to him but to Yahweh.²³ These two notions are constants throughout the Bible: man is commissioned with a task, yet the heritage is not his property but God's. The notion too, of "sanctuary" is clear in this Psalm in the guiding of the people to a holy region (v.54), the destruction of the sanctuary or forsaking of the tabernacle (v.60) and the ultimate love of Yahweh for Juda, Mount Zion, the central sanctuary established by David. Within this Psalm, there occurs a verse that is of key significance for the doctrine of the time (probably before 722 B.C.)²⁴ about infidelity to the covenant, about sin and for-

givenness:

Yet He, being merciful, forgave their sin
and destroyed them not;
Often He turned back His anger
and let none of His wrath be roused. (v.38).

Psalm 73 (74), a Psalm of Asaph, recalls the tradition that David instituted the Temple choirs when he first brought the Ark to Jerusalem (1Chr.16:4-42) and that he installed Asaph and his brethren to "give thanks" and "minister with music." It is possible that Asaph and his choir were the Temple choristers at the time of the Chronicler, however, about 350 B.C. It is Snaith's opinion that the writer of Chronicles largely "clothed the events of other days in the garments of his own time,"²⁵ and thus this Psalm may be a late community lament and a truly liturgical plea for salvation which begs Yahweh to remember the sheep of His pasture (v.1), the flock, His "community."

Remember your flock which you built up of old,
the tribe you redeemed as your inheritance,
Mount Sion, where you took up your abode.

Here converge all the themes of flock and inheritance, reunion and the Jerusalem sanctuary, the dwelling of God with His people. The Psalm itself describes the desolation of the Temple (vv.3-9); the "fool" or "reprobate" (v.22) may have been Antiochus Epiphanes²⁶ who burned the doors of the Temple and profaned the sanctuary, or it may refer to the sacking of the Temple by the Chaldean armies, for at this time "there was no longer a prophet," no one who "knew how long" (v.9). The Psalm pleads for divine help; the poet feels keenly the contrast between the love and the wrath of God. The traditional references are to the days of old when Yahweh's love was shown in His "purchase" of Israel: He had redeemed His people and His city as a wealthy man might redeem the lost heritage of an impoverished kinsman. All through history too, He had been the shepherd of Israel, "the flock of pasture" which He protected, guided, fed. Now the Psalmist pleads against the wrath of God, that He

might come and see the awful ruin (v.3) and thus be moved to act. It is as if (vv.4-11) Yahweh had put out His hand to help and then changed His mind; but the poet is only puzzled, not doubtful. His faith simply waits for the restoration, pleads in a certain security that God will not give up His "turtle-dove," an image which Osee links to Israel "the son" called from Egypt (11:11); God will not forget His "afflicted one" forever (v.9), the crushed, the poor and the needy (v.21). The theme of the anawim becomes a corporate one here; suffering is one of predominant motifs in the supplication Psalms.²⁷

The nation had to endure oppressive sorrow, in order to know what it meant for their forefathers to be freed from Egyptian slavery. ...The individual absorbed into the people of God thus felt the force of God's saving power....²⁸

Even here the Exodus theme dominates. God's people are "my kingdom of old" (v.12); the royalty of Yahweh is fundamental to Israel's meaning as a covenant people: it is within the people that God is present and that presence, localized in the Temple and the Ark of the Covenant, is what makes the nation cohere. The repetitions of "You" in the Psalm denotes the constant orientation of the people to God. It is this God who, in remembering His people, in reconciling Israel to Himself once again, will in fact simply be pleading His own cause (v.22).

Psalm 79 (80) is another national prayer for the restoration of the people, as the two which precede it, but here the situation is different. Each of the latter contemplates a single catastrophic event, though exactly what the event was, is not certain. In this Psalm there is reflected an important notion of the permanence of the desolate state of the land. It seems to refer to northern Israel (vv.2-3) devastated by the Assyrians, before the fall of Jerusalem,²⁹ for Yahweh is seated upon the "cherubim" (v.1), an image of the Jerusalem Temple, and connected by Ezechiel with the "Glory" of Yahweh, a sign of His presence.

The total imagery of Yahweh's inheritance is here differentiated; like a shepherd or vinedresser, He concerns Himself with His heritage. "The soil of Palestine is destined to give God His harvest, His home, His bride."³⁰ The Canaanite ideal of Baal as "master of the land" seems to persist in the sense that the land was, in much the same way as Israel herself was, the spouse of Yahweh. God and the land correspond to God and Israel, and further, the idea is consistently linked with the covenant.³¹

The Psalm is built entirely on the themes (as in Ezekiel) in which God is both vinedresser and shepherd; it begins "O shepherd of Israel," but the vine image dominates; the vine is vigorous, its boughs reach to the sea, its tendrils to the river, that is it covers the entire messianic kingdom (v.11). Joseph was a vigorous vine (Gen.49:22) and the figure is a standard prophetic image. This vine Yahweh Himself had removed from Egypt and replanted (v.8), smoothing the way for it. He had destroyed the land of Canaan in order to plant there, but the wall of protection is no longer around His vine.³² The notion of a punishment at God's hand is here:

Why have you broken down its walls,
so that every passer-by plucks its fruit? (v.13).

It seems that God Himself, rather than Israel's enemies, has broken down the wall; national disaster as well as national restoration is entirely in His hands. Then follows the plea for renewal of the vine that is Israel. The vineyard is the symbol of God's hope for the land, and in the corporate longing for redemption the people is fully aware that only if God does the converting will they be able to turn to Him (v.18). The language here recalls a liturgical formula which we will find preserved in Osee (6:2), "Give us new life, and we will call upon your name" (v.19). The plea that Yahweh's "help be with the name of

your right hand" (v.17) is perhaps a delicate play on Benjamin, "the son of the right hand,"³³ or a reference to either Zerobabel or Israel herself, for a king could embody the entire people as a single personality,³⁴ particularly before God.

In sum, the Psalm recalls the first Exodus in order to move Yahweh to a new restoration; the insistence of the people that they are deserving of some special consideration is simply because of God's fidelity and tenderness for His vine, His garden, His son. It is the vocation of this people to have community of life with Yahweh and so He is called upon to restore them because by His choice, they are His.

The last Psalm, 84 (85), we shall examine is again a national supplication for a full pardon and restoration, that is, for "peace." Past salvation is referred to in vivid imagery in which the Lord had favored the land by restoring the fortune of Jacob (v.1).

You have forgiven the guilt of your people
you have covered all their sins (v.2).

Then follows the plea that the saving God restore His people now, by proclaiming the messianic peace, in which "the land shall yield its increase" (v.12). Gales dates this Psalm in the time of Zerobabel, about 520 B.C.³⁵ This would indicate that the penance and reconciliation of the people after the Exile was not in their eyes the complete restoration they had dreamed of. The Lord was mindful of sin "throughout the ages," (v.5), yet His mercy is great and so the Psalmist beseeches God for a new revivification of His people.

This is a messianic Psalm, which is not explicitly Davidic, but truly describes his work. The "glory dwelling in our land" (v.10), that is, the Glory of God which Ezechiel is to see leave the Temple, will dwell in the land and thus be a sign of salvation.³⁶ This would be the perfect accomplishment of the Davidic work. The post-exilic restoration

was the guarantee and very dim figure of the messianic restoration for which the Psalmist, in the name of the community, calls. It is a time when kindness and fidelity or truth will meet, justice and peace will kiss, truth will spring up from the earth and justice will look down from heaven (vv.11-12). It is difficult to decide if these are personified divine attributes and so refer to God Himself or to human exponents of them. Gales opts for the latter, since the last verses (13-14) indicate qualities given when the Lord gives salvation.³⁷

The usual interpretation is that there are three clearly marked divisions in this Psalm: (1) the reference to the past restoration (vv.1-3), (2) the present prayer for restoration of the people to Yahweh (vv.4-8), (3) the description of a present (that is, very near) restoration, a happy time in the land when Yahweh Himself will be among His people. This has been strongly opposed by Oesterley who points out that the past restoration cannot possibly refer to the return from Babylon; it is contrary to the facts described in Esdras and Nehemias. Further, the future restoration takes us into the domain of the supernatural when the Glory of Yahweh is thought of as abiding in the land and He walks with justice and salvation personified before Him. All the verbs used here are in the perfect tense, as though a past event were being described, but the Hebrew perfect is used to express facts which are imminent and therefore, in the imagination of the speaker, already accomplished.³⁸ This is often called the prophetic perfect because the prophets use it when they are so transported into the future that they describe it as accomplished.

A technical term at the beginning of the Psalm also belongs to the language of the prophets: "Thou hast turned back the captivity of Jacob" (v.1).³⁹ This phrase is used by them to mean a restoration of primeval times of happiness, a "golden age" theme which plays an impor-

tant part in the prophetic teaching concerning the future. In Jeremias, "I will cause the restoration of the earth to return as at the beginning" (33:11), indicates a restoration of creation in its original perfection. This return of the primeval state of bliss was a conception of ancient, outside Israel, which was adapted by the prophets who use it in reference to the messianic age. Thus this Psalm is a prophetic view of the restoration, and is essentially eschatological. The result of the divine presence is seen both materially (v.12) in the prosperity of the land, and spiritually in the union of love and truth, the kiss of justice and peace, for material and spiritual are not disparate in the Hebrew mind. The final message of the Psalm is peace itself, which means a restoration of the covenant, union and harmony between God and His people. It is significant that none of the Psalms of collective supplication which we have examined have expressed royal "Davidic" messianism in the sense of an individual king.⁴⁰ It is Jacob, the land, the people of Yahweh as one, which He will restore and reconcile when He Himself will dwell among them.

With the later prophets the entire covenant relationship became more closely linked with the Temple liturgy⁴¹ and the doctrine of corporate restoration to God as revealed in the Psalms is a picture of post-exilic Israel engaged in common prayer. Israel sought reconciliation with God through the Temple, through its history as a people, and particularly through itself as a community. "The community itself is a 'sacrament' of God who lives in it"⁴² and even the most personal Psalms do not lack the awareness that it is as a people that Yahweh gathers His flock to Himself. The Psalms of national supplication, the days of communal prayer and penitence are the veritable Sitz im Leben, the concrete circumstances into which Israel is born.⁴³ Not only do these express the truth that it is as a people that Yahweh pursues His beloved Israel, the

Psalms and the liturgy continually shape and form and purify that worshipping community into the perfect Israel which Yahweh is continually drawing to Himself.

The doctrine of the Psalms which employ our key words reveal, in summary, the idea of the community need for redemption because of a community consciousness of sin. The images of flock and vine repeatedly emphasize dependence upon Yahweh; confidence in His power is expressed in reference to His work in creation and past salvation events; trust in His love is expressed in Israel's awareness of her election through Yahweh's gratuitous choice. The Psalms reveal Israel's conscious need to be holy as Yahweh's special heritage and the theme of the land further involves the messianic notion of Yahweh dwelling with His people. While the Davidic Messiah and his work are mentioned, he is not seen as an individual king. Yahweh alone is sovereign. The penitential spirit of the anawim recurs in several places, together with trust in the merciful God whose will is to restore a paradisiac happiness by saving, delivering, redeeming His flock, His vine, His Israel, His people.

What the prayer of the Psalms sought to express is clarified by the prophetic voice in the Bible. We will study texts in Osee, Jeremias, Ezechiel, and Second Isaias to trace the development of the concept of corporate reconciliation from pre-exilic to post-exilic times.

II. THE PROPHETS

Osee

Our research has focused on three words to highlight key concepts in the prophet Osee: "heal," "return," and "redeem" and it was found that all three words are interwoven in three groups of text which involve the people as a whole. The first is the group of oracles from 5:13 to 7:1. The word "heal" is used to refer to Juda (5:13); the people speaking in chorus use it in reference to themselves (6:1); God uses it in reference to Israel (7:1). Within this first group we find also used in a corporate sense, "return" (6:1), and "redeem" (5:14, 6:11).

The second text is the oracle 11:1-11, in which the word "return" is used two times in 11:5, of Ephraim or Israel, "the child." The third text is the oracle 14:1-9, in which "return" is used twice (vv.1,2) and "heal" in v. 4 is used of Israel, "the people."¹

The great innovation of the prophet Osee is that the relation between Yahweh and Israel is revealed to be intimately personal. On God's side it consists primarily in love and compassion, and therefore man's response should be one of love and humble trust. Osee picks up the traditional theme of all that God had done to save His people in the great deliverance from Egypt (9:7), referring to it as Israel's earlier relation with Him. He speaks of God finding Israel like "grapes in the wilderness" (9:10); the old Israel was dearest of all to God. The wilderness motif, without any reference to the Exodus from Egypt, which recurs in Ezechiel and in the Psalms, indicates the prophetic belief

that the days before the people entered Canaan were an idyl of peace.² The book of Osee centers around the comparison of Osee's marriage to an unfaithful wife (1:1-12), to Israel similarly unfaithful to her husband Yahweh; the conjugal symbol is to become a constant image of God's covenant love for Israel, His spouse, or for "virgin Israel," that title which often is connected with Israel's fickleness. And the "knowledge" of God, divinely accorded by the Spirit is not only as intimate and personal as sexual love, but the bond itself between God and His people endures in spite of separations. It makes the covenant a persistent encounter with the divine.³ The marriage allegory is evidently not entirely new with Osee for the use of "my husband" and "my Baal" or master (2:16) indicates that the people knew the idea only too well. The symbolic action in which Osee named his three children is important (1:3-9) for the names given are somehow effective of God's activity with the people; they bring about their significance in reality.⁴

The first child is named Jezreel and stands for the doom of the house of Israel, for Yahweh will "demand the blood of Jezreel" and "bring to an end the dominion of the house of Israel" (1:4). The second is a girl, which may simply mean that Osee's next child was a girl, or that the prophet wanted to change the masculine "Israel" to the feminine in order to use the image of wife. The daughter's name means "she-who-is-not-pitied" and this seems to be a definite refusal of any further tenderness on the part of Yahweh for Israel. The categorical denial of the third name "not-my-people," sums up this account of the three stages of God's rejection of His people Israel, "that people whom God went to redeem to be a people to Him" (v.4).⁵

With the prophet Osee comes the realization that Yahweh is essentially the lover of Israel and it is because of His love that moral demands are made. As always with the prophets, Yahweh's love and choice

of Israel as His own is in reference to His saving her in the Exodus experience; the people is expected to give a love-response of obedience not because the commandments of Sinai are right or beneficial but because the Lord God who brought the people out of Egypt (Ex.20:2) demanded it. This is the first redemption, the enduring point of reference and it is the corporate redemption of a people. Only because Yahweh has saved this people does it exist at all. However, there are no redeemed men in Israel, only an Israel which is incessantly being converted; Yahweh not only was but is the saving God.⁶

Osee realized in his own personal life that judgment and condemnation are not the end. The end of his marriage is like the punishment and condemnation of God upon Israel's forgetting of Him, her adultery. But Osee was ready to make a fresh start; he had never really stopped loving Gomer in all the pain of her betrayal. So too with Yahweh: He send a message of restoration to Israel; He could not change, He did not stop loving. And as Osee remembers the beautiful first days of his marriage, so God recalls the union with Israel in the desert; Osee therefore prophesied a new Exile, bitter in its loss of the promised land and yet one in which God would entice Israel to the wilderness again, once more make love to her (2:14). The three names of the children will be reversed, because this new Israel is to be God's people and Israel will say that Yahweh is "my God."⁷

That the prophet's personal life and particularly his marriage are symbolically effective of Yahweh's pre-ordained deeds with regard to His erring people is another aspect of "corporate personality;" Osee can be a "sign" to Israel because as a prophet he embodies the people, and so what happens to him happens to the people in him.⁸ The redemptive significance of the marriage and the children's names are thus central in the pattern of exegesis: God's condemnation becomes successively worse,

until it appears to be final. Then it is reversed.

The first texts we will consider are those in the section from 5:13 to 7:1. In the first part, (5:13-15), Osee's hope for redemption of the people involves an example of the Israelitic understanding of sin and its consequences melting into a single entity.⁹ Punishment, expiation, material ruin and internal destruction are all part of sin. In this passage, God, having removed Himself from the people, which is itself punishment, is not pictured as being active in achieving the new attitude of His people, in doing the work of bringing Israel back to Himself.

I will rend and be gone
I will carry off, with none to rescue.
I will go back to my place
Until they realize their guilt and seek my face
In their trouble they will seek me (5:14-15).

"Until they realize their guilt" is translated as "they have paid the price... and acknowledge their offense" in the Revised Standard Version of the Bible from the Hebrew root 'asham'.¹⁰ The noun from this root is used in post-exilic times as the technical term for the guilt-offerings for offenses in which the damages can be estimated in case or kind.¹¹ While we do not know what form the offering took in these pre-exilic times, the fundamental meaning is present in the word. So in Osee 5:15 the reference is to Israel paying the full penalty and thus obtaining her redemption. The punishment is within the sin. The same word used in Isaias 53 with its vicarious atonement theology is a development along the same line, but far from Osee's simple conviction that the relation between sin and suffering is one of a price to be paid by a sinful people.

The hope of a new beginning is brightest in Osee in 6:1-3. Possibly these verses are a continuation of 5:15, although it seems to be separate. It is nevertheless a genuine oracle.

Come, let us return unto the Lord;
 For He has torn but He will heal us;
 He smote, but He will bind us up;
 He will revive us in two or three days;
 He will raise us up that we may live before Him.
 Let us know, let us press on to know the Lord;
 As soon as we seek Him we shall find Him;
 He will come to us like the winter rain,
 Like the spring rain that waters the land. (6:1-3)

Here the prophet imagines a penitential liturgy, the words of which he has perhaps borrowed from some expiatory rite.¹² The people, frightened by the announcement of the coming punishment and abandonment by Yahweh (5:14-15), are exhorted to return to Him. The hymn expresses the awareness of corporate guilt and punishment and the need of the nation to be converted. There is too, the beautiful consciousness that Yahweh can and will heal them, will bind up the collective wound of His people. The utter faith that He will forgive, that it is a very short time, only "two or three days" that they must wait, is striking. They see that God does not change, the conversion must take place in the people, for as soon as they seek Him they will find Him. The awareness of God's saving plan is dominant in Osee: there is constant hope that divine blessings will follow upon Israel's punishment and conversion.¹³

This oracle plainly goes much further than the earlier one (5:15) in which God says He will return to His "place" to wait until the people turn and seek Him. Here Yahweh is active in bringing the wounded, dying Israel to life. It is possible that the two sections go together and intend to say that Israel must first turn and then God would be active in her restoration.¹⁴ In any case, the Lord will soon be coming to give His people new life; Israel is to deepen her knowledge of the Lord for He comes to her as surely as the spring and winter rains. Fertility of the land is an important concept in the messianic or eschatological strain that is found in Osee,¹⁵ and the water image is to grow in importance in the prophets. Here it is the perfect expression of the

continuing conversion and restoration of His people, especially since this "knowledge" is the personal and intimate knowledge-love of her God which Israel experienced so deeply.

The rich variety of images which Osee uses interweave: the faithless wife who is loved in spite of her infidelities is the central figure of the whole book (2:2-13); the vineyard theme that is to become more and more important is involved when Osee seals the pardon of his wife by giving back her vineyards (2:15); Israel herself is a spreading vine (10:1), and the shepherd image is present in 12:12. Each image makes it plain that Israel is the loved one whom God is restoring to Himself.

The original calling out of Egypt is the background in the second text (11:1ff.). Here the metaphor has ceased to be that of husband and wife and becomes one of father and son. Osee recalls events from the life of the remote patriarchal ancestor Jacob or Israel, and continually applies them to the contemporary people Israel (Chs.11-13). These chapters are a striking example of corporate personality; the individual and the group fuse into one. The Semite was well aware of the distinction between the individual and the collectivity but the two were so much a part of each other that they could never be entirely separate in his thought. The person was at once the individual and his society; Israel was at once the historical person of the past and the corporate person of the present.¹⁶ Israel the patriarch was not simply the representative of Israel the nation; they were both the same Israel.

In the passage (11:1-11) which contains the repeated use of a corporate "return," it is the Exodus experience which Yahweh recalls:

When Israel was a child, I came to love him
And from Egypt I called him.
The more I called them,
The more they went away from me;

But it was I who taught Ephraim to walk
 I took them up in my arms;
 But they did not know that I cared for them
 With human lines I led them
 With loving cords; (11:1,3,4).

The references to the guidance through the wilderness when Israel was a child, a guidance motivated only by love, are beautifully drawn; God, the Father, teaches Ephraim to walk, picking him up in His arms when the child stumbles, a Hebrew image of sin.¹⁷ The images of "human lines" and "loving cords" are not so much of a father and son, as of a shepherd who treats his flock with "human" attention.¹⁸ Again at 13:4 there is a statement of God's rescue of Ephraim out of Egypt, a sentiment which will recur frequently in Second Isaias, when the rescue from Babylon is always seen in reference to the earlier rescue from Egypt.¹⁹

But here (11:5), Israel is seen to repudiate its election, "Ephraim shall return to Egypt ...because they have refused to return to me." Yahweh says plainly that the people is utterly dependent upon Him (v.7), and then breaks into the touching exclamation:

How can I give you up, O Ephraim!
 How surrender you, O Israel! (v.8).

To this extent God pursues Israel and seeks to renew His claim upon her loyalty. "He will not lightly give her up."²⁰ Just as His grace preceded her response in the deliverance from Egypt, so it persists after her failure. Never indifferent to her response, Yahweh continues to seek her, to restore her to Himself.

I will not carry out my fierce anger;
 Nor will I again destroy Ephraim,...
 I will bring them back to their homes (vv.9,11).

This entire passage is disputed among scholars because of a badly preserved text. There are some frankly confused additions and many verses which announce coming disasters, (e.g. v.10), and the question is whether the entire theme is one of hope or desolation. It is certain

however, that Osee expects both the destruction and the restoration of the people. And the apparent dilemma is, in a manner, "solved" insofar as the prophet realizes that the key is God's unchanging fidelity to His promises, His forgiving love for His people; it is the only explanation for the divine redemption, its essentially distinctive characteristic.

The last passage (14:1-9), although possibly from another and later prophet,²¹ beautifully sums up the message of the book. By isolating the passages of redemption, we have necessarily ignored those which condemn sin and evil and speak of imminent destruction. They are as many and as frequent in Osee as they are in Amos.²² However Osee goes beyond Amos in his vision of the new rescue, the new Israel, in this last chapter particularly. Israel is called upon to return (v.1) to his God, to return to His Lord and say to Him "wholly forgive guilt" (v.3). If Israel so turns to Him, Yahweh says:

I will heal their backsliding
I will love them voluntarily
For my anger has turned away from them.
I will be like the dew to Israel,
So that he will blossom like the lily
And his roots will spread like the poplar,...
And they shall blossom like a vine... (vv.4,5,7).

Again the key is love (v.4). Hesed, the word used most frequently in Osee for "love" (53 times), and which is bound up with mercy toward men and fidelity toward God, especially denotes for this prophet that which God expects from men. But the word used here in verse 4 is rahamim, and in Osee, is reserved for God Himself.

He introduces us into a new world, the world of love. For Osee, the entire history of Israel is the adventure of a love, the love of God. It is at one time the love of a husband, at another time the love of a father. There is nothing capricious whether of the head or of the heart, in this love. It is a love of the entire being.²³

Thus it is that the famous passage in Osee (2:19) interprets the hope of Israel as a people in the vocabulary of love. There could be no better summary of the prophet's doctrine. Here, by an unusual coincidence,

"justice," "kindness," and "mercy," the ideal of the Psalms, are found together. Yahweh betroths Israel to Himself and His betrothal gift to His bride is one of justice and righteousness, mercy and love, and the knowledge of God. In the way of Yahweh with His bride, justice has a depth and warmth unexpressed by our word. It means a Savior-God who lifts the fallen. It is the characteristic of Osee's God whose enduring attitude is always to begin again that He might save Israel from herself.²⁴ The hope of messianic restoration in Osee is thus identified with the object of the covenant, for the covenant was based on God's justice, His judgment - sedeq, mishpat.²⁵ Mercy (or kindness or tenderness) means a full and free forgiveness; it is hesed or loving-kindness, the most important word. It is God's persistent covenant-love for Israel that makes Him allure her once more to the wilderness. His strong love for wayward Israel must seek her out, forgive her, draw her to Himself. Thus does this passage explain redemption. It means the eternal laws of justice, all the dreams of brotherhood among men, the tenderness of the heart of God and His unshakable solidity; this is the foundation of the union of God with His people. In the union of Yahweh and His bride, she had nothing to offer her husband; all its riches are His gift.²⁶

Jeremias

The wider destinies of the divine plan as made known by the pre-exilic prophets were revealed to the people in the very metaphors which were used. Israel the wife of Yahweh, Israel the vine, Yahweh's child: all were meant to have a social force that Israel might know her mission as instrument. The Israelites were conceived of as a unity, and prophetic preaching was aimed at the preservation of this unity, for Yahweh's election and the covenant had brought into being a people, not an aggregation of persons. The Semitic sense of solidarity in which society itself was only "family writ large" was the foundation of the prophets' emphasis on the corporate identity of Yahweh's people as distinct from all others in its singular destiny. And Jeremias is an integral part of the prophetic tradition which fought to maintain the ancient conception of solidarity.

Some modern observers have held that because of this corporate sense, prophetic preaching was self-defeating, and was rescued in the new idea of individual responsibility and conversion of the interior hearts of men emphasized in Jeremias and Ezechiel. However, it is an exaggeration to say that these two prophets discovered the individual.²⁷ It is true that they stressed personal responsibility and it is also true that social solidarity was much stronger until they appeared on the scene. "But in no period of the life of Israel do we find extreme collectivism or extreme individualism, but a combination of both."²⁸ There is a collective sin and a collective well-being of society in both pre- and post-exilic prophets.

Jeremias' message to the people is distinctive, however, in that it is concerned with the particular notion of man's individual freedom and dignity; the new and interior covenant will transform the individual

within himself (31:34) and each one will know the Lord. Jeremias places a new emphasis on the personal element with the community (31:30), but it is a stress which was a corrective to the opposite false position of the day; individualism was not the whole of his teaching.²⁹ Thus it is important to gather evidence that in spite of Jeremias' concern with the most spiritual conception of the "heart" of each man, the notion of corporate solidarity and forgiveness is retained.

From the wealth of evidence which the book of Jeremias contains, the tracing of the words "save" and "return" shows them to be used repeatedly in four key texts: (1) 3:7-4:4, where the word "return" occurs five times (3:7,12,14,22, 4:1); (2) 23:1-8 where "save" is used (v.6) of the kingdom of Juda; this text will be considered in conjunction with 50:6-20, for its similar imagery and reference to the "pardon" of a remnant; (3) 30:5-22 where "save" occurs (vv.10,11) in reference to the people as Jacob; (4) 31:1-26, where "save," (v.7) "redeem," (vv.10,11) and "return" (v.21) are used with all the imagery of the shepherd, the father and son, Jacob as the people, and the figure of virgin Israel.³⁰

The significant fact of all these and many other texts is this: while the new covenant of Jeremias is peculiarly personal and interior, it is nevertheless a covenant with the house of Israel. Jeremias had no intention of founding a new personal religion; it is still "my people" (31:34), it is still a covenant which rests upon divine forgiveness, the shattered people knowing the extent of their sin. The individual emphasis was meant to strengthen the solidarity and both Jeremias and Ezechiel see, however dimly, that the solidarity had to depend on something other than common land and common blood, as they envisage a new Israel much like the old except for sin.

Jeremias' portion is mainly to be the herald of doom and destruction, of uprooting and tearing down. The lack of apparent plan in the

book is inherent in the nature of his message of contradiction; themes interweave in the announcement of sin, suffering, punishment. Jeremias' words reveal the horror of the condition of Israel, the people whose whole function is to know Yahweh, as involved in religious and political idol-worship. The message of hope and consolation which finally does break forth is that of a future glory, a distant fulfillment which will come.

The imagery of Jeremias testifies to the continued notion of Yahweh's relations with the people as one. Jerusalem is a harlot who preens herself (4:5-31); Israel had loved Yahweh as a bride in the desert (2:2)³² and Yahweh had led her to a garden land (2:7). She had been planted as a choice vine by God (2:21) and now she has become obnoxious to Him. So deep and habitual was the sin of the people that they can do nothing for themselves; the purging will come from without. The coming seige of Jerusalem and the Exile to Babylon are seen as the immediate consequence and punishment for the people's sin. God is master of His people as the potter is of his clay (19:1-13); He fashions them at will and if they fail to repent He will break them. In a grandiose vision, Jeremias takes the cup of wrath from the hand of God and finally gives it to Jerusalem and all the nations to drink; they shall drink and be convulsed and go mad (25:17). This is the extent of the evil and all are guilty.

The texts we have chosen, however, repeatedly express God's restoration of His people. Yahweh begs her to return that "you may dwell in the land which I gave to your fathers." There is a continual expression of the "tender love of God for His people, and the patience and persistence with which He sought to renew the bond between Israel and Himself even when Israel had broken it."³³ In the first series of texts (3:6-4:2),³⁴ Yahweh treats of Israel as a son, which is the probably

meaning of "rank you among the sons" (v.19); Jeremias here follows Osee who had spoken of Yahweh calling His son out of Egypt (11:1). The meaning in Jeremias is that having given Israel the status of son by redeeming the nation from Egyptian bondage, God also gave the people its land. Because of His love for Israel, God gave it the special dignity of being His particular heritage. Since He thus treats Israel as a son the response He expected was that of reverence and respect as to a father. Instead (v.20) the people betrayed Him - and the betrayal is worse than that of a son - it is like an unfaithful wife who betrays her husband for the sake of a lover.

This appears to be the same imagery as in Osee, but here there is more insistence on the past history of Israel;³⁵ all her meaning as a people is due to what Yahweh had given her and yet she is disloyal. Nevertheless He repeatedly begs her to return (3:7,12,14,22, 4:1). With the image of the spouse of Yahweh, the possibility of reconciliation is always present: the image as related to the covenant demands love or "knowing" Yahweh, more than "holiness."³⁶ The first two times it is "apostate Israel" who is called upon to return, then (vv.14,22) it is "return, apostate children," and finally

If you return, O Israel...
Return to me (4:1);

or in the Jerusalem Bible:

Si tu veux revenir, Israël, oracle de Yahvé,
c'est à moi qu'il faut revenir.

The whole context is an alternating narrative and refrain which is a plea for the total return of the people. Historically, while later generations would understand "return" to refer to the return from the Exile, Jeremias himself could only mean repentance; and the Septuagint reads "return unto me." The prophet's exhortation is clearly connected with the title which he repeatedly gives the people. They are "apostate"

not "exiled." Since Israel's guilt is summed up in its apostasy, what was first demanded was repentance, not a change of position. The conditional "if you return" (4:1) would have been a mockery of a captive people,³⁷ and so we can be sure that Jeremias' particular doctrine of repentance is to be found in this oracle. However, as Gelin points out, the section from verses 14 to 18 seems to presuppose the events of 587 B.C.³⁸ and a return to Sion which will reunite Juda and Israel. Further, it would seem that sin and guilt are so one with material and national disaster and ruin, in the mind of the prophet, that to separate the sin of the people from their political state is to make an unnatural dichotomy. Penance is part of politics in a people whose whole purpose is to be God's people.

It is God's mercy (hesed) which highlights the notion of forgiveness in Jeremias,³⁹ together with a demand for undivided obedience and submission.⁴⁰ This is simply the result of Yahweh's character. Being who He is, the only way to Him is repentance. And in these verses which are so dependent on the thought of Osee, several new emphases are made. "In those days the house of Juda shall join the house of Israel and they shall come together from the land that I gave your fathers for a heritage" (3:18). Here is a hint of the messianic restoration when the future kingdom will be united in the tradition of David's unification.

Return apostate children!
I will heal your apostasy.
See we come to thee,
For thou art the lord our God. (3:22).

In a dialogue with His repentant community, there is the whole of Jeremias' doctrine of forgiveness. The people must return and yet all healing is done by God. He had told Juda that because of her hypocrisy (vv.7-10) she was worse than her sister Israel; finally (4:4) the Lord tells Juda to circumcise her heart, the heart of a whole people. The

second use of "return" (v.1) is in such a position that the emphasis is not on the people but on Yahweh "who is at once the source of Israel's self-disgust and... of every new hope," and it means that to Yahweh, "they may, they must, they can return."⁴¹ The series of oracles begins and ends with repentance.

The next passage is one in which Juda is "saved" (23:1-8) and it may be compared with 50:6,7,20. In a messianic vision, Jeremias sees that God Himself will gather His scattered flock into their fold. The shepherds of Israel having been wicked, "Yahweh will raise up for David a righteous shoot," someone who will be a perfect king in the future age (v.5). His name, "the Lord is our vindicator" or "Yahweh is our justice" is a symbolic name in pointed contrast to the name of King Sedecia which means "Yahweh is my justice."⁴² Here the return from the Exile is given equal importance with the Exodus.⁴³ The evil of scattering His flock is what Yahweh intends to punish, the restoration of His flock will be the good accomplished in the messianic age.

In an oracle against Babylon (50:20), Yahweh speaks of a pardon which He will grant to a remnant, a pardon so complete that Israel will have no guilt, Juda will have no sin. This occurs in a text which carries out the notion that the people are lost sheep (v.6), a "scattered flock is Israel" (v.17), and the new note is that Israel will be brought back to the fold by a pardoned remnant. Here is just an indication that the function of the remnant will be a world-mission, an idea which will deepen into the understanding that God seeks the world through Israel.⁴⁴

The third and fourth texts (30:1-22, 31:1-26) are within Jeremias' "Book of Consolation" (30-33). It is seen that, awful as the time of distress is for Jacob, out of it he will be saved; this salvation is a breaking of the yoke from Jacob's neck, a freeing from slavery. The people will serve only Yahweh(v.9) and David, the king whom Yahweh will

raise up for them. Jeremias emphasizes the non-political character of the Messiah; in fact, his meaning is a "collective Messiah" for he refers to the entire Davidic line.⁴⁵ Jacob is Yahweh's "servant" (v.10) whom God will save as a race from the land of captivity. Historically, this captivity is not the Babylonian Exile. The message is addressed to the northern exiles of 721 B.C., and the hope expressed refers to a restoration of the Davidic kingdom. In the first words of the oracle (30:39) we find Jeremias' nationalistic messianic testimony; Israel and Juda will be reunited under Yahweh and His king, David.⁴⁶

For I am with you to save you...
I scattered you,...
I will correct you (v.11).

Here recurs the notion of a saving God who is a present, acting power. All that happens is the effect of Yahweh's will. He punishes, but His punishment is to educate, to straighten man. Jacob's wound is incurable (v.12), his guilt is great (v.14) and so it is that only the Lord can and will bring recovery and "heal you of your wounds." The love of Yahweh is His dominant will to restore and He will heal because Sion, the outcast, has none to care for her (v.17). The restoration is in terms of a return to a past union, the time of "living in tents" (v.18), Israel's first union with God. The Exodus is the standard; a new congregation will be established (v.20) and Yahweh will allow the prince and ruler who will come from the midst of the people to draw near and approach Him (v.21) Again the messianic theme but here it is tempting to see someone like Daniel's (7) Son of Man, not a king, but a prince who approaches God.

From this passage we move immediately into the next (31:1-26) in which the Lord has saved His people (v.7), the remnant, has ransomed and redeemed Jacob (v.11); Israel is called to be restored because she has repented (v.18), Yahweh calls to virgin Israel to return (v.21).

In the prophets, the image of the "virgin of Israel" throws light on the unity of the nation from the point of view of salvation, as well as corporate unity in its infidelity.⁴⁷ As always, God's love takes the initiative in prompting the movement of return. Israel will find grace in the wilderness, for the everlasting love of Yahweh is that which draws her to Him (v.23). Osee's theme is carried forward here. It is the "virgin Israel" who is to be converted in the desert through a new Exodus.⁴⁸ The vineyard is mentioned (v.5), and the refrain is shouted:

The Lord has saved His people
The remnant of Israel (v.8).

That the call in Ephraim is to go up to Sion indicates the beginning of the religious unity to be recovered in the single sanctuary at Jerusalem. Nationality is still the condition of salvation here, but in the new covenant passage which follows, the moral conditions are primary.⁴⁹ Again Yahweh is seen as a father to Israel, His first-born (v.9). And with this verse is allied another (18) in which Ephraim is "my son, my darling child," who begs, "restore me that I may be restored."

The significant fact that these passages reveal is the retention of all the corporate ideas of solidarity and restoration with God in a passage intrinsically connected with the climax in Jeremias, the expression of the new covenant (31:31). The images of the sheep and the virgin daughter are involved with the higher union of the Lord with His people expressed there, the interior transformation of the individual within himself, so that each one knows the Lord in an intimate way. The traditional language and thought show that neither the old covenant nor sacrifice and cult pass away; they are extended.⁵⁰ Jeremias insisted to the end that Yahweh could not be served well except in the social relationship that He had always willed for Israel. The new covenant retains and transforms the old.⁵¹ The covenant relation in its beginning rested

on the free grace of God who called Israel into it. The new covenant rested on the same free gift, but it was new in this: it forgave the breach which had destroyed the old. It had all the content of forgiveness and thus could unfold its meaning only to a people who understood its need for forgiveness. The covenant relation is old and yet it is new because it involves sin and reconciliation, facts which can only be explained by seeing that the relationship between Israel and Yahweh is the response of love to the divine gift.⁵²

Ezekiel

The strange figure of Ezekiel is the next prophet we will consider. A younger contemporary of Jeremias, he may have uttered some of his prophecies in Jerusalem but for the most part, authors accept the exilic situation of the book which bears his name.⁵³ Ezekiel preached among the exiles for at least twenty years, that is, for fifteen years after Jerusalem fell. Before the final collapse of the city, he had but one message: a pitiless, relentless doom. There is a noticeable lack of a number of restoration passages in the total book, even as compared with the traditional "doom" prophet, Jeremias.

Ezekiel was an ecstatic, whose performance of symbolic acts, as signs of Yahweh's intentions for the people, is well known. Perhaps the most touching sign is the one, reminiscent of Osee, in which the prophet's wife, "the delight of his eyes," dies, and he is forbidden to make any sign of sorrow (24:15ff.). The coming disaster is to be for Jerusalem either too awesome for tears⁵⁴ or so sudden and total that there will be no time for private grief.⁵⁵ Ezekiel further embodies his people and their sin as "son of man" as well as in his symbols.⁵⁶ His message of doom, not so poetic as Jeremias', describes the guilt of the people as so deep that, unlike Jeremias and Osee who had idealized the wilderness days as a time of Israel's fidelity, he sees it primarily as the time of the revelation of the Law,⁵⁷ and the people have been disobedient from the beginning (ch.23). Ringing the changes on Osee's figure of the adulterous wife, Ezekiel's baldly vivid allegory of the faithless wife (ch.16) is a total condemnation of Jerusalem as the illegitimate offspring of sin. She is worse than Samaria or even Sodom:

she is covered with guilt.

The sin that Ezechiel hammers at is much the same as in Jeremias, for he too speaks of a new kind of morality. He protests against the ancient principle of solidarity as Jeremias had (31:29), and like Jeremias, Ezechiel is a champion of individualism. In a famous vision (chs.8-11)⁵⁸ there is given the beginning of his doctrine, as individuals are marked out as being wicked or good, and thus designated for punishment or salvation. Although it is the whole house of Israel or Juda whose guilt is immeasurable, the sin exists in single persons. The principles here indicated are enunciated more clearly (ch.18) as a doctrine of individual personal morality is given, an important development in the religious thought of Israel. While it is true that the excessive rigor of later Judaism is to develop from the fact that it is no longer true that the "father eats wild grapes and the children's teeth are set on edge" (18:1), Ezechiel's expression contains none of the later unrealistic legalism.⁵⁹

It is surely significant that Ezechiel retains, as a central part of his message, the concept of the reconciliation of the people as a whole to God. For it appears that not only is he preaching a religion of the individual, he catalogue of sins and stress of individual purity⁶⁰ would seem to put the emphasis on men and not on God. Further, an exiled people, lacking the national bond that is provided by a homeland, and this particular people whose very being was God-centered in Yahweh's Temple-presence, would seem to be deprived of all that would help them maintain a corporate personality.

In a way, all this was true. The people were scattered and had no city or temple or liturgy to unite them as one before Yahweh. It is precisely for this trial that Jeremias' covenant of the heart and Ezechiel's individual righteousness had to be preached. The faith of

Yahweh's people must be kept alive in the heart of each one until the time of return. It has been said that "the Semitic writer... is conscious of one thing at a time and he affirms it with all the vehemence of his remarkably fiery temperament."⁶¹ This does not mean that he is denying one truth when he states an apparently contradictory idea. He merely views the truth from many aspects, "uncircumspectly." The doctrines of individualism of Jeremiah and Ezechiel have received many interpretations which are equally untrue to the real principle of solidarity.⁶² While Ezechiel seems to negate all possibility of corporate righteousness, the unusual circumstances of the Exile and the Hebrew mentality of the writer must be considered.

The book of Ezechiel contains the words "save" and "restore" and they are usually used in a corporate sense. For while the theme of individualism prevails in the prophet's denunciation of sin, it was the people which had perished as the result of that sin.⁶³ We will consider the following passages as contributing to the doctrine of corporate reconciliation: (1) "return" as used in 11:18 of the "house of Israel," (2) "restore" as used in 16:53 of "Samaria and her daughters," (3) "save" as used in 36:29 of "my people." In the last two passages "save" is the same word used in the Psalms we considered, in Osee, in Jeremiah, and it will be the key word in Second Isaias.

The first passage of restoration (11:13-21) occurs immediately after the famous vision in which Ezechiel saw the divine presence leave the sanctuary. The very person and "human" Glory⁶⁴ which had appeared to call him to his prophetic mission, now rose above its holy place of dwelling and left the Temple. This divine presence "created and maintained in being the people of Israel as the people of God."⁶⁵ If this presence ceased to be, Israel ceased to be. It would seem that the first part of this chapter is an interpolation⁶⁶ and thus the restoration

promise would normally follow the scene of the departure of the Glory. Several key concepts are seen in the passage; the first is the remnant notion. Ezechiel clarifies a theme which has been growing: the definitive people of God will be a people purged of its "loathesome and abominable impurities;" a purified people will be gathered and restored by Yahweh. Therefore there must be a separation. The original notion of the holy people as "separated" was necessary not only for purity but for unity as well. Next we see that Yahweh will give the people "the land;" the familiar theme of the inheritance is here joined to the establishment of a perfect people. Later in Ezechiel the new apportionment of the country (chs.47-48) will be its symbol.⁶⁷ It is Yahweh Himself who will give the people a new heart and spirit, removing from their flesh the heart of stone. Ezechiel often indicates the renovation of both the nation and the individual by the phrases "new heart" and "new spirit."⁶⁸ It is further characteristic of him to emphasize the supernatural help, the utter gift that is to create the Israel according to the spirit, the new house of Israel, for only God can and will so create her.⁶⁹

In spite of his message to the individual, in two of his most famous allegories Ezechiel recounts symbolically the history of Israel and her sin in a distinctly corporate way. The allegory of the two sisters (23:1-49) which puts in parallel Jerusalem and Samaria, carries out the same theme as the passage we are considering, the allegory of the faithless wife (16:1-63). The description of Jerusalem's totally helpless position from the very beginning and throughout the history of Yahweh's kindness to her could be no plainer; soiled and unclean and naked when He found her, she grew and became strong only because of His word and will. Again He passed her, covered her nakedness and finally plighted his troth with her in the covenant (v.8). Perhaps there is a reference to the installation of the Ark at Sion, a symbol or indication

of cultic unity.⁷⁰ It is God who bathed and dressed her, made her beautiful; "your beauty was perfect because of the splendor that I bestowed upon you" (v.14). Here again is Ezechiel's particular contribution to the doctrine of Yahweh's relation with His spouse, the gratuitous and purifying character of His love. Jerusalem is only lovable because God made her that way. Now the allegory launches into the awesome description of Jerusalem's harlotry; God's action in the form of "judgment"⁷¹ will be the effect of her abominable activities of slaughter, bloodshed, idolatry, political intrigue. Old Testament judgments are salvific, however, and Yahweh remembers, even in the midst of the horror (16:53) and promises to restore the fortunes of Samaria and Jerusalem (v.60): "Yet I will remember the covenant which I made with you in the days of your youth, and I will establish an everlasting covenant with you."

As all sin is covenant-breaking, conversion is the indispensable means for return, and return itself always refers to the pure covenant of Israel's origine.⁷² Ezechiel emphasizes that God Himself will give the repentance, "so that you may remember, and feel ashamed,...when I forgive you all that you have done" (v.63). In the entire allegory Israel is seen to have no grounds in her ancestry or purity of race for her covenant privilege. And Ezechiel equates the formulas of marriage and the covenant (v.8).⁶ "This allegory of Israel's history takes for granted the Hebrew's consciousness of solidarity with his people, his land, his God Yahweh. These things cannot be dissociated."⁷³

After the fall of Jerusalem, the attitudes and preoccupations of Ezechiel were transformed. The discouraged people, exiled in a strange land, without their legitimate Temple and its organized cult, felt that God had forgotten them, that He was not present, and that the punishment was the definitive annihilation of Jerusalem.⁷⁴ Against this twofold temptation Ezechiel gave a message of comfort and hope: a new

Exodus deliverance was coming and the Exile situation was a new wilderness discipline in which Yahweh was purging His people before leading them home. The old national hope will revive but will be pushed into the future and transformed, wholly dependent on a new divine saving act. Ezechiel did not surrender the hope deposited in the promise to David, "but he tore it from its roots and hurled it into the future."⁷⁵

The prophecy immediately following the news of the capture of Jerusalem shows that the hope is still to be a corporate one. It is a prophecy against the shepherds of Israel who have failed to care for Yahweh's flock (34:1-31).⁷⁶ "You have neither strengthened the weak, nor healed the sick, nor bound up the wounded, nor brought back the strayed, nor sought the lost" (v.4). The failure of the shepherds has resulted in the scattering of the sheep, therefore Yahweh will save His flock (vv.12,22), rescue His flock (v.12). He will seek out the lost, bring back the strayed and bind the wounded Himself. This "save" is the saving used in Jeremiah and Osee for God's beloved spouse, and is found in the corporate prayer of the Psalms. In all these places it involved the medicinal notion of healing as well as judging. God Himself will execute an individual judgment (v.22) and will set up one shepherd over His flock. David, His servant, will be His prince (vv.23-24). The reference to David, rare in Ezechiel, is perhaps a later addition or simply a generic formula adopted by him.⁷⁷ God will make with His people a covenant of peace, the result of which is paradisiac in scope. Perfect freedom from hostile neighbors, from the forces of nature, and a fertile and productive land will be the happy state (vv.25-28). But especially, the flock, "the house of Israel, my people," will know that Yahweh is their God and they are His people (vv.30-31).

It has been said that the messianic texts of Ezechiel are neither

as many nor as rich as those found in Second Isaias.⁷⁸ And yet the profundity of this text, together with 37:16-28, can hardly be overestimated in the light of the New Testament. Here it is not a question of a glorious messianism so much as the picture of the king-shepherd, an ancient oriental notion taken over by the prophet. Jeremiah had applied "shepherd" to the leaders of Israel (23:1); here it is Yahweh Himself who will gather His flock and restore His people. It is only after the restoration by God that the Messiah appears, David. The title "servant" designates fidelity to an office,⁷⁹ obviously opposed to the false leaders of the flock. The new David will be Yahweh's prince and shepherd, implying both justice and love. The passage maintains Ezechiel's characteristic emphasis on the divine, not human, rule,

In the allegory of the two sticks (37:15) some further light is shed upon the Davidic Messiah. In this symbol Israel and Juda are represented as joined in the prophet's hand (v.17). The Lord will gather His children into one hand and they shall have one king and shepherd (vv.24-25), yet David will be Yahweh's servant, His prince (v.26) in the everlasting covenant of peace. Again this may be reference to a collective Messiah, the entire line of David.⁸⁰ Not only does this passage reveal Ezechiel's insistence that the twelve tribes in the desert had no king,⁸¹ but it further hints at the transformation of true kingship into "servant-ship."

The true prophetic hope of salvation is beginning to focus on the establishment of a kingdom, God's kingdom. In this restoration passage of Ezechiel (34) an idea emerges which will become a constant in Second Isaias, that of a future age of peace in all nature, a paradisiac harmony in inward and outward creation (vv.25-30).

The last key passage (36:1-38) is another in which Yahweh will save His people, this time from their "impurities" (v.22). The word is

common in Ezechiel's liturgical descriptions (40-48) and is often used in the Psalmic liturgical texts. The passage speaks first of the restoration of the land (vv.1-15), then of the regeneration of the people (vv. 16-38). However it is a single oracle pronounced after the fall of Jerusalem⁸² for the references to the profanation of God's holy name are many and probably refer to the great scandal of foreign profanation of the land, city, and Temple (v.20). The oracle retains in the first part the notion of Yahweh's heritage, for He plants His Israel as a vine in the land. (In 19:1-11) there is a poem which says that the mother of Israel is a vine, but the emphasis is not on God's kindness so much as on the vigor of the plant, which is finally plucked up in fury and planted in the desert.)⁸³ Here the action of Yahweh is one of gathering the people and bringing them to their own land (v.24). The land that was desolate is to become like Eden (v.36) because the Lord Himself will rebuild and replant it.

The distinctive addition of this passage is the notion of corporate purification. We have seen that the remnant implied a "winnowing" of the people. In this text, purification has much to do with the giving of the new heart and spirit to the people (v.26); a heart of flesh is given to replace the heart of stone (v.27).⁸⁴ In the messianic age, characterized by the outpouring of the spirit and effected by the Messiah, the work of salvation will be accomplished.⁸⁴ The purification described must take place because God's holy name has been profaned; it is not for Israel's sake but for God's own name, that Yahweh will restore. In fact, His name is what is restored (v.23). This is to be effected by a cleansing and healing lustration; Yahweh will sprinkle pure water to purify the people "from all your impurities and from all your idolatries" (v.25).

Ezechiel was the son of a priest (1:3), a "priestly prophet" who

would project the new Israel according to the designs of his famous vision (40-48). When he describes a stream of living water flowing from the Temple (47:1-12), he will express in symbol the truth that Temple worship will not only knit the people as a family, it will provide the family's source of life.⁸⁵ These last chapters are written as the provision for the new order, the restored Israel of the new covenant. Ezechiel had spent his early life in close proximity to the cultus, and the sins that most impressed him were those that had to do with Temple worship.⁸⁶ Thus his extreme concern is for the purification of the sanctuary and the altar, and he provides for sin and guilt offerings for people and places and objects. Further priestly overtones are had in the passages of restoration in which Yahweh will make the people numerous as a flock: "like the flock for sacrifice, like the flock at Jerusalem during her festivals..., a flock of men...shall know that I am the Lord" (36:38).

The reconciliation of the community to its God always means a "descent to Israel of a presence, of the divine presence."⁸⁷ The ritual religion is the sign of this presence and all the institutions of Israel existed only as testimony to Yahweh's presence. Thus will Ezechiel emphasize that the restoration of the community will be intimate bound up with the Temple liturgy. The everlasting covenant of peace means that Yahweh has set up His sanctuary forever among His people, His dwelling place is with them, (37:27), and makes them one.

Second Isaias

The writings of Second Isaias (40-55) have been called a "theological manifesto about salvation,"⁸⁸ specifically involving all Yahweh would do for His people, for His own glory, His "justice" which is His generous nature and His will to save. The song of comfort rings out with urgency, the prophetic portion of joy is here as well as the figure of the suffering just man, which appears for the first time as being the explicit promise of the purification of Israel and the salvation of the nations. Second Isaias changes and discards some of the earlier forms of prophecy and while out of all the prophetic tradition, he is in closest affinity with Jeremias, still he contrasts with him in omitting all biographical data, testifying indirectly to a more profound spirituality. Although his interest in the cult is slight, the influence of Second Isaias meant a deepened spirituality in the cultic life of post-exilic Israel.⁸⁹

The transition to the world of Second Isaias involves the tremendous effect which the Exile had upon Israel, for it was a trial which meant a fresh orientation. In Babylon, the people had no temple or king, but only the Scriptures and the prophets to guide them. The memory of Jeremias lingers, for "Ezekiel and Second Isaias are his spiritual sons: it was they who planned the new Israel and helped it into existence."⁹⁰ Isaias' commission was to speak tenderly to Jerusalem (ch.40) proclaiming to a despairing people that Yahweh was coming not to judge but to release Israel from her bondage and to restore the shattered foundation of her homeland. Pardon, restoration, and grace are imminent and the

exultant tone of the opening chapter is characteristic of practically the whole book.

The single word "redeem" is used corporately in a number of passages.⁹¹ In 41:14, Yahweh is the redeemer of the "worm Jacob," the "insect Israel;" in 43:1, He has redeemed both Jacob and Israel; in 44:22, Jacob is Yahweh's servant who is begged to return for God has redeemed him; in 51:11, the prophet recalls the past and present redemptions of the nation. The "heal" which is used by Isaias only once is in the key passage 53:5: "we" were healed by the stripes of God's servant.

The first text (41:14) brings us into a passage in which many of the fundamental themes are interwoven. Israel is "my servant" (v.8); Jacob is "chosen." Yahweh's servant appears repeatedly throughout the prophecy and outside the Servant Songs, as well as once explicitly within them (49:3), is always in identification with Israel. It is another image of the covenant reality, for the servant is the people chosen and separated by Yahweh in order to be a witness before the nations (43:10). This servant has been unfaithful (42:19) but Yahweh will pardon and save Israel. In the Servant Songs, another meaning will be attached to "servant."⁹² Here the "worm Jacob," "insect Israel," (more expressively in the Jerusalem Bible, pauvre larve, chetif vermisseau), is told not to fear because "your redeemer is the Holy One of Israel" (v.6). This go'el is the word for the "avenger of blood" (Nb.35:19), one who redeems a debtor, or the close relative who defends the widow as in the book of Ruth, an idea closely connected with the Sinai covenant. Two important themes are indicated: the brief mention of the anawim (v.17) in the poor, the needy who will be answered when they are parched and thirsty; and the remnant who will be led in the new Exodus. It is the Lord Himself who will lead His people, opening rivers, providing life-giving waters (v.18), planting the desert as a luxuriant garden (v.19). The

eschatological and patriotic themes of Second Isaias are expressed in a God-centered universalism.⁹³ The desert truly becomes a new paradise, for (v.20) the prophet sees in the new Exodus imagery a culmination of Yahweh's creative and redemptive activity, reaching back not merely to the first Exodus but to creation.⁹⁴

The notions just indicated are expanded in the next passage, 43:1-21. Yahweh had created and formed Israel, now He restores the people to Himself: "I have called you by your name, you are mine" (v.1). As in the Exodus, Yahweh will be with the people when they pass through the waters (v.2) and they shall not be overwhelmed; the new Exodus opens a way in the sea (v.16). At the same time there shall be waters in the desert and rivers in the wasteland (vv.18-21) - the important idea of life-giving waters. The image of gathering and leading the people recalls the king-redeemer (v.15), and always it is the Holy One of Israel who saves, "and apart from me there is no savior" (v.11). In all of the Old Testament, the word "savior" belongs only to Yahweh, the holy and one God.⁹⁵ It is He, their Creator (v.15) who is doing this "new thing" of creating a new paradise (vv.20-21). The promised land is a material reality as before, but there is a higher spiritual content too; to be chosen means to know Yahweh, that intimate, personal love-knowledge and awareness of God's loving choice.⁹⁶

This total restoration is better described as a renewal in Second Isaias for the new Exodus, the new paradise, the new song of Israel, involve a re-creation of the old relationship with God. Yahweh has ransomed Israel "because you are precious in my sight, honored and loved by me..." (v.4). To renew the people is to love the people. For this He created and formed each one who is called by Him. Israel is each Israelite, and the whole plan of salvation is for God's glory (v.7), a saving glory from of old, for Yahweh has always been the same (v.13).

Israel is seen as a consecrated nation, but as "consecrated to the God of the universe,"⁹⁷ of all creation. The salvation of Israel is as a witness to the world.

So it is to the nations that Second Isaias speaks, for the Exile and dispersion had the effect of making the Jews aware as never before of the wide world, and the breadth of prophetic outlook correspondingly expanded. The scattered Jews, cut off from the Jerusalem ritual, naturally turned to the more spiritual and universal elements in their religion. Second Isaias advances the notion of the salvation of the Gentiles. The collapse of the nation also meant a new awareness of Israel's unique election. While politics as such had always been a threat to her purpose as a holy people separated from the nations, the Exile awakened a world-consciousness in which Yahweh's purpose in history was revealed in wider scope. The time was ripe for seeing Israel as the redemptive instrument for all mankind.⁹⁸ She was to be a light to the nations which would show the Gentiles that Yahweh is Lord of history and will save all men.

The next passage of redemption involves the notions of sin and God's way of forgiveness (44:21-45:10). Jacob, God's servant, is reminded that it is Yahweh who formed him and who will not forget him:

I have blotted out your transgressions like a mist
Your sins like a cloud.
Return to me, for I have redeemed you (v.22).

This redemption is the revelation of God's glory (v.23). He has accepted the penance of the Exile and so has already forgiven. It is clear that the reason for all the disaster is disobedience; the Exile is not simply a matter of politics but is punishment for sin, God's righteous judgment. But "justice" and "glory" mean that He had never surrendered His saving intention.⁹⁹ The mercy and love and tenderness of the covenant God are one with His fidelity; since He is always the "same" (43:13), His forgiveness must be the same. The formulas of the covenant repeat that

God's gift will never be revoked,¹⁰⁰ and Second Isaias insists that the covenant bond had never really been broken. The Exile was no divorce but a momentary estrangement, a wilderness experience necessary for the religious understanding of the people. Even Cyrus, the liberator, is Yahweh's instrument in restoring His chosen nation to Himself, for he is called "my shepherd" (v.28). In the opening chapter it was Yahweh Himself who as a shepherd tends and gathers His flock, carrying the lambs, gently leading the young (40:11). Now it is understood how cosmic is their God's control. Not only are they able to return because He had redeemed them, all of history is directed by God's saving purpose. The inclusion of Cyrus in God's plan shows the new and broader concept of a universal salvation (vv.6-8), and yet Israel's conviction of her own special place is never surrendered.

The last word meaning "redeem" (51:11) is in the context of a long deliverance passage (51:1-52:12) addressed first to "the peoples" and then to Jerusalem. The first section repeats the ideas of a new paradise and new Exodus which will bring all nations to Sion. Rahab, or Egypt, (51:9) is also a symbol of the primordial chaos ordered by God's creative act.¹⁰¹ The nations are "the redeemed," "the ransomed," (51:10,11) who come to Jerusalem with "everlasting joy." within the universal salvation, Israel's special portion is reserved, for it is as part of the creative act of Yahweh that He said to Sion, "you are my people," (51:6). The cup of punishment (v.17) is taken away from the holy city (52:1), the captive daughter (v.2). It is His people that God freely comforts (v.3) and redeems (v.9). The last note is one of purification; the holy people must touch nothing unclean, keep itself pure for its holy function (v.11).

The last passage in Isaias is in the fourth Servant Song and the word "heal" is that used so often by Osee and in the Psalms. The reali-

zation of sin in these chapters involves the prophetic proclamation that God would glorify Himself through the mission of Israel, whose nobility was to be found in her task, her service. Here the figure of the Servant of Yahweh takes shape, surpassing any previous historical figure in dignity and effectiveness as He uses suffering as a means of expiation for guilty humanity.

It has been proposed that much of this last hymn was originally written about Jeremias, and reworked by the later Isaias who related the figure to his own servant Israel.¹⁰² The questions of whether the Servant is to be taken in a corporate or an individual sense, whether his work is to take place in time or in the messianic future really have no basis in the prophet's message as such, for this is clear testimony that the community may be addressed as an individual or an individual may incarnate the whole community, past and future.¹⁰³ Rowley lists the opinions of scholars that the Servant is the actual, not ideal, Israel,¹⁰⁴ that he embodies the mission of Israel to the world,¹⁰⁵ and his own opinion, dependent on that of Christopher North, is that there is a certain development and fluidity alternating between the collective and individual, the people and the remnant.¹⁰⁶ It is a particular example of the Old Testament conception of solidarity, of the community of all generations, "the Servant is Israel today and tomorrow."¹⁰⁷ Just as sin is never an individual concern, the community-individual distinction in Israel's covenant faith was not an either-or proposition. The community itself is an individual; the Servant is probably collective in the first two songs and individual in the others: the prophet himself in the third and the Messiah in the fourth. The Servant as Israel is agent to the nations in the first song, yet has a mission to Israel in the second; those who hear him must walk in darkness in the third song, perhaps recalling the shepherd imagery. But the last song is the most mysterious

proclamation of the messianic message in the Old Testament. Isaiah 53 is the exalted and spiritual summary of atonement theology, a vicarious expiation in which the Servant lays down his life as a sin offering for many (52:12). The Servant is the figure of a martyr and savior, a person but no single person; he includes and represents Israel as the community that is Yahweh's servant. True Israelite and true Israel, the just man's suffering is fruitful for sinners through solidarity with them.¹⁰⁸

Eichrodt has observed that vicarious satisfaction was never dominant in the cult of Israel¹⁰⁹ and therefore while the Servant's life is compared to a guilt offering, it does not mean a penal substitution, because sin offerings did not mean this.¹¹⁰ The idea of vicarious punishment was simply not involved in sacrifice, but that the passage has no connection with the guilt offerings of the Priestly Code and the second Temple,¹¹¹ does not seem to follow. The sacrificial significance in the "ransom" which is a free offering of life is the transformed and spiritualized idea of ransom of life by substitution, the basis of the redemption of the first-born.¹¹²

The passage indicates that all peoples will be able to approach God through this Servant who bore the "guilt of us all (v.6); the Hebrew has "for the sins of my people." The suffering Messiah is absolutely unique, shown as the object of God's justice He makes vicarious satisfaction for others in his own innocence. He will be exalted through suffering and the mystery will ultimately be understood by the people. The Servant had grown up like a "shoot from the parched earth" and, struck and smitten for the sins of the people, he thus restores them to wholeness and peace. The nations too, confess that the sacrifice was for their sake (52:15). Like sheep, the people were gone astray (53:6) and Yahweh had laid their iniquity upon another. Here is a profound insight into the meaning of suffering, unparalleled in its perception that Yahweh's

plan for restoration uses affliction, and He is not so much punishing as identified with the Servant's voluntary sacrifice. "God's purpose and man's action coalesce."¹¹³ The prophet has brought into royal and innocent suffering the ancient idea of vicarious expiation, lifting it to a profound spiritual plane by his insistence that the victim must deliberately and heroically accept suffering in order that his oppressors may be saved.¹¹⁴ The universalism of Second Isaias which is unique in its relation to the mission of Israel, the servant of God, is now concentrated in the Servant who suffers for universal ends.¹¹⁵

The final chapters sweep into a vision of the glorious new Zion. Yahweh Himself has done all these things, called back the wife whom He had abandoned because His love is enduring. Even though the mountains and hills be shaken, His covenant of peace shall not be (54:10), but rather shall be renewed. The life-giving word, like the rain and snow from heaven, shall make the earth fruitful, and all creation will acknowledge the Lord's memorial in the establishment of His reign, and His everlasting sign.

* * * * *

The testimony of the prophets has been seen to maintain the doctrine of corporate reconciliation, while continuing to deepen and spiritualize its meaning. Osee emphasized the personal love element in Yahweh's relation to Israel, His bride, His spouse. The honeymoon of the desert, the recurrent wilderness motif, is a situation which is entirely restored through Yahweh's healing. A time of punishment is only meant to make the wife freely want to return, and yet God alone gives her the power to do so after the required time. The punishment time makes Israel conscious of her guilt; this is a prerequisite for her return. The fertility of the land is the theme which especially contains the messianic

element in Osee: it involves the image of Yahweh's flock and His vine. And yet in the notion of heritage, Yahweh gives back the vineyards to Israel, His spouse. Healing is then the corporate restoration of His bride by Yahweh who alone gives Israel the desire to return to Him.

In Jeremias, the themes of land and heritage, vine and flock, and especially the bride, are retained in spite of emphasis on the individual, the interior covenant within the heart of each man. The individual within the community is delineated when the prophet preaches, not against mediation and the official cult, but against the prevalent externalism of such ritual. In fact, the community ordinances are meant to be the official norm for individual piety. The notion of corporate healing is maintained as is the emphasis on the divine initiative. However, the conditional (Deuteronomic) mentality of the covenant is more sharply affirmed. While Yahweh gives the ability to return and His salvation is a liberation and a freeing of the people, they must correspond. Their response to Yahweh's call is a necessary element in the reconciliation. The notion of the remnant becomes more important in Jeremias, for the return from the Exile will equal the Exodus in importance. Messianism is definitely present in Jeremias: the Davidic king is referred to in the image of the just shoot and restoration is seen in terms of the union of Israel and Juda under David. Reunion is spiritual and takes place within the heart of man. The covenant means the union of each Israelite with Yahweh but within the total Israel whom Yahweh heals and restores to Himself.

Ezechiel, in contrast with Jeremias, places a great deal of stress on the external liturgy and repeatedly points out the need for the people to be purified for their holy function. The restoration passages emphasize the notion of a holy or separated people, the remnant. Ezechiel's doctrine of the individual is balanced by his imagery of the shepherd,

Yahweh Himself, and the flock. In fact, it is within the flock that the shepherd exercises judgment of each individual. It is characteristic of Ezechiel to point out that all restoration and healing is Yahweh's gift; His judgments are salvific. It is only through supernatural help that the new heart and spirit can be given: Yahweh's bride is utterly dependent for her cleansing, her healing, her restoration. Race and ancestry are no grounds for security. And yet at the same time the solidarity of land and people is the background for the fact that God's love makes Jerusalem, His bride, lovable.

Second Isaias draws together the threads of the prophetic doctrine in a profound theology of salvation. The themes of flock and vine culminate in a new paradise mentality; fertility of the land is involved with life-giving waters and a new Exodus passage through the waters. Israel's election and the fact of the remnant are seen in a universal framework: Israel's mission is to be the redemptive instrument for the salvation of the Gentiles. The Servant theology of vicarious atonement is the summit of corporate reconciliation, catching up the theme of the anawim and the corporate personality of Israel, the servant. The free offering of the Suffering Servant accomplishes the healing of guilt, the redemption of all nations. The stress in Second Isaias on the need for Yahweh to cause the free return of the people draws into focus the use of suffering or "punishment" which educates or re-orders, and a God who does not so much punish as He becomes identified with the Servant in his sacrifice. The reconciliation of all people in one and as one is the interior message and imminent hope of Second Isaias.

III. COMMUNITY ATONEMENT

"All belief strives toward incarnation;"¹ and for the Hebrew, all visible things are soaked with symbolic meaning. The cultus was the medium by which the divine power was presented to man and man was reconciled to God. Restoration of the people was accomplished by Yahweh through the Temple worship which He Himself ordained. The community Feast of Atonement particularly was the occasion in which the whole nation expressed its need for reconciliation. While we know of the popularity and importance of other Jewish feasts, it has been said that this tremendous consummation of the concept of atonement came to dominate the whole sacrificial law.² However, the origin and significance of the feast is neither decisive nor clear. We will examine some of the underlying notions involved in expiatory sacrifice in general and in this feast, which itself involves a fusion a various expiation rites.³

Israelitic cultic life is marked by an increasing sense of sin. The joyous character of the early festivals was partly displaced by the somber tone of the rites described in Ezechiel and the priestly literature, and as the prophetic indictment of the nation was validated by the succession of national disasters. The total result was a solemn feeling of the weight of persistent sin, the conditional element in the covenant, and the pervasive uncleanness of the people. The tabernacling of the holy God in the people's midst, the seal of the covenant and a source of joy, was at once the cause of the nation's fall because holiness could not be present where impurity existed. So it is that God had ordained

that the ancient blood rites of primitive peoples become acceptable as a means of atonement. And for priestly theology, by making atonement the breach of the covenant and the problem of sin were effectively handled.⁴

Thirty years after Ezechiel's last dated utterance, Cyrus gave permission for the restoration of the Temple. The ritual code in Ezechiel does not correspond with the worship of the Temple but its tone is the same. Ezechiel preached repentance to a covenant people, and sacrifices, generally speaking, operated within the covenant; they were offered to a God already in relations of grace with His people, not to attain His grace but to retain it. Although the priest was said to "atone" for sin by means of sacrifice, it was not essential to forgiveness;⁵ Yahweh forgave whom and when He wished. If any "rule" predominates in Old Testament thought it is that whatever the means for reconciliation with God, they are put at man's disposal by God. Pardon is an act of God's mercy. "Atonement...always depends...upon obedient performance of what the covenant God Himself has ordained for the maintenance of His covenant."⁶ Thus is eliminated any notion that sacrifice is meritorious in itself, or magical. It is a pure gift, effective only because Yahweh has said so.

The most general term for pre-exilic sacrifices is gift and while God, of course, has no need of man's gift, by accepting it He somehow binds Himself to man. The transformation of the sacrificial victim by fire into smoke, and the blood as the life-source contacting the altar, the symbol of God's presence, constituted communion and gift. It was only incidental that if Yahweh was angry He might be appeased by presents, and in this way the early sacrifices might be said to have expiatory significance.⁷ Thus Ezechiel's emphasis on expiation was a new thing in Israel, but expiatory sacrifice was probably derived from very

ancient rites. It became important when great national calamities brought home to the people its own guilt, and in Ezechiel, expiation becomes the chief purpose of worship. Two new types of sacrifice, besides the burnt-offering and the peace-offering appear; the sin offering for ordinary sins of weakness, and the trespass offering for unintentional sins of ignorance.⁸ The fact that of all four types the sin offering is the most important, points to a new tone in post-exilic religion. The rejoicing of the festal meal is partly displaced by penitent humiliation before Yahweh.

The Jewish high priest was "holy" or set apart as representing the entire people and he bore the names of the twelve tribes on his shoulders and breast. While the sin offering was also made by individuals, it was particularly offered on the behalf of the high priest and was, in fact, a bull, the same type of offering as was made for the entire community, for the guilt of the high priest defiled the whole people.⁹ The high priest thus representing and embodying Israel is a clear manifestation of corporate and individual solidarity.

The purpose of expiatory sacrifice was always to re-establish the covenant with God when it had been broken by sin. The importance of the blood ritual in expiation is evident. It was sprinkled on the veil of the Holy of Holies, rubbed on the corners of the altar, and the remainder poured out at the foot of the altar (Lev.4).¹⁰ Blood could be used to expiate because it is the means of life, but it was effective only because God willed it. The early belief in the redeeming power inherent in the blood is overcome by the time of Leviticus: "...for the life of the creature is in the blood, and I direct you to place it upon the altar to make atonement for you; for it is the blood which as the life makes atonement (17:11). The animal flesh so offered is not "loaded with sin" but is rather a victim pleasing to God, who in consi-

deration of this offering, took away sin. And the hizza ritual (Lev.4), which is only included in sin offerings, denotes the special effect of consecration of the blood, in order that it may be used for sacrifice. There is no "self-redemption" here: this consecration stamps the expiation to follow, (the rubbing of blood on the altar or kippur act) as a sign of Yahweh's mercy.¹¹ This special consecratory act only occurs in the case of a community sin (Lev.4:13ff.) or that of the high priest which brings guilt on the whole people (Lev.4:2ff.). It seems highly significant as pointing to the penitential purification of the people for a further liturgical participation.

The entire ancient world was aware of a mysterious force inherent in things; to touch the "impure" or the "sacred" placed one under some kind of interdict. This impurity is a state, a condition from which man, or a nation, must emerge in order to re-enter normal life. These ideas as retained in the Pentateuch, have a transformed meaning, and served not only to separate Israel from the pagan world around it, but to "inculcate the idea of Yahweh's transcendent holiness and of the holiness which His chosen people ought to preserve."¹² It was "holiness" in fact, that was involved in every effort of the Levitical system to discover and reveal the sacred value in things as created and therefore penetrated by God. This was the entire effort of the cult.¹³

The naive and spontaneous early sacrifices thus became "required" and nationalized. Indispensable public services assured the daily purification of the nation from sin,¹⁴ a stain that endangered the community, made it "not whole" or unable to participate in meal sacrifice. The two ideas of reconciliation and expiation are not distinct for kippur often means both. And Yom Kippur, the Day of Atonement, or simply "The Day," was the culminating point of the religion of Judaism. The leading idea of the entire Priestly Law here found its best expression. It is the

center of the whole system, the last consequence of the principle, "You shall be holy, for I am holy." The two important facts about Israel's approach to God through holy places and seasons are the centralization of worship at a single Temple where its purity could be effectively guarded, and the deepened moral meaning which such special days of approach to the Temple acquired in the light of historical experience, punitive and redemptive.¹⁵

The Day of Atonement is a fusion of various rituals: (1) an ancient ceremony of expiation, connected with the Sacred Tent, in which the whole sin of the congregation was removed, and focused in the rite of the "goat for Azazel;" (2) an expiatory act before the Ark and the altar involving the multiple sprinkling of blood. Both are very ancient and particularly does the scapegoat ritual have old and magical roots. It was probably a popular non-religious custom sanctioned by the priests at the time of the restoration. And it may be that it was merely a non-effective symbol of the effect of the blood ritual. This, of course, can only be a later explanation, not the original meaning.¹⁶ The ceremonies are strictly confined to the priesthood. The Priestly Code joined these ancient elements, added an incense ceremony, and so created the act of atonement. But its special significance lies in the fact that the whole congregation, all of Israel, you and old, men, women, and children, were active participants.¹⁷

The feast was probably not instituted until quite late; neither Esdras nor Nehemias know of it as such, and the feast described by Ezechiel (45:1ff.) does not correspond to the Atonement feast as it is given in Leviticus (16:1-34).¹⁸ The date is laid down for the tenth day of the seventh month (Lev.23:29). At a meeting in the Temple, special sacrifices were to be offered to make expiation for the sanctuary, the priestly house, and the entire people. The ritual (Lev.16)

centers in the two ceremonies which were entirely different in spirit and origin.

The Levitical ritual in which the high priest offered a bull for the sinfulness of himself and the whole Aaronite priesthood is mentioned first. This is the only occasion when he entered behind the veil which shut off the Holy of Holies, to incense the mercy seat, and sprinkle it with the bull's blood. Next he offered a goat for the sins of the community and sprinkled the blood in the same manner, and finally there is an aspersion for the sanctuary and the altar itself.¹⁹

The second part of the expiation is the "goat for Azazel," which is set before Yahweh alive. The priest imposed his hand on its head, and confessed "all the iniquities of the Israelites and all their transgressions in all their sins,...laying them on the head of the goat" (Lev. 16:21). Then the goat, now impure, is sent off into the desert by a man who himself must be purified before re-entering the community. There are various extra-biblical counterparts for this rite, and DeVaux finds a close analogy within the Bible itself. For in the ritual for the purification of a leper, a living bird was released to carry the evil away and the leper declared clean.²⁰ Similar Babylonian rites are surely included and transformed in the Atonement rite, but the meaning is much deeper in the "goat for Azazel." When the high priest drew lots between the goats the parallelism "one for Yahweh, one for Azazel" which he spoke demands that the latter be the name of a person, and probably a supernatural being, a devil. The Syriac version interprets it thus; the Book of Henoch refers to Azazel as the prince of devils banished to the desert, and the Hebrews thought of the desert as the dwelling place of the devil.²¹ It must be remembered, however, that the transferral of sins and resultant expiation could only effectively exist (if they were more than a simply symbol of the blood rite)²²

because the goat was set before Yahweh (v.10) who brought about any effectiveness. The Israelite ritual has truly exorcised the original primitive custom.

The meanings involved in these rites are diverse. And the fact that "the Law does not describe the existing practice, it prescribed it,"²³ means that our biblical information about the Atonement Day involves much wishful thinking. What the actual practice was, and what precise meaning it had, is indecisive. But some basic significances can perhaps be discerned, and these do seem to indicate the fact of Israel's need for corporate reconciliation, and for the liturgical expression of that need.

For the Temple, the Atonement was like a new consecration, and Israel was again made a holy people, assured of the blessings of Yahweh and made worthy of her glorious destiny.²⁴ At the beginning, the high priest laid aside his usual dress for simpler attire that he might enter the Holy of Holies in all humility; the penitential tone is evident throughout. The fact that this becomes the most important feast, especially towards the time of Christ, indicates the change of community spirit. Israel, reflecting upon her present state, gave over much of the rejoicing of the annual feasts for a spirit of penance, and the ordinary ceremonies were inadequate to express the keen sense of the burden of sin. The Day of Atonement is an attempt to regain the holiness lost in the year that has gone that the whole people might again approach the holy God. Thus the Atonement consisted in a restoration of a quasi-physical relationship, and was ordered to further union in the other sacrifices.²⁵ The heightened concern for the Law heightened also the fear of breaking it, and thus produced a deeply felt need for continual expiation. The Atonement Day is the public, official and liturgical manifestation of this corporate attitude.

In the episode of the goat the removal of sin is stressed. By

confession of sins and the imposition of hands, the people claims to identify itself with the victim and to share its fate. The priest, acting in God's place, performs the sprinkling of the blood and thus frees the power of life there contained for the benefit of a people who were virtually dead.²⁶

The secretive and nocturnal character of similar primitive rites is dispelled in Israel's open, community acknowledgement of sin and guilt and her need for reconciliation. Israel's feast is singular in that the entire people took part; at the same time the entire people was embodied and represented in the high priest. The prophetic doctrine that the divine initiative is at the root of all restoration is fundamental; the liturgical rite was only effective and healing because of Yahweh's salvific will. And even then, this sacrifice which healed and reconciled the whole people to God was only partially efficacious, for as the Epistle to the Hebrews will emphasize, it had to be repeated.

In Israel, all the rites of purification are seen to be unified by their relation to Yahweh and to the establishment of His holy people. This is their deep significance. The blood or life is important in its reference to Yahweh; it is because of the divine will that this is the way of establishing a way of life pleasing to Him, by the means which He Himself provides. The transformation takes place gradually as ritual purity becomes symbol and expression of interior and moral perfection.²⁷ When Yahweh provides the means of atonement and so helps the people to maintain the covenant relationship with Him by removing disturbing elements, it is simply that God is expressing His dominant will to sustain and deepen His union with His one people, His Israel.

The doctrine of corporate reconciliation with God has been seen to deepen in the prophetic writings. Osee's introduction of Yahweh's personal love for Israel as spouse, Jeremias' spiritual covenant of the

individual-in-community, Ezechiel's emphasis on the need for the purity of the holy people, prepared for Second Isaias' announcement of Israel's corporate mission to the world. "Salvation" of the people of Israel deepens from the physical and temporal order to mean the messianic salvation, and finally the Exodus and the Exile are seen to be the dim figure of a corporate salvation from sin. All the prophets speak of a "purifying judgment" in which God cleanses and heals His favored people in order to unite them to Himself, and the Day of Atonement is the expression of this purification. The Old Testament bears witness that this purification of the people is continual: God's covenant with His people, His flock, His favored vine, His bride, is a constant grace of reconciliation.

IV. THE NEW TESTAMENT

The coming Ecumenical Council has elicited much writing on the notion of Church reform, and although only an individual can sin, there is a limited but true sense in which the "holy" Church can be called sinful. She is therefore called to repentance, not in her nature as gift, but for her imperfect response to the gift.¹ In this part of our study we will sift the New Testament evidence which shows the essentially corporate nature of the completed and the eschatological redemption in Christ. Finally we will attempt to draw together some aspects of the Scriptural doctrine into an expression of the continuing nature of the reconciliation of the community to God as a specifically Christian, Incarnational or sacramental process.

The Old Testament themes which we have traced have shown both the deepened sense of sin and the increased corporate hope of restoration which developed in the later prophets. Ezechiel's cultic and expiatory emphasis, perhaps reflected in the national Feast of Atonement, was accompanied by his prediction and promise of the flock to be saved by Yahweh Himself. The narrowed remnant and Servant themes of Second Isaias are balanced in his universal salvation of the nations through Israel's mission. It is into an atmosphere of sin,² to a people pre-occupied with legal purity, but a people who felt the need of salvation and "looked for the consolation of Israel" (Lk.2:25), that the New Testament message came. Forgiveness and reconciliation are close to the center of the Gospel: the good news is that the barrier of sin is broken in Christ, fellowship with God is man's and is to extend to all

society and to the whole universe. Christ has done and is doing all that is necessary to meet man's need.³ The Person of Christ is the center; we shall examine a few texts which demonstrate one aspect of the mystery that Christ Himself is the bearer of our penitence, has saved and is continually saving the people of God.

Christ caught up and transformed three key Jewish ideas: the kingdom of God, the Day of Yahweh, and the remnant. These will be seen to penetrate the texts of corporate redemption. Some of the earliest Christian sources, the sermons in the Acts of the Apostles, reveal that salvation has happened, the Day of the Lord has been accomplished (Acts 2:21ff.) and Christ is the cornerstone of salvation for all men (4:12). Even before Acts, however, is the evidence of the preparation of the Apostles by Christ which can be discerned in the Gospels.⁴ At the beginning, John the Baptist demands metanoia (conversion or complete turning), because the kingdom of God is at hand. In His public life Jesus announces the kingdom, it is "in your midst" (Lk.17:21), and while He refused the title of king (Jn.6:13), He identifies Himself as the Son of Man, the messianic figure of Daniel 7. When the people fail to respond to the parables of the kingdom, Christ devotes Himself to the little group of disciples until the confession of Peter (Mt.16:16), the peak of Christ's self-revelation. The lesson of the post-Resurrection appearances is one of presence, and after the Ascension, the Apostles are aware of two comings, not one; "the time of Israel's restoration remained hidden,"⁵ the universal judgment of the Day of the Lord was deferred and linked to the second coming of Christ.

So in the primitive kerygma, the Apostles preach that the messianic times have come. Yahweh's Spirit has been bestowed and the group of Apostles are transformed into the new people of God. They are the remnant, they form the messianic community which is Israel's restor-

ation, but on a totally new and higher plane because of the presence of the risen Jesus, who has been exalted in power.⁶ This restoration can be understood in terms of the Old Testament themes of the liberations of the people of Israel accompanied by their God, closely connected with the Sinai covenant. It is the Greek words lutrosis, lutrotēs, lutrosthai, apolutrosis or "redemption" that provide one key to the New Testament affirmation that the fulness of time prefigured and announced by the ancient liberations has arrived. For Christ is spoken of as having saved mankind in the same way in which Yahweh saved His chosen people. This salvation possesses a positive coloring, for God saves in order to take possession, to unite man to Himself. In St. Paul, Christ is a "ransom" for all, since His Death and Resurrection was an act of supreme love, a perfect sacrifice by which all were given freedom from sin.⁷ The word "redemption" connotes the economy of salvation in which God frees all men in a loving desire to communicate His own life, share His own happiness.⁸

In the Gospels and Epistles it is seen that the definitive salvation of man has taken place. Jesus represents the kingdom as the messianic realization of the remission of sins or the salvation from sin, promised by the prophets as part of the new covenant.⁹ His kingdom is the restoration of Israel as God's special people through the reign of "justice."¹⁰ Paul sees God's justice as manifested in Christ, the immediate source of man's justification; God's justice is an activity which accomplished the restoration of Israel. It is a positive notion which implies a change of state, a gift. "St. Paul puts himself squarely in the pure prophetic tradition, for which the justice of God denotes a new state of innocence and perfection, transforming the hearts of men through an eschatological act."¹¹

The time of God's "anger" is over and the time of salvation is

here; through solidarity with Christ mankind as a whole has been justified. The Gospels see the death of Christ as a ransom, a deliverance, an atonement, as He transforms the Son of Man concept by uniting it with that of the Suffering Servant.¹² The Epistle to the Hebrews particularly speaks of the definitive redemption which has been accomplished, once and for all.¹³ The whole New Testament testifies to the redemptive Death and Resurrection of the Incarnate Son of God, which has taken place.

And yet the possession of the kingdom and of redemption is not yet complete, but is an inchoative possession of the fulness which is to come. It is a partial but real possession, a pledge of the final perfection of the kingdom of the future. This eschatological orientation is characterized by the mystery that, in spite of the true dynamism of "justice" which radically re-turns mankind to God, man is still free and can thwart this positive re-ordering!¹⁴ This tension between the present, inchoative possession and the eschatological fulfillment of salvation is, ultimately, the foundation of the Christian's moral life. He is no longer "carnal" but "spiritual" in Paul's expression, yet in a real sense, he still lives in the "flesh."¹⁵

The message and mission of Jesus included the whole complex of sin, debt, and forgiveness, and His salvation of the human race as a whole which has occurred is inevitably involved with the message of future redemption, just as the salvation of the individual is intimately connected with the restoration of the people. "Realized eschatology" is a characteristic of the New Testament message: Christ has saved and yet is saving His people. We will examine the notion of corporate reconciliation which permeates the New Testament in all its imagery by analyzing some texts in which the key words "save," "heal," "redeem," and "restore" are again used in a corporative sense. "Cleanse" and "reconcile" are added in the New Testament study. These words invariably lead to a

consideration of the notion of the kingdom, the themes of the Son of Man and the Suffering Servant in the Synoptic Gospels. In the infancy narratives, the words point to Christ Himself as the fulfillment of the corporate restoration promised in the Old Testament, while in St. John, they occur in the context of the vineyard and shepherd allegories. In the Epistles of St. Paul, we have limited the texts to several in Romans and Ephesians, which indicate the development of St. Paul's theology of the Church. Finally several passages in the Epistle to the Hebrews will be studied in relation to the Feast of the Atonement. Our study will show that the concept of corporate reconciliation which persists in the New Testament is transformed in the Person of Christ, the "corporate" Servant who redeems, the "collective" Son of Man who will complete the final reconciliation of the kingdom of the saints to God.

V. THE GOSPELS

The Synoptics

The Synoptic texts in which "save," "heal," and "redeem" are used in a corporate sense will be examined first, and then the infancy narratives of Matthew and Luke, which represent a later reflection on the Person of Christ who is revealed as the fulfillment of the Old Testament corporate hope. The Greek words for "redeem"¹ and "redemption"² lead to Matthew 20:28 and Mark 10:45, in which the Son of Man is come as a ransom or redemption for many; Luke 24:21, in which the Apostles had hoped that Christ "would have redeemed Israel;" and Luke 21:28 which describes the eschatological redemption when the Son of Man will come again. These words further lead to the infancy narrative of St. Luke (1:68) in which Zachary speaks of the "redemption of His people," and 2:38 in which occurs the description of Anna as one of those who looked for the "redemption" of Israel or Jerusalem.

The Greek word for "save"³ as used in a corporate sense in Matthew's infancy narrative (1:21), is also in his parable of the lost sheep (18:11). It is used corporately in St. Luke (9:56, 10:10) in reference to the Son of Man. The Greek word for "return" or "restore"⁴ as used so often in the Old Testament is used only once corporately in St. Luke (1:16,17), when the angel tells Zachary that John the Baptist will restore many of his people Israel to their God. The Old Testament word "heal"⁵ is used only once of the community as a whole and this in St. Matthew (13:15), where the healing of the people is in a citation

from Isaias 6. These are the texts around which the Synoptic evidence of corporate reconciliation will be approached.

The total message of the Gospels is salvation, and therefore we simply see different aspects of the saving story in each evangelist. St. Mark's Gospel approaches the central fact of the Person of Christ in the Incarnate Son of God who, in His Death and Resurrection, has realized His vocation as the Isaian Servant of God; in Mark, even the Son of Man is the "Servant."⁶ St. Matthew views salvation through the mystery of the Church in the image of the kingdom, while for St. Luke in his "Gospel of salvation," Jesus is primarily the Savior, and in the themes of priesthood, Jerusalem, and the Temple, Luke describes the fulfillment of the religious aspirations of the world.⁷

Mark 10:45, "the Son of Man also has not come to be served but to serve, and to give His life as a ransom for many,"⁸ occurs after the request of James and John that they might have the privilege of sitting at Jesus' right and left hand, when He is in glory (v.36). Jesus refers to the "cup" which He must drink, the "baptism" He must undergo, sacramental references to His passion, and He is dealing here with specific groups: "the ten" (v.41), "among you" (v.44), "for many" (v.45). The Son of Man is the messianic title which, when used in the Gospels, indicates fairly surely an authentic saying of Jesus.⁹ The unique statement used in St. Mark is perhaps the most important salvation affirmation in his Gospel and demonstrates the close bond in his thinking between soteriology and Christology. For Mark's interest in "who is Jesus?" is a question of the salvific activity of the Son of God, rather than one of essence.¹⁰ Here Jesus describes His suffering and death as a gift for it is as the Suffering Servant that He will inaugurate the kingdom of God, that divine sovereignty over men which is imparted to them as a grace. By employing the word lutron which expresses expiation as it is found in

Isaias 53, Mark evokes the Servant theology. Thus this verse is an explicit affirmation of the redemptive value of Jesus' suffering and death; He is come for no other purpose but to redeem "many" at the price of His life, offered for their sins.¹¹

In the Old Testament the idea of the kingdom of God was rooted not so much in the sense of a territory or association of men, but in the conception of God as king. Yahweh alone would, in the Day of the Lord, bring to pass His personal and dynamic reign. This rule of grace is, in the New Testament, seen to be present in Jesus, for the unique relationship of Christ with God and His kingdom is focused in the Son of Man. Christ used this title to refer to Himself, and its distinctive meaning can be traced to the primal or heavenly man of oriental myth which was appropriated by Jewish apocalyptic writings.¹² The direct source is probably that Son of Man who appears before the Ancient of Days in the Book of Daniel (7) to receive an everlasting kingdom for the people of God. It was in the Son of Man form that the whole messianic concept was most closely associated with the transcendent kingdom which Jesus preached. The title had an "inclusiveness, finality and ultra-national range and transcendence belonging to none of the earlier messianic forms."¹³ With one exception, it is always used by Christ, not by others of Him; by it He sometimes meant Himself, sometimes the elect community of which He is the Head. In a process of unfolding and gradual enlargement, the title encompasses references to the present, the future, and to messianic suffering.¹⁴

Analysis of the Son of Man sayings in the Synoptics reveals the existence of a group of genuine sayings which take the form of dogmatic predictions of the sufferings and death of the Son of Man.¹⁵ This dogmatic rigidity, especially in St. Mark, shows a definite tradition that Jesus rejected all forms of the messianic office which were incompatible

with His redemptive mission and ultimately, sacrifice. For the Son of Man in Daniel is the glorious messianic figure of majesty and power who is able to approach the very throne of God and therefore is, in a manner, equal to God. By identifying the glorious Messiah with the Servant in this saying, Jesus effects the reversal of power and service which will be the ideal code of the kingdom.¹⁶ He is indeed the Servant of whose mysterious fate Isaias wrote; that sufferer for God also had been promised empire (Is.53:12), his sacrifice was to bring an age of expansion and blessedness (Is.54) in which the promises of the covenant with David would be realized.¹⁷

The Son of Man in Daniel (7:27-28) is a collective figure who represents the saints of the Most High, the faithful remnant, although when the title occurs in other contexts, he seems to be more individual. While it has been suggested that the Son of Man should be interpreted corporately so as to include Jesus and His disciples,¹⁸ there is no Gospel text which requires this exact interpretation, and all must admit that finally Jesus stands alone, embodying in His own Person the royal claims of God. However the fluid notion of corporate personality which was described above¹⁹ would explain how the figure is both one and many. The "holy ones" (v.18) are seen as "the people" (v.27), the king's subjects. And so the Son of Man "as Messiah-King is their corporate representative; they reign with him and he gathers them together in himself."²⁰ To maintain this fluid notion of corporate personality makes it equally true that when Jesus used the title either generally or in reference to messianic glory or to the sufferings and death of the Servant, He meant it to express the fact that He was the Messiah of God called to walk with sinful men, bearing the burden of their sin, in order to offer them the blessings of divine rule and to enter upon the kingship He was to receive from His Father through His humiliation and

death.²¹

This corporate mentality is also shown to be linked with the Son of Man figure because in the other Gospels the Son of Man logia refer to Him as come to "seek and to save" as the shepherd-redsemer of the Israel of God. In Luke 19:10, Zaccheus' "house" receives salvation for the Son of Man "came to search for what was lost and to save." This is reminiscent of Ezechiel (34:16), especially when considered with the Son of Man in Matthew 25:31, who as a shepherd-judge separates the sheep from the goats, as the future shepherd will judge his flock in Ezechiel (34:17). Furthermore, it is a kingdom which is given to the saints (Mt.25:34); it is a corporate restoration.²²

Thus the kingdom, which is intimately allied with the Son of Man, distinctly implies a community and at the same time involves the Hebrew notion of a future consummation. The work of the Son of Man is not yet completed. The kingdom is the messianic continuation of the true society of Israel which is that Church for which Christ prepared in "the twelve," "the twenty," and "the seventy-two."²³ The corporate character of the kingdom is inescapable. Scholars who do not equate it with the Church as either a divine or a human society, see that the kingdom presupposes a church, for the rule of God implies the community of the people of God as seen in Jesus' parables and metaphors; furthermore the Last Supper means a covenant with a new community of the redeemed people of God. "The rule of God as interpreted by Jesus implies the church, the new Israel, the people of God, charged to live under the kingly rule of God, and commissioned as envoys of the Son of Man to proclaim divine salvation to men in the new age which had dawned."²⁴

Thus the idea of community involved in the messianic vocation of Jesus is seen under both aspects of the Servant and the Son of Man. Whatever the Servant's identity, it is clear that by his suffering the

community becomes the organ of God's redemptive purpose in the world and there is sufficient evidence that Christ desired His disciples to share in His suffering as well as His triumph. As the Son of Man He was the representative of the new people whom He had gathered that they might be bearers of the divine rule to men. The corporate overtones of the Marcan Son of Man are demonstrated when at the beginning of the Gospel (2:23-38) Jesus says that the Son of Man is the Lord of the Sabbath, justifying His disciples for plucking grain. The force of the argument lies in the close unity that existed between the disciples and Jesus precisely as the Son of Man. Because by this title Jesus included in Himself the new people who were represented by the disciples, what was His right was theirs also. Because Christ is the Messiah, He is also Israel, the people of God.²⁵ His own preference for the Son of Man title, rather than the Servant, is because the former is more inclusive, embracing His glorious eschatological function as well as His humanity.²⁶

In Mark 10:45 the redemptive activity of God is centered in the cross. Christ died so that men might become reconciled to the kingdom which had already come but was uniquely manifested in the cross. The word "ransom" is difficult to interpret, but the meaning of something done for another to secure his freedom is clear. The authenticity of few words in the Synoptic tradition has been more hotly contested than this; it has been declared a piece of post-Resurrection theology, a "dogma of the community transferred to the lips of Jesus," but Manson²⁷ maintains its authenticity, as do Taylor and Stanley.²⁸ It is certainly not out of harmony with Christ's teaching. The significance of the passage is more than Jesus' coming seen as a service to mankind, for the service He renders culminates in an act which frees man, delivering him from the power of evil. It is probably that in "ransom for many," "for" should be translated "instead of," but we are not justified in

going beyond the idea of the representative suffering of Isaias 53. Yet, a "ransom for many" does imply that Christ accomplished something for men which they were unable to do for themselves. Christ's offering for many indicates a definitive act, not a lifelong sacrifice.²⁹ In this statement, He goes to the one passage in the Old Testament which points to God Himself initiating the act of redemptive self-offering. If the meaning of Mark's statement "the Son of Man goes even as it is written of Him" (14:21), is that He goes (to Jerusalem) to give His life as a ransom for many, (ransom being a rough equivalent for the asham or guilt offering) then Jesus regards His death as the proper work of the Messiah. This work is to make expiation for the sins of the many. "The many" is here not a limited salvation for in Semitic usage it is contrasted, not with "all" but with "one."³⁰ It is significant that when Jesus speaks of His suffering He uses the kingdom-title of Son of Man. The relation between the kingdom and His death is unmistakable; it is because of His death as the redemptive act that the kingdom is realized.³¹

In the corresponding passage in Matthew (20:28) the evidence is much the same; in St. Luke 22:27, while the title Son of Man is not used, the reversal of kingship and the servant idea is present. Here at the Last Supper Christ opposes His own servant-ship to the kings of the Gentiles; in His kingdom, because the group of Apostles will share in His suffering, Christ will confer upon them the right to eat and drink at His table (v.30) and to judge the twelve tribes of Israel. In a distinctly sacramental context the servant motif is closely linked with the corporate aspect of the kingdom, and the group of Apostles are seen as the judges of the old corporate economy, or as possessing judgment corporately.³²

There is one Lucan passage which employs the word "save" in a corporate context. In the story of Zaccheus, Christ says, "for the Son

of Man came to seek and to save what was lost" (Lk.19:10).³³ The notion of salvation as belonging to the sons of Abraham (v.9) left its mark upon the Apostles' conception of the kingdom, for it is a consistent idea that they would reign over the kingdom as Jewish regents. Since the idea is found also in Matthew, it could not have been invented by Luke, who saw clearly that salvation was for the Gentiles.³⁴ "To seek the lost" (v.10) is reminiscent of Ezechiel (34:16) where the picture is that of the shepherd restoring his flock, and it enhances the previous notion while recalling the theme of St. Luke's Gospel that the covenant of peace inaugurated by the Messiah was for the people of His choice (2:14). The chosen people had been Yahweh's servant and Jesus is expressly identified with the Servant (22:37) when Isaias 53 is cited. The people are designated the "little flock" (10:21, 12:32) to whom God has chosen to give His kingdom.³⁵ When Luke comments that they were near to Jerusalem (19:11), where the national and political restoration of the Israel of this world was expected to occur, He is correcting that idea with the servant theology. Matthew 18:11 contains the phrase, "for the Son of Man came to save what was lost," just before beginning the parable of the lost sheep (v.12), and although the passage is disputed,³⁶ it is significant that the parable which follows reveals the Father's universal salvific will, and identifies Jesus' saving work with that of the Old Testament shepherd imagery.³⁷

The word "redemption" is used with the Son of Man title in Luke 21:28 when Christ's second coming is described. The redemption of the people will be at hand when they see the Son of Man coming in a cloud. This is the only time apolutrosis is used in the Gospels for redemption.³⁸ It is a Pauline term, often used in connection with the coming or full redemption in glory, and the singular "cloud" (v.27) is that used by St. Luke in the scene of Christ's glory at the Transfiguration. Here the

salvation is not temporal and political but a cosmic event wrought by God. Luke inserts the idea (v.31) that the kingdom of God will be at hand when these things occur, a possible correction of Mark's (31:27) implication that not only the Son of Man but the end of this age is to be expected after the signs described. For St. Luke, the coming of the kingdom on earth is but one step toward the final consummation.³⁹

It has been noted that the Old Testament Servant and the Son of Man, however separate they may have been in origin, came to designate only variant aspects of a total messianic concept and in Jesus they find unique fulfillment in a transformation which retains all the distinctive notes of the ancient revelation.⁴⁰ The covenant which God makes with His people becomes a light to the Gentiles through the redemptive suffering of the Servant, a person who is finally invested with His full glory as the Son of Man.⁴¹ As the Son of Man, the Servant embodied His people, consolidating in Himself the corporate mission of His people. It is true that we see the unique fulfillment, the bond between the Son of Man and the Servant, Jesus, who Himself attributed to His death-acceptance a value of universal salvation. The early Church realized that Christ died for our sins (Acts 8:32) and found that idea corroborated by Scripture; they present Christ dying as one conscious of giving His life as a "ransom" for "the many," and of instituting by His death a covenant between the many and God.⁴²

But the bond between the cross and the establishment of the kingdom in the Servant-elect who freely submits to the divine design by suffering for all sinful men, surely not an integral part of Judaistic theology, was perhaps not clearly seen even by the evangelists themselves. It is possible that Christ Himself was the only one ever to affirm the relevance of the true meaning of the Isaian text, for the servant theology is an essential aspect of His thought; the allusions are

not made by the evangelists who cite the texts, and in the Passion narratives they never use the possibilities offered by Isaias 53. While several Pauline texts carry the servant idea, and a close allusion is made in $\text{\textcircled{P}}$ Peter 2:24, it is significant that the Christian community did not develop the theme. Intimately connected with the Son of Man logia, the servant theme introduced a vision of things which singularly transcended the thought of the times. Thus we can conclude that Jesus was the first to seize the texts, accomplish their meaning, and this precise aspect of the doctrine of redemption was not fully reflected upon in the primitive community. It was an accomplishment that went beyond all ancient expression, and it is the summit of corporate reconciliation in the Person of Christ.⁴³

The infancy narratives of Matthew and Luke present another aspect of the restoration of the people to God. In Matthew 1:21, the angel tells Joseph in a dream that he is to name Mary's child Jesus, "for it is He who is to save His people from their sins." It is the only place in Matthew where the Greek word is used in a corporate sense;⁴⁴ it is the word he uses for the saving of the lost sheep (18:11), the Apostles' word to the Lord when they feared the storm (8:25), and so on. Matthew's infancy narrative is carefully constructed to preview the theme of the entire Gospel: Israel's rejection of Jesus is part of the divine plan since thereby the Gentiles inherit the kingdom. Matthew shows the continuity which links the Gospel message and the religion of Israel by the genealogy and then presents a "public life of the infant Messiah"⁴⁵ whose royalty is revealed to the Gentiles but rejected by the Jews (2:1-12), and who, through suffering persecution from His own people (2:13-18), receives His messianic vocation from God (2:19-23).

From the beginning the child is presented as the Savior of Israel, and the word "Savior" is always used in a corporate sense in the New

Testament.⁴⁶ His name means "salvation of Yahweh" or "Yahweh saves;" He is the Davidic Messiah who brings the salvation of Israel in terms of all the Old Testament prophetic and Psalmic hopes. The Church, at the time when Matthew was writing, was largely composed of converts from paganism. And so while "Yahweh saves" is a fulfillment of the Old Testament, the genealogy which designates Jesus as the Davidic Messiah also contains the names of four non-Jewish women, which demonstrates Matthew's universalism.⁴⁷ The name which means the salvation of Israel is involved in the whole episode which Matthew sees as predicted in the Emmanuel prophecy (Is.7:14), for the meaning "with us is God" is to be extended in this Gospel's fundamental interest, the Church.⁴⁸ The story of the Magi enlarges the narrative to include pagan salvation and culminates in the flight into Egypt which reveals Christ as the new Israel called from Egypt, named the "son" by Osee (11:11) who had viewed the Exodus as the liberation and adoption of Israel as a people. Even the story of the Innocents (2:16-18) is linked with the passage in Jeremias which introduces the new covenant that Yahweh is to make with His people (31:15-34), in the reference to the sound of Rachel weeping for her children.⁴⁹

Thus does Matthew present Christ as the new Moses and the new Israel;⁵⁰ as in Osee God had called the people of Israel, His "son," out of Egypt, so Christ now gathers the scattered people into a new and higher unity, the Church. The connection with the people of the old covenant remains as the seed and root of God's new people. Salvation now means that all nations partake of the promises first given to Israel. The interpretation that sees the root and stem of Jesse, the branch and the Servant as the remnant par excellence, thus sees Christ Himself as the remnant, the holy seed, in Himself representing the whole of Israel.⁵¹

For Matthew the significance of salvation for the pagan world of his time in the kingdom-become-Church is paramount. The parables of the

eleventh-hour worker (20:1-16), of the net (13:47), of the wheat and the tares (13:34), found only in his Gospel, and which represent the Jews' rejection as an essential part of the salvific plan,⁵² are at the same time images which have a corporate significance in describing the kingdom. The flock (26:31) further points to the Apostles as the remnant sent by the Lord, the shepherd, to save the lost sheep.

The single corporate use of the Old Testament "heal" which occurs in the New Testament is Matthew's (13:15) citation of Isaias 6, "lest they be converted and I heal them." It is found in the middle of the parable of the sower. When the disciples ask about Jesus' use of parables, He tells them that they, as a group, are given to know "the mystery." Matthew is thinking of that body of doctrines already possessed by the apostolic Church. Jesus' purpose was certainly not to punish but to draw the people easily toward the truth, but as biblical authors describe the order of God's plan with the order of its actual realization, Matthew uses Isaias in such a manner.⁵³ The instrumentality of Israel's rejection in the total concept of the Church is expressed and the importance of the use of ecclesia in Matthew 16:18 and 18:17⁵⁴ comes into focus.

In the Gospel tradition, Christ is as a good shepherd to the flock of His Church, and at first this is the Apostles. Christ separated a small band from the rest of the Jews, sharply opposed to Pharisaism and the whole impenitent nation, in order to constitute the true ecclesia of God. When Peter is told that he is the rock upon which Christ will build His Church, it is a major event in the history of the Christ. But it is the group which is important for the early Church; they cared more that Jesus had "twelve" with Him than that something definitely be known about them individually.⁵⁵ In the presentation of the messiahship by Christ in the sense of Daniel 7, where the Son of Man is not an individual

but the representative of "the people of the saints of the Most High," Christ has set Himself the task of making this people a reality.

Schmidt, therefore, sees the Last Supper as the formal founding of the Church, where the Son of Man title is in the foreground; Jesus links it with Isaias 53, and thus the whole notion of Matthew's "church" is directly in line with the "church" of the Acts and of St. Paul.⁵⁵ Schmidt points out that the Son of Man theme shows the eschatological nature of the Church which is not identified with the kingdom of God but which preached the kingdom as its fruition, the complete reconciliation of the community with God. His word-study of the Church shows that the Christian community in given places represented the whole body and has holiness and righteousness imputed to it; the Church, in New Testament thought, as the individual, receives justification and sanctification.⁵⁶ Further, Christ gives Peter the power to bind and to loose (Mt.16), and a little later (Mt.18) we find it accorded to others. There is no evidence as to whether these "others" are the Apostles only, or all Christians. Bonsirven points out that the Vicar of Christ is inseparable from the Church and so, he conjectures, these powers are only able to be exercised by the authority of the Church. This judicial power, accorded to a collectivity, is a complete system which would include all the restorative power of the Church, from fraternal correction to cases submitted to the decision of higher authority.⁵⁷ Both authors then, see the Church in a limited way, as a "person."

The infancy narrative of St. Luke is the context of the only two Gospel passages in which the Greek word lutron is used for "redemption."⁵⁸ And the word for "return" or "convert" used so frequently in the Old Testament is found here (1:16,17), one of the few Gospel cases where it is used corporately.⁵⁹ (It is the word used in the Acts, for example, for conversion as well as for simple bodily turning.) It has been

proposed that Luke's infancy narrative is a carefully planned midrash built on several key Old Testament prophecies, and of a highly liturgical character.⁶⁰ It has often been said that St. Luke's Gospel is the Gospel of Salvation, the only one in which the Greek words soter, soteria, soterion occur, the only one which applies the name "Savior" to Christ. The Lucan additions to traditional logia include the explanation of the parable of the sower, in which "saved" is included (8:12), the verse about the Son of Man come to seek and "save," (19:10), and the phrase about "redemption" at hand (21:28). Luke's specific contribution is the highlighting of the universal nature of the salvation achieved by Christ's Death and Resurrection; his soteriology is carefully worked out in technical terms which closely link the Passion and Death of Christ to the Resurrection.⁶¹

The three texts (1:16,17, 1:68, 2:38) occur in a context which embodies the corporate personality of Israel. Although the rest of St. Luke is universalist, the infancy narrative is completely nationalistic in tone: the messianic joy is for Israel only.⁶² In the first text, John the Baptist's function of converting Israel, of reconciling Israel's children to God, is seen as the preparation of a perfect people for the Lord. In the reference to the Blessed Virgin as "handmaid" (v.38) there is the feminine form of the "servant" of the Lord (Is.52). Luke therefore intended a double reference, to Mary and to the nation she represents. Allied to this is the "daughter of Sion" also found in Isaias (52:12), for Mary is the daughter of Sion in a double sense.⁶³ The canticle of the Magnificat is a messianic hymn of joy to be sung by the nation Israel for (v.54) it is Israel who has received God's mercy. Since the logical place for Mary's hymn of joy would be either immediately after the Annunciation or the Birth of the Savior, Luke has probably rearranged his source material to make a more dramatic identification of

Mary and Israel.⁶⁴

There is little doubt that the Benedictus is really a hymn to the Messiah rather than to His forerunner, for the Old Testament references in the words "visited," "house of David," "peace," are messianic⁶⁵ and thus must have some connection with the Birth of Jesus. It has been suggested that it originally stood as the song of Anna and is the substance of her words to those who awaited the redemption of Jerusalem.⁶⁶ "Redemption" occurs in both passages and the direct address (2:71) agrees perfectly with the situation. Again, for Anna to utter a song of praise balances Simeon's song and there is a sense of anti-climax in the mere "she spoke about Him," after the elaborate description of Anna (v.36).

In Luke 1:54 there is an explicit and unique reference to Israel as the Lord's servant, and the redemption of the people of the house of David (v.68) literally means "made redemption for." Luke later uses the word for redemption with the Son of Man title. The "horn of salvation" (v.69) in Old Testament thought meant a vindication of Israel, the nation's hope of deliverance from political domination. It is still part of the New Testament eschatological hope and it will gradually take on deeper meaning. But here the emphasis is on the power of the Messiah to save Israel from her oppressors, and thus connects Jesus with Yahweh as the Savior God.⁶⁷ Similarity with Old Testament prophecies of deliverance (e.g. Jer.30:8) is clear, and as the prophetic hope of restoration included the hope of deliverance from enemies, so the enemies (v.71) to whom Zachary refers are probably the Romans. Luke intends the conversion of enemies,⁶⁸ or of anyone who would oppose the new movement, but it is likely that the hymn has a patriotic source which regarded the Messiah as the political champion of Israel. Again, "to make ready" (v.76), originally would have referred to the Messiah making ready for the Lord, and Luke has adjusted it to mean John preparing for Christ.

The hymn (v.77) goes into profounder theology in "salvation through the forgiveness of sins." Jeremias had promised forgiveness of sins in the new covenant (31:34) and Luke in his Last Supper narrative links the covenant with the kingdom; the relation between the cross, the covenant and forgiveness is clear, while messianic overtones are a possibility in "risen from on high" (v.79), which may refer to the branch or sprout of the root of Jesse.

Simeon's canticle (2:29-35) is that of one who lived "awaiting the consolation of Israel" (v.25). This is an idea of later Judaism which implies the redemption of Jerusalem that is to be brought by the Messiah. Later, Jesus as the Son of Man, says that it is the "redemption" for which the faithful are to look in the last days (21:28). In this canticle the servant theme appears (v.29) as a light to the Gentiles, which is seen as the glory of Israel; this is the mission of the true Israel to "all the peoples." Simeon's words to Mary (v.34) see Christ as the Old Testament "stone of stumbling;" for Luke, Christ is both the new Temple, and the cornerstone (Acts4:11) of salvation for all men. The sword which pierces Mary pierces Israel in her, for as in the Magnificat, she is both the collective daughter of Sion and an individual.⁶⁹ This, Mary's place in the theology of the remnant, is thus seen in relation to the deeper mystery of the Church. She is at once an individual and representative of a group, the daughter of Sion, the Old Testament spouse of Yahweh.⁷⁰ The sword (v.35) that will pierce the soul of Mary is that which will "pierce the land" (Ez.14:17), and ultimately divide the people. The figure of Anna as one who awaited the redemption of Jerusalem is another indication of Luke's preoccupation with the city, and with the Temple and liturgy. The constitution of the new Israel means the liberation from sin for all peoples (Lk.19:10), in a positive salvation which transforms the meaning of the Temple liturgy

in Christ.

The whole of St. Luke's Gospel shows that while the kingdom preached by Christ is the unique continuation of the history of Israel, it is to be utterly distinguished from the time of the Law and the prophets for it is the awaited time of accomplishment. The historic event brought to pass by the coming of Jesus is the recognition of sin and the true liberation from sin in a positive return to God. The "joy over one penitent" is because God Himself ended the separation of men from Himself through sin by positively drawing them to Himself. In His own life, Jesus actually produced the crisis described in the parable of the prodigal son and showed that fellowship with Himself is God's answer to repentance, and at the Last Supper the notion of the Father's authority in Christ links the remission of sins with both the new covenant and the eschatological kingdom.⁷¹ The function of Christ is to proclaim the divine forgiving love, and for the early Church forgiveness was always in Christ, in whom "the holiness of God is the judging of sin" and "the love of God is the saving of the sinner."⁷²

At the end of Luke's Gospel, the Apostles on the road to Emmaus still hoped that Christ might have "redeemed" Israel (24:21), a literal restoration. Peter, in the Acts (3:19) looks for this restoration in the future. These are the days of the Son of Man, essentially connected with Christ's "glory," both in the unique moment of the Transfiguration and more definitely with the Resurrection and Ascension. The restoration of Jerusalem and Israel, the final consummation in the Parousia and Judgment are seldom directly referred to by Christ. But the eschatological nature of the kingdom is unmistakable and certainly implies a corporate reconciliation of the people with God.

St. John

The Gospel of St. John testifies eminently to the love of God in Christ for His flock and His desire for their perfect unity. While its theology is considered among the latest New Testament writing, it contributes much to the theology of the kingdom so we will examine here three particular texts which have been selected from many. The whole Gospel is a salvation story; the sacramental Gospel of Jesus' signs is itself a sign of Christ's death for the people's salvation, "that He might gather into one the children of God who were scattered" (11:52). St. John sees the cross in the light of the Incarnation.⁷³ The death of Christ is the supreme proof of God's love but it is also Christ's glorification. To some degree in the Gospel is the sacrificial character of the atonement expressed: Christ is our advocate with the Father and is Himself the expiation for the sin of the world.⁷⁴

St. John uses the word "save" corporately in several places which correlate with the Synoptics.⁷⁵ However, it is also used with the allegory of the good shepherd and we will analyze this text, together with two which employ different Greek words for "cleanse:" 13:10, the scene of the washing of the feet, and 15:3, the reference to the Father cleansing His vine. The former word is that used in Ephesians 5:26 of Christ cleansing His Church, Titus 3:5 in a baptismal context and in Hebrews 10:22.

In the first passage (Jn.10:1-8), Christ is seen as the door of the sheepfold (v.8) and as the good shepherd (v.14). The only unity to be found within the entire discourse is a Christological one. The em-

phasis is upon Christ rather than His kingdom, but the allegory presupposes the unity of the flock. John is primarily dependent on the biblical and messianic meaning of the shepherd imagery; the resemblance to Ezechiel 34 is unmistakable, for the Old Testament symbolism is as well-established as it is natural. Jesus speaks of the sheep preyed upon by robbers, neglected, torn by wolves; in Ezechiel the flock which was not tended became food for the beasts. But here the good shepherd leads the sheep and they are saved; they go in and out and find pasture when he rescues them. He knows his sheep and they know him. This knowledge again is the biblical knowing which is not purely intellectual but an experience, a presence which expands into love.⁷⁷

Ezechiel's allegory is a sentence of judgment on the unworthy rulers of Israel and in John (10:1,10), it is the false rulers upon whom judgment is passed, the Pharisees who are scattering the sheep whom Christ came to gather. And as in Ezechiel, judgment leads to the promise of the deliverance of the flock, for in John, the good shepherd is Christ, both David and God Himself.⁷⁸ However, the shepherd in John brings life. He is an heroic shepherd who lays down His life for His sheep. It is because of the intimate knowledge of His own, that the shepherd is willing to lay down His life and this knowledge (or love) goes beyond Israel to the Gentiles (v.16); if Jesus personally came to save the lost sheep of Israel, His Church will go beyond these limits.⁷⁹

Surpassing the shepherd of the Old Testament, the capital idea is that the life is distinctly given to save the sheep, and is illustrated by the tableau between the hireling and the true shepherd. The present tense is used (v.17): He freely wishes to give and will give His life. Jesus therefore dies in place of, as substitute for, His sheep, but the dominant idea is the love of the shepherd for His sheep and His desire for their life (v.10).⁸⁰ In Ezechiel, the shepherd who discriminated

between sheep and sheep was David, the Messiah sent by God; by linking this section to 10:36, the reference to Christ as made holy and sent by the Father, John re-interprets the messianic concept by saying, in short, that the Messiah is the Son of God.⁸¹

The scene of the washing of the feet (13:1-30) is an event narrated only by John but is in line with the Synoptic tradition (Lk.22:27) that Jesus was in the midst of His disciples as a servant. If it is true that the whole section of chapters 13 to 17 is an explanation of the passion narrative, this scene is special. The washing of the disciples' feet both prefigures the crucifixion itself and interprets it. The public act of Jesus on Calvary and the private act in the presence of His disciples are alike in humility and service proceeding from His love for His own. "The cleansing of the disciples' feet represents their cleansing from sin in the sacrificial blood of Christ."⁸²

The foot-washing is enacted in recognition that Jesus was to pass from the world to the Father (v.1) and salvation in John is frequently saving from the world, that is, dissociation from this world to pass to another.⁸³ At another level, Baptism and the Eucharist are pre-figured; in the Johannine play on words in "bathed" and "cleansed" many commentators and many of the Fathers have interpreted "bathed" as "baptized" and the partial "cleansed" as the Eucharist or Penance, both cleansings the result of Christ's abasement.⁸⁴ The two words are not identical in meaning, but John's fondness for pairs prevents any certain conclusion, however, that he distinguished between them. In any case, an ontological relationship is set up between sacrifice and cleansing, and the whole of the washing is what the crucifixion is: a divine act which heals man, releases him from sin, reveals God's love for man, and is an example for imitation.

The word "cleanse" is however, one of the standard New Testament

terms for Baptism, and was not frequently used in the Old Testament. It does occur significantly in Ezechiel (16:4,9, 23:40) where Yahweh is said to cleanse and heal Israel, His faithless wife and is used corporately of the Church in Ephesians 5:26. Further, the cleansing is treated as a "significant" action in St. John. It occurs "during the supper" (13:12), the "focus of the rite of the anamnesis of Christ crucified and risen,"⁸⁵ and the idea of washing suggests, by use of the same word, the sacrament of Baptism as in Titus 3:5, "He saved us by the bath of regeneration." Thus the passage should be placed within a sacramental catechesis; "the washing of the feet is a sign of at least certain aspects of the Eucharist."⁸⁶ It has probably been preserved for its reference to the Mary who anointed Christ's feet and dried them with her hair (12). The ointment for Jesus' burial (12:7) means the burial of the seed which is the source of life (v.23), Christ's death and glorification. Thus the "day of Christ's burial is the day of the Church."⁸⁷ The Lucan anointing is, incidentally, done by the penitent woman whose sins are forgiven because she has loved much (7:38).

In John, moreover, the incident occurring at the moment when Jesus was about to leave the world and go to the Father, gives peculiar emphasis to His act of humility. Christ, to whom all authority is given (3:13) descends to the lowest place of service, becomes a "slave." The washing of the feet therefore is a "sign" of the Incarnation and of its consummation in His death. As water is instrumental in regeneration (3:5), the washing of the feet is the means for the disciples to "have part" with their Master (v.8). If Peter is not washed, he will have no share in the benefits of Christ's passion, no place among Christ's people. Thus Baptism is immediately suggested, but Barrett opposes too rigid an equation of the act of Christ with a specific sacrament. Rather, he says, John has penetrated beneath the surface of Baptism as an ecclesiastical

rite, seen it in relation to the Lord's death, into which men are baptized and so has integrated it into the act of humble love in which the Lord's death was set forth before the passion.⁸⁸ And yet, it would seem that both levels or aspects could simultaneously be present in John's richly symbolic narrative.

Finally the departure of Judas, who is the reference of "you are clean, but not all" (v.10), who has been washed with all the other disciples, rules out all mechanical operation whether by Baptism or otherwise. The passage is in line with Matthew's parables about the mixed qualities of the members of the kingdom, for Judas' feet were washed but he did not enter into the meaning of Jesus' act of humility and love. We are reminded of John's theme of the "sifting" of men according to their responses to the words of Jesus;⁸⁹ the sifting is now complete, the faithful remnant has finally been selected as Jesus cleansed this little group for Himself out of the unbelieving world. If the partial cleansing is related to the sacrament of Penance, this passage then points up its relation to Baptism and its aspect of preparation for sacrifice as intimately involving both individual and community.

Two of the principle Johannine themes of salvation interpenetrate in the word "love;" Jesus manifested God's love for His people by coming to save them, and recognition of this love has no other end than to incite love among men, which is again, salvation.⁹⁰ In John 15, in harmony with the whole biblical tradition, the symbolism of Israel as the vine or vineyard of Yahweh is transformed. Jesus had used the idea in the Synoptics and John now sees that, as Israel had been a vine which had yielded a poor harvest in spite of God's loving care, Jesus Himself is the true vine and His Father is the husbandman. Israel is rejected as the vine of God's planting, and Christ is the new Israel. Like the Israel of old, He is a corporate person. "You are the

branches" (v.5). The vine is an allegory of the whole Christ, Head and members, and the branches yield fruit only because their life is drawn from the vine; a branch broken off is only fit for burning (v.6). St. John intends the allegory to teach the essential unity of the Church in the very life blood of Christ Himself, for the Eucharistic implications are clear in the setting of the Last Supper.⁹¹ The Apostles have just drunk the wine-made-blood and the whole symbol is perhaps a Eucharistic commentary: Jesus is the vine, the channel of life to the branches.⁹²

The corporate sacramentality is thus seen in a framework of the continuous life of the Church, rather than the vineyard applied to the crisis in Jesus' personal ministry as in the Synoptics. No story is told; it is no longer an apostatizing people but Christ and those incorporated in Him. The cleansing (v.3) of the vine means that the disciples have already undergone the process of purification (13:10) as the initial members of the people of God. The fact that they are clean already because of teaching or "the word" (v.3) is not inconsistent with the cleansing of the foot-washing scene. John is not contrasting physical or baptismal cleansing with one wrought by the spoken word. In both chapters he is thinking of the total effect of what Jesus was and did for His own. The washing of the feet means His whole loving service for men, and the cleansing is the word of salvation which Christ brings, and as the Word, is.⁹³

The allegory of the vine is a distinctive figure of the relation of the Church and the risen Lord. It opens with the thought of God's care for His vine,⁹⁴ deepens to its Eucharistic symbolism. In Christ are the members of the true people of God; the fruit of this mutual indwelling is love. The love of Christ for His Church is to find parallel expression in the love of the members for one another. Thus, for John,

Christ's mission, to take away the sins of the world, achieves its purpose in the community that is delivered from sin. The deliverance is to be made concrete in the community through the practice of love, the opposite of sin. And yet John is not unaware of sin existing in the community; he recognizes that for this very reason the present Church lives in a continual state of tension, tending toward the love as yet unfulfilled.⁹⁵

* * * * *

In summary, the evidence of the Gospels on the presence and transformation of the Old Testament notion of corporate reconciliation seems conclusive. In the Synoptics, the Greek words used in the Septuagint passages of corporate restoration in the Old Testament, are chosen by the evangelists in several significant areas. These words are used in a corporate sense in the infancy narratives of Matthew and Luke, which logically pertain to the purpose of the Incarnation. Christ is seen as the Messiah who has come to redeem Israel, to save His people, and at the same time He is Israel and He is the redemption. Matthew's treatment is in distinctly universal terms and He identifies Christ with Israel, Yahweh's "son" in Osee. The infancy narrative of St. Luke, in all its priestly significance, dwells upon the messianic redemption of Israel which is clearly described as salvation through the forgiveness of sins. The songs of the Mother of Christ, who perhaps represents Israel as the daughter of Sion, and of Anna and Simeon, refer to the redemption or consolation of Jerusalem, the city which is the heart of the religious life of corporate Israel. In the other Synoptic passages in which the key words occur, the reference is always to Christ, as either the Son of Man or the Servant. The corporate, or at least fluid, universal and collective personality attached to these figures in the Old Testament points

to Christ as reconciling to God the people whom He represents, as one and in Himself. Further, the Son of Man title is particularly seen to have reference not only to the cross as the redemptive act of the Messiah, but to the eschatological fulfillment of this reconciliation. In the second coming, the Son of Man will restore the kingdom of the saints. The kingdom is both the present community, especially in its Eucharistic bond, and its future fulfillment. Thus the Synoptics point to the corporate reconciliation in the action of the Servant on Calvary and the glorious eschatological restoration of the kingdom.

The evidence in the Gospel of St. John flows from the fundamental notions of union and unity. In the passages which employed "save" and "cleanse" in a corporate sense, the figures of the flock and the vine are central. There are messianic connotations present in the obvious reference to the flock of Ezechiel as well as the ideas of judgment of the individual-in-community and restoration of the flock through God's own judgment. The concept of saving, healing the lost sheep of Israel involves the notion of life given to the group through the love and death of the shepherd. The vine figure of the Old Testament Israel is here subsumed in Christ Himself. In a sacramental context He is the corporate redemption of all, and the love of the present community is, for John, the sign of the union of Christians with one another and in Christ. The third text in John, that of the washing of the feet, is a clear "sign" in its communal setting which prefaces Calvary. In an act of humility, the final sifting, healing, and cleansing of the remnant occurs before the definitive sacrifice and establishment of the Church in the greatest of all the signs, Calvary.

The Gospel evidence for the corporate reconciliation of the people to God is climaxed in the Holy Spirit, the Paraclete whom Jesus will send from the Father, who will bear witness in and through the

disciples (Jn.15:26). In the apostolic Church, it was the experience of the Spirit which was the proof of the presence of the messianic age, and Church membership was a participation in the Spirit. The reception of the Holy Spirit in Baptism assigned the individual his particular task within the total Church. The kingdom of God was directed to sinners. When Christ gave "salvation" by healing, by raising from the dead, the essential idea was the giving of life, a positive gift through the remission of sins.⁹⁶ The demand of Christ for repentance and conversion is met with forgiveness according to love and Christ's cures anticipate the Church's gestures of forgiveness.⁹⁷ Furthermore, "what had been made known within the covenant relation through the divine patience with a sinful and refractory Israel is here extended to all mankind."⁹⁸ It is a universal forgiveness.

The essentially redeeming function of the kingdom was provided for in the totality of the sacraments, which were necessary to both the individual and the collectivity. Since Baptism and Penance are the fruit of the redemption acquired by Christ's Death and Resurrection, they are promulgated after the Resurrection. The power given in the Holy Spirit (Jn.20:22) expressed a complete divine-human mechanism of forgiveness and remission of sins, a supernatural power of binding and loosing which was given to Peter and the entire Church.⁹⁹

The primacy of the kingdom in the Gospels is clear; from the Old Testament concept, "the land" disappears while the "inheritance" remains. The Christian formula "inherit the kingdom" expresses the entire relationship between the two Testaments, and the kingdom of heaven infinitely surpasses the Old Testament.¹⁰⁰ In the New Testament the inheritance is strictly an eschatological fulfillment of the present realization, which is a continually developing society. Because it is a work of God, nothing can stop this development, but nevertheless there are

perpetual disorders until the moment of consummation. The demand of Christ for perfection supposes a community of exquisite charity, and is possible only because it is a work of divine love which perfects the society and draws it as one to perfect union.¹⁰¹

"The twelve" who take Jesus' place after the Resurrection, with Peter as the leader whom Jesus told to care for His lambs and sheep, comprise the "Church" of St. Paul, and it is entirely possible that Christ Himself used the Hebrew qahal, which meant the sacred Israel "called together." While the kingdom of God means the ultimate and ideal kingdom of the Father, its terrestrial realization, good and evil, is the Church, the continuity of divine society with the Israel of God.¹⁰² Matthew has set in parallel the experience of the apostolic Church and Jesus' earthly life; in a foreshortened historical perspective he sees the apostolic kerygma as a continuation of Jesus' establishment of the kingdom, and the presence of the kingdom-become-Church can be discerned in his Gospel.¹⁰³

The transition from the kingdom of the Gospels to the Church of St. Paul rests upon the Apostles' awareness of themselves as the remnant, the gradual shift from Jerusalem to Antioch as the center of the community. St. Luke views the coming of the kingdom which coincided with the founding of the Church as an evolutionary process which developed over a period of time, and Paul's realization that the Parousia is contingent upon the collective entry of the Jews into the kingdom made him turn his attention to the mystery of the Church herself and to promoting the conviction that the "coming of the kingdom was to be identified with the organization of the Church."¹⁰⁴ Paul's theology is much akin to that of the Jerusalem community which saw itself as that formed by Christ as Messiah, His elect community of disciples, His flock which looked back to its prototype in the desert assembly which typified the messianic nation. Paul adopted these ideas. He too could have written about the

kingdom of heaven as a present reality on earth in the mystery of the Church. However, he preferred to write of the Church as mysteriously present in heaven. 105

VI. THE EPISTLES

St. Paul

The doctrine we have traced finds rich fulfillment in the Epistles of St. Paul. Again because of the density of material, only a few texts which employ the words "save," "redeem," "cleanse," and the word "reconcile" which only Paul uses, will be studied. St. Paul however, makes distinctions between the meanings of forgiveness, justification, redemption, reconciliation, and salvation, which should be considered first. For although they all involve the continual activity of Christ, they do not mean the same thing.

Christ's redemptive action is at once expressive of God's righteousness and love in St. Paul, for in reconciling man and the world to Himself in Christ, God is being true to His own nature. And while the redemption of Christ has taken place, the fact of a community in constant need of renewal is fundamental.¹ The notion of "forgiveness" in the New Testament is not the full restoration to fellowship but is an antecedent stage to reconciliation. It is the removal of obstacles and while not being completely negative, it is concerned with things that stand in the way of fellowship with God, rather than with the restoration to fellowship itself.²

"Justification" is the characteristic Pauline idea: while Paul uses "forgiveness" three times, he uses "justification" words ninety-eight times. To be justified, for Paul, was a much richer concept. It expresses the graciousness of God in restoring man to Himself and the

idea of man standing before God as redeemed. Actually there were no words for Paul to use which could express all he meant. Justification was first of all God's activity, His saving grace which is a present experience, an eschatological act brought into the present. Its condition is a faithful response of men to both the Person and the work of Christ, and its ground is the stonement of Christ, His sacrificial death, His life offered freely for men on the cross.

The roots of the doctrine are eschatological. Certain texts suggest the idea of the Final Judgment: the End-time when God's rule is finally established and His judgment expressed on nations and persons.³

Expectation is part of Paul's inheritance, but the notion is even more closely linked with "salvation." This is clear in passages in which he distinguishes between justification and salvation (Rom.5:9). Here justification has taken place, man has received righteousness, the present possession of the baptized Christian, and salvation is an eschatological reality. But other passages show it to have formally begun (2Cor.6:2), and in Colossians and Ephesians, salvation is spoken of as having taken place. This two-fold aspect of salvation is found in Old Testament messianic concepts and for Paul this tension between present and future fulfillment is characteristic of Christian life.⁴ Jesus is the eschatological Savior of the Psalms and yet He has already accomplished salvation. There is no contradiction for God, through His Christ, saves us from the judgment to come because He has saved us from the servitude of Satan. It is a state acquired but its full effect is not yet achieved.

Hence when St. Paul says that Jesus is the Savior he means that He has fulfilled the promise of Yahweh, has justified us, and will save us body and soul; indeed has already saved us from eternal death.⁵

The key metaphor is "redemption" and its Old Testament meaning is to buy back the freedom of one's next of kin. It was used repeatedly in Second Isaias' new Exodus theology to mean the nexus of ideas involved in

the liberation of Israel from Egypt. There is no notion of money paid to someone in Paul's use of the word.⁶ God, through the death of Christ, has redeemed a people for His own possession, a new Israel; nevertheless the "day of redemption" or full fruition is the Parousia. The Holy Spirit is the earnest of this ultimate redemption; the essential doctrine is that taught in St. Luke (21:28) of the Son of Man.

When Paul speaks of redemption, he always indicates its source in Jesus who gave Himself for us, to ransom us from all guilt, a people set apart for Himself. The allusion is a common Jewish fusion of the Exodus and the Sinai covenant. At Sinai the people became the people of God, and so redemption is essentially a positive reality: God obtains ownership. Paul says that redemption is an acquisition (Eph.1:14) and the full meaning of redemption is found in the final, complete acquisition.⁷ The redemption stems from the mystery of the cross as a mystery of love and obedience in which the Resurrection is the outcome rather than the recompense. Christ's sacrifice, in Paul, is unique because He offers Himself, and redemption is identical with His return to the Father. He therefore gave Himself not in our place, but for our sake, and in Him we all return to the Father; His act of love does not dispense with man's, but permits man to love. The whole Pauline doctrine of redemption is that he united Christ's giving of Himself to free us from sin with our reunion with God (Tit.2:14). In writing of Christ's acquisition of the world for the Father, Paul's mentality is that of the Old Testament Israel's "return" to God, not juridical but mystical.⁸

"The people" which God in Christ has redeemed for Himself, is the Old Testament word for the nation as one, the concrete reality. The "privileges" belong, not to the historic Israel, but to God's Israel, "a people whom God has destined to make ready for the future." She is then, the concrete reality which embodies God's designs and this notion

of the ideal people was steeped in messianism and eschatological thought; Israel's "privileges" would be fulfilled in the messianic age. Therefore the tension between the ideal and the reality which characterizes Paul's "redemption" seems to be an application to Christianity of a doctrine which he probably held before his conversion, as a Pharisee.⁹ Similarly, the new people in Paul take over Israel's privileges in their entirety. That this heritage meant the reconciliation of the entire Church to God will be evidenced in the analysis of several texts.

The word "save" is used in a corporate sense in Romans 5:10, 8:24, 11:26, and Ephesians 2:5.¹⁰ One of the two New Testament Greek words for "reconcile" occurs corporately in two of these texts (Rom. 5:10, 11:15), and in Ephesians 2:16 and Colossians 1:20.¹¹ "Redemption" is in Ephesians 1:7, 14, 4:30,¹² while "cleansing" as used in the washing of the feet in St. John, occurs at Ephesians 5:26.¹³

In the Epistle to the Romans (5:9,10) Paul describes the fact that we are "justified" now and that we shall be "saved" eschatologically. "If when we were God's enemies we were reconciled to Him through the death of His Son, it is far more certain that now that we are reconciled we shall be saved through sharing in His life" (5:10). We were "reconciled" is another way of saying we have "peace" with God (v.1), for reconciliation is the restoration of sinful men to fellowship with God. It is an act of God through Christ rather than the process which is salvation, which is to be consummated at the Last Judgment. In Jewish doctrine, God would declare men to be righteous or otherwise at the end, and Paul's "realized eschatology" brings justification into the present but does not renounce the Final Judgment.¹⁴ Justification means the objective sway of God's righteousness; reconciliation with God is to be delivered from God's "wrath" and placed in a relation of peace with Him.

It is the present event made possible by the death of Christ from which the future event of salvation is concluded. The two clauses which seem to mean justification through Christ's death and salvation through His life (v.10) present a rhetorical, rather than a substantial, contrast.¹⁵ The reconciling "life" aspect will be more fully developed in Paul's later Epistles to the Colossians and Ephesians.

"Reconciliation" is used in only six texts by St. Paul¹⁶ and yet it is difficult to determine what belongs to the nature of reconciliation and to its consequences; peace, freedom, sonship, and particularly fellowship are involved. All lead to sanctification, and none of these ideas can really be separated. St. Paul's fundamental emphasis in reconciliation seems to be on the Father's action in reconciling the world of men to Himself; it never implies man's activity. It is a work of God, accomplished in Christ and the use of "enemies" in this context simply heightens the paradox of God's love. Reconciliation depends on the amazing grace of God made known to us in Christ, supremely in His cross. Paul expresses this when he precedes this reconciliation with "God proves His love for us..." (v.8), by Christ's death on the cross. It is love operative on the cross, revealing God as meeting all the conditions vital to reconciliation, as going "all the way" in His free acceptance of the sin of man, in His willingness to be the means of penitential approach to God. Love, for Paul, means God loved us first and sent His Son to be the expiation for our sins. By being incorporated into a singular race, He became the Redeemer of that race and reconciler of sinful men to God.¹⁷

Though we have in the Spirit a foretaste of the future, we groan to ourselves as we wait to be declared God's sons, through the redemption of our bodies. It was in this hope that we were saved.

This second text (Rom.8:23) reveals in its context that salvation and resurrection are in some way already in our grasp. The process by

which the Church is gradually embodying the divine fulness of Christ is set by Paul within the total scheme of God's redemption, for the movement here is from creation to the Church, in anticipating the eschatological moment (v.18) of the "glory that is to burst upon us." Creation can do nothing but wait and groan, as we do also but with the advantage of possessing the first-fruits, the Spirit. For St. Paul, the Spirit represents part of the future that is already present; it is the Church then, founded by the Spirit at Pentecost, which brings the future into the present. Adoption is seen as the final acceptance into God's family, for which "redemption" of the body must be a synonym.¹⁹ The life of the body at resurrection is the same as the present spiritual life of the soul, and as everlasting life simply means three stages in one reality.

The "body" here may well refer to the "whole mass of human nature which we share as men;" "body" for the Hebrew is not that which individualizes men but what links them together in solidarity. Paul employs a collective singular here instead of the plural in "our adoption," "our body."²⁰ The word is the hinge of the doctrine of corporate redemption in St. Paul, the two Greek words sarx and soma link man in solidarity with creation in his distance from God, with man as made for God. "Redemption" is the change which allows the transition from the first state to the second; it is the body "made spiritual."²¹

"Saved" (v.24) is again seen to refer to the future, and is almost always used in the future tense. The past is possible here only because it is qualified by "hope" which means the expectation of the Parousia. It is present inclusion in the Body of the risen Christ that is ground for hope "in the Spirit." The solidarity of men in the solidarity of creation is the explanation for the deep connection between sin and everything that is pain (8:20), and as creation groans "unconsciously,"

and man groans within it, so too the Spirit groans with man (8:26). Thus the full salvation is a hope, a promise yet unfulfilled; of its nature it is unseen and unattained, and yet it is bound up with "waiting" (v.25) in the sense of active submission. "His longing is not merely for a personal victory but for an eternally unhindered service. That will not fully be his until his whole being is actually, as well as in covenant, redeemed."²²

The last text in Romans (11:26), "then all Israel will be saved," is in a chapter in which the image of the vine, Israel and its messianic function is expressed, flows into the thought of the grafting of the Gentiles into the places of the broken branches of disobedient Israel, and finally (12:5) returns to the unity of Christians in one body. In this context, Paul is saying that all Israel will be saved for God does not change His mind (11:29). It is complete corporate salvation that God desires now as well as in the past, and Paul predicts that Israel, as a mass and not in scattered units, will be saved. She will be "delivered" as in the Psalms, from her sins, that is, hardness of heart and refusal to submit; but Paul does not say when or how.²³ For in God's complete plan, two ideas are central: God's mercy, and "secret" or mystery. "The secret is that a partial hardening has fallen upon Israel and will remain until the full number of Gentiles has come in; when this is done all Israel will be saved."²⁴

"Partial" indicates that a remnant still believed and thus the pattern of salvation for Paul is first the remnant, then the Gentiles, then Israel as a whole. He shows too, that Christians are the continuation of Israel, God's people. "Like branches of a wild olive grafted into a cultivated stock,...the new Israel, the Church...shares in the blessings of the Old Testament covenants."²⁵ The Jewish converts to Christianity, small in number, must nevertheless be the holiest section

of the Church, and it is only because the Gentile converts are brought into their society that the former can be called Israel. The figure of the olive tree, which for Osee had meant the messianic community (14:7), here indicates the "one body" in which God has placed salvation.²⁶ Paul is saying that the Jewish people, the holy stock of Israel, must be holy if the fruit is to be holy. "Holiness is identified in some way with the vocation of the nation and its privileges."²⁷ Paul is "snatching at every argument which can sustain his faith that the rejection of Israel is providential and temporary,"²⁸ and will be followed by full restoration. In thinking of Israel as a whole, and through the Old Testament citations (Is.27, 59), Paul relates covenant and forgiveness of sins (v.27), with the entire Jewish and pagan world (v.25), in the ultimate mystery of a God who does not change His mind (v.29) about those people whom, even as "enemies," His love has chosen.²⁹ God's way of salvation for Israel is a mystery of unbelief to faith, a way through fall to restoration.³⁰

The five texts in the Epistle to the Ephesians (1:17, 2:5, 2:16, 4:30, 5:26) and the related text in Colossians (1:20) serve to re-iterate the theology of Romans and to develop Paul's ecclesiology. In Colossians Paul is fighting against innovators who would place between God and man hierarchies of powers. In opposition he acknowledges the absolute primacy of Christ as Head of the Church, His Body, the unique and universal mediation through the cross which reconciles all things to God. This mystery is penetrated further in Ephesians, wherein the Church is the plenitude or pleroma of Him who "fills all in all," and God's intention is to "gather into one" in Christ all that is divided.³¹

In Ephesians 1:7,14 we have our redemption, the remission of sins through Christ's blood (v.7), and yet this salvation (v.13) means the "Holy Spirit of the promise" which is the pledge of future redemption.

The characteristic Pauline tension is present within the cosmic scope of the divine plan to "re-capitulate" or "re-establish" all things in Christ (v.10), through His Body the Church. In the "rich inheritance" of God's people, the fundamental concept is that the present life is a participation in the risen life of Christ, but since the people are not yet risen, it is a realm of great mystery. The theme of salvation is carried out (2:5) when the present union is seen as the gift of the mercy of God. It has been said that Paul's eschatological passages seem to refer both to the immediate past and to the future. However they all involve the saving activity of God in Christ in a language borrowed from Judaism which views both as parts of a single reality. "Realized" and "futuristic" eschatology are terms which might be abandoned for the saving acts of God already accomplished in Christ and those still to be accomplished in Christ.³²

We will consider the next text, Ephesians 2:16 with its doublet Colossians 1:20; the divine plan is the reconciliation of all things through the Body of Christ." The single assumption in St. Paul is that Christians have died in, with, and through the crucified Body of the Lord only because they are now in His Body that is the Church. That Christ's mystical and physical Body are so one in Paul's mind is seen in "He has reconciled you in His Body of flesh through His death (Col.1:21) and its parallel, "...reconcile both in one Body to God by the cross" (Eph.2:15). The obscurity is intentional, the fleshly Body of Christ seen as the point at which Christ's Death and Resurrection passes over into His people.³³ The meaning of both passages is the whole redemptive work of Christ by which the "alienated and enemies" (Col.1:21) of old, strangers to the covenant (Eph.2:12) are reconciled, Jew and Gentile made one in Christ, who is Himself "our peace."

In the Ephesians passage, Paul is again thinking of the corporate

privileges of Israel and the Jewish remnant in the community where there is no longer distinction between Jew and Gentile. That Christ "made both one" by breaking down a "wall" (v.14), introduces a new image of building, but one which ties in with the olive tree often protected by a wall in biblical thought. Christians form the new nation as the messianic people is integrated into the continuity of Israel. More than a continuous development however, of the old root of Israel, Christ, in abolishing the Law, reconciles a new creation.³⁴ In breaking down the partition between Jew and Gentile that Christ might create in Himself one new man, Paul first ascribes all to Christ, thinking of His historical mission (2:13,17) to both Jew and Gentile. But the deeper thought (v.18) is the peace (or reconciliation) of both to the Father. The whole section has a marked communal interest: "commonwealth of Israel," "covenants of promise," "one new man," "one body," "God's household," all growing into "a temple, holy in the Lord." Paul is thinking not only of individuals reconciled to God but also of "the creation of a new divine community, the Church of God, in which His work of reconciliation in Christ is to find its perfect embodiment."³⁵ Further, "saints" (v.19) and "holy" (v.21) show that he contemplates a sanctified community.

Colossians 1:19-22 shows that Paul's doctrine of universal reconciliation includes all the heavenly spirits as well as all men, and does not involve the individual salvation of all but the collective salvation of the world by its return to order and peace in perfect submission to God. The individual Body of Christ is the place where the reconciliation occurs because here He virtually reunites all mankind whose sin He takes upon Himself; "flesh" is the state of the body as subject to sin.³⁶ Paul is thinking of the spiritual powers which the Colossian teachers held as able to determine the destinies of men, and he maintains that Christ is pre-eminent, not one among the powers but inclusive of them all (v.19).

There are no bounds to His work (v.20), no gradual process (v.22). The context becomes personal, for peace-making (reconciliation) is between persons; and equally marked is the emphasis on the death of Christ (v.22), "to present you holy and undefiled and without blemish." This is the sacrificial language of the Old Testament; the significance of blood is the making of peace (v.20) and the establishing of union. The preceding state of "alienation and enemies" (v.21), uses the same participle as Ephesians 2:12 does for "alienated from the commonwealth of Israel." Here the Old Testament alienation is enlarged to mean the hostility of all men toward God, and "reconciliation is conceived as a complete change...to loving fellowship with God."³⁷

The eschatological orientation of reconciliation is suggested in Christ's purpose "to present you" (v.22). It is a divine action which seems to refer to the Final Judgment. Thus reconciliation is an immediate act of God and Paul does not describe it as a process tending-toward, although the beginnings of such a step are present here: God has reconciled man for a further consummation.

In the cross and Resurrection, the work of Christ was surely complete (Col.1:20) and nothing is outside the scope of that redemption. "What is complete in extent has to be made intensively effective,"³⁸ and the agent in this activity is the Church whose function is to extend throughout the redeemed universe, acknowledgement of His victory. In the Ephesians passage (2:21) "every part of the building is closely united and grows into a temple." Whenever Paul uses "building" it means the Body of Christ, the Church, not His individual Body,³⁹ and so the Church in these passages appears with its meaning of universality. The mystical identification of the Church with the Body of Christ means that it possesses the sanctifying power of God in Christ,⁴⁰ constantly receiving from Christ the fulness which He receives from the Father.

It is significant that the image of "building" or of "temple" never describes the Christians' relation to Christ but to God or the Spirit, for the connection with Christ is more organic: the Head is the interior principle. The purpose of the Father is carried out through a reversal of the Old Testament principle that a remnant, or one, can represent the many. Paul argues in Colossians that now many represent one. Christ is still one, but a unity which is inclusive, mystical and not simply representative; thus Paul's repeated phrase "in Christ."⁴¹ So too, God's calling of Christians and of the Church is one. The Church is always in fieri, the state of a people who, because they have been called by God are ceaselessly being built up, until the day of the Parousia, "until a full grown man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ" (Eph.4:13).

The final passage (Eph.5:26) typifies the way in which the universal Church of Jew and Gentile sometimes is seen as a semi-hypostasis in the later Epistles, the bride of Christ.⁴² Here the theme of Christ's Body merges with the theme of the bride.⁴³ Two distinctive ideas are present: one is the mystery of salvation and this view starts from man; the other is the mystery of Christ and this view begins with God and creation. Paul gently begins by saying that wives are saved through the intermediary of their husbands, for their subjection determines their position in the Church, and such is the Church's submission to Christ's saving love (v.24). The parallel between the love of husband and wife and Christ's love for His Church is one in which both terms mutually clarify each other. Christ is the spouse of the Church because He is her Head and loves her as His own Body, and this should be the love of a husband for his wife (v.23). It is based upon the symbolism of Osee and Ezechiel, the image of Israel as the spouse of Yahweh. In Paul's thought Christ loved the Church and delivered Himself up for

her, purified and washed away her sins just as God in the Old Testament purified Jerusalem and washed away her sins. He wishes her to be glorious, without flaw, holy, just as God wished Jerusalem to be rescued and renewed. The Church as Christ's bride and the betrothed or spouse of Yahweh are "too much alike not to be identified."⁴⁴

This hymn is the culmination of what the whole Epistle has tried to express about the union of Christ and His Church, and their union with the Father. What goes on in the communion of Christ and the Church is seen to be something conceived by God, created and maintained by Him (3:4ff.). Here Christ and His Church are bound in obedience and love as husband and wife; the Savior loves and cares for His Church, healing and cleansing and saving her, nourishing and cherishing her.⁴⁵ It was a custom in the orient for a bride to be ritually bathed and adorned before being presented to her bridegroom. In the mystical case of the Church, Christ Himself washes His bride from all sin by the bath of Baptism. The words are expressive of a baptismal formula, "cleansing her in the bath of water by means of the word" (v.26);⁴⁶ it is the word used in the Johannine foot washing scene and the bath of regeneration in Titus 3:5. Thus a corporate sacramentality is again revealed; whereas in other cases it was often various groups in which the sacramental idea appeared, here it is the entire Church sacramentally restored to God.

It is clear moreover, that the ecclesia is not a fellowship of men but the Body of Christ. The one essential is union in Christ, and when holiness is ascribed to the Church (v.27), it is not a "thing possessed" but is bound up with the true concept of justification.⁴⁷ The Body of Christ is an extension of His Person and His life and here the metaphor of sexual union, or "one flesh" (v.31), points to the idea of the bride of Christ as intimately linked with the doctrine of the Body and its members as "corporal" in its original meaning rather than "cor-

porate." As it is worked out here the doctrine of the Body arises in a discussion of the most physical relationship of bodily life. It is with a studied ambiguity that Paul opens the section (v.23) by describing Christ as the "Savior of the Body," words which in themselves must apply to the Church, but which have a level of meaning in the idea of "corporality" and marriage.⁴⁸ This aspect of sacramentality has further significance in the Eucharistic Body of Christ and the life-giving union it signifies.

In the theology of St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians the hope of the Body is the glory of Christ, the reconciliation whereby He is able to subject all things to Himself, the process of (or for) redemption is repeatedly described as "unto the praise of His glory" (1:6, 12, 14), and it is equally unto the glory of Christians, the final glory of the Church (5:27). She is rendered capable for this by Baptism, the general Baptism for all men at Golgotha, according to Cullmann,⁴⁹ when Christ gave Himself for the Church to cleanse it. The same word for cleanse is used in Ezekiel 16:4,9, which provides the general background for this entire passage. There Yahweh addresses His bride:

Then I bathed you with water and washed your blood from you,...I clothed you...I adorned you,...you grew very,very beautiful,... your beauty was perfect because of the splendor that I bestowed upon you (vv. 9-14).

So too the great and continuing work of redemption is carried forward, "unto the building up of the Body of Christ." The glory of the heavenly temple or city that is the Church (Eph.2:19) and the glory of the new Israel or bride of Christ are two symbols which correspond in the whole of Christian tradition. And yet the heavenly city, the Church carried into glory above all powers, has never left the earth in St. Paul; when the early Christians thought of the universal Church, it was idealized as the messianic people or the heavenly Jerusalem, but it remains for Paul a temporal thing.⁵⁰ As the Christian hope of resurrec-

tion is fundamentally social, it is inescapably historical, a resurrection not from, but of the body. The new creation is not a "fresh start" but is the old made new. The building up of the Church therefore is not an elect group, it is rather the resurrection body of history itself, the "open consecration of a part marks the destiny of the whole,"⁵¹ as made for God, created and redeemed in Christ. This is the way Paul sees the redemption of the body begun in the eschatological community of the Spirit (Rom.8), which will be cleansed and purified by Christ (Eph.5:26) until the Body of Christ will stand forth, not as a world within a world, but as one solidarity in the restoration of the original image of creation, "where there cannot be Greek and Jew...but Christ is all, and all in all." (Col.3:10).

The Epistle to the Hebrews

The Epistle to the Hebrews draws less on prophetic and messianic themes than on Jesus as the fulfillment of the priesthood and sacrifice of the Old Testament liturgy. The use of sacrificial terminology may go back to Isaias (53:10), but the author of Hebrews goes far beyond Isaias. By comparing the death of Jesus with the regularly repeated ritual of sacrifice, the author gives singular emphasis to the total efficacy of the atoning death. This Epistle further combines the themes of kingship and priesthood; the ancient Semitic and Sumerian priest-king represented the people whom he incorporated before the gods. In the Israelitic monarchy, this concept did not appear; the people were unwilling that the king become a sacral figure. Now Christ, a priest according to Melchisedek (a priest-king), not of the order of Aaron who was simply a priest, restores the ancient conception, the roots of which are outside the Old Testament.⁵² The purpose of the Epistle is to exhort and encourage the faithful, perhaps a group of converted Jewish priests who fled Jerusalem in the persecution and strongly missed the liturgical cult of the Temple.⁵³ The author affirms the absolute supremacy of Christ as sovereign Priest, and in a comparison with the Levitical priesthood, shows how Jesus in His unique sacrifice, saves and purifies Christians, and having entered heaven, lives forever, continually interceding for His own.

In the covenant sacrifices the essential rite was the pouring of blood on the altar and the aspersion of the people; this meant a pact of friendship, a psychic union between God and the people because of shared

"life" (blood). This made them God's people. The full significance of the Feast of the Atonement then was to purify the sanctuary and the altar, for the sins of Israel had polluted the land and everything that was holy, and had so driven God from their midst. By the ritual of expiation the tabernacle is purified and God returns to them. The purification was symbolic of that of the people; when God returned to their midst He was reunited with a purified people. Purification and reunion are aspects of a single reality.⁵⁴

The author of Hebrews⁵⁵ is deeply impressed by the power of sin as a barrier to fellowship with God and maintains that it is removed by the finality of Christ's vicarious act of dying. Like Paul, he interprets Christ's act as that of a representative, but he describes it as that of a mediator or high priest. Christ effects man's deliverance by offering Himself in perfect obedience to the Father's will; the conscience of man is thus cleansed and a new, eternal life opened to him.⁵⁶ The two Old Testament tents represent the antechamber for the priests' rites and the divine presence; the first is a symbol of the world barring the way to the second. The high priest alone was able to enter the tent of presence to perform atoning rites with the blood of animals. The blood effected a purification which could restore the covenant people to good standing as worshippers in the earthly sanctuary but it did not purify them fully, did not destroy sin at its root. Therefore the rites failed to enable entrance to God in the heavenly sanctuary. The priests of the old covenant could not follow the high priest into the second tent, but the whole priestly people of God can now follow Jesus, the High Priest.

The sacrifice of Christ effectively cleanses the people: in His Body of flesh and blood is provided a way to God through material creation; His act is final and decisive, but as the author shows, the constant intercession of Christ demands that the believer must constantly

exercise his function, keeping "clean" and overcoming, for the whole of Christian existence is a continuous divine service.⁵⁷

Hebrews 5:7 uses the word "save" in reference to Christ's prayer and goes on (v.9) to refer to Christ as the principle of "salvation;" He "saves all" in 7:28. "Redemption" (9:15) and "cleansed" (10:22) lead to other corporate contexts. Finally the word "heal" is used corporately, the single New Testament instance which is not an Old Testament citation, in Hebrews 12:13. Every other time "heal" is used in the New Testament, it is in reference to an individual.⁵⁸ (It is usually a miraculous cure that is referred to and thus perhaps a "sacramental" sign.) This passage takes on added significance in the light of its frequent Old Testament occurrence and its use in the servant theology of Isaiah 53.

In the first context (5:7,9) there is a description of Jesus the High Priest. An earthly priest is a mediator who offers "gifts and sin offerings" (v.2) to expiate sins and because of his own weakness, he understands the weakness of those whom he represents. The accent is on the humanity of the priest who can offer for the people because he is a part of that people.⁵⁹ So Christ is our Priest and His offering (v.7) is the whole of His passion; the prayer of Christ, His "piety" (v.7), which implies the perfect submission of the prayer in the garden, was such that His prayer was granted. His obedience, consummated in His office of priest and victim became the source of unending salvation for all (v.9). The exhortation which follows here (6:4-8) is not a denial of the possibility of penance. "It is impossible to arouse people to fresh repentance when...they have fallen back" (vv4-5). Nowhere does this Epistle envisage the case of a repentant sinner seeking readmission into communion with the Church. These Christians have not fallen away and the author is saying that they have no right to count on a second chance. The Hebrews were converted as adults and to fall away would be

to deliberately close their eyes to the light.⁶⁰

The passage (7:25) which speaks of Christ who is able to "save all" because His priesthood is absolute and final, sees Jesus as the High Priest interceding continually for all because He is always alive (v.25). The multitude of Levitical priests (v.23) was a necessity because death prevented them from "abiding." The rarely used Greek word employed here implies both fellowship and service.⁶¹ Because of Christ's perfect and unique sacrifice, there is no need to offer daily sacrifice now (v.28). It is significant that the following section (8:8ff.) cites Jeremias 31:31, God's new covenant with the "house of Juda" and the "house of Israel." It is a covenant sacrifice which the author has in mind by which Christ cleanses and preserves and purifies the entire community.

The context of the "redemption" passage (9:12) is a description of the Feast of the Atonement, the ceremonies of the first tent which were intended to purify the worshipper (v.9) and the daily ceremonies of the priests. When the high priest, who alone could enter the Holy of Holies, did so, he carried animal blood to effect a cleansing of himself and of the people from sins of ignorance. Because God's people (v.8), represented by him, could not enter the earthly sanctuary, so too was the heavenly sanctuary closed to them.⁶² "None of the rites effected the needed purification, not even the solemn annual feast. But (v.11) Christ, the High Priest, made entrance once for all; the "greater and more perfect temple" may mean the Body of Christ for through His own blood He effected the eternal redemption.⁶³ The thoughts springing out of the fulfillment of Christ's priestly work are developed in the remainder of the chapter, where the purifying power of His blood (vv.13-14), is extended to His people and is a ratification of the new covenant (vv.15-22).⁶⁴ Christ's death as an expiatory sacrifice for sinners is powerfully asserted in

terms of His Ascension (v.12); His entrance into the heavenly sanctuary was the final Day of Atonement which brought the whole system of man-offered sacrifices to an end. It achieved for all the true eschatological "redemption" of the future (vv.9,15).⁶⁵

The people are called to draw near with total faith in the text (10:22) which uses the "cleanse" of Ephesians, with hearts "sprinkled" and bodies "washed," to make ready for the return of Christ at the end of time (v.25). There may be an allusion to some symbolic liturgical rite here, and the parallel may be between a cleansing for the Parousia, similar to Christ's cleansing of His Church in Ephesians (5:26), and a healing lustration which was a preparation for the "approach" (v.22) to the Eucharist. This is pure conjecture but the sacramental overtones are present. Holding fast to "confession" may mean the baptismal profession or its liturgical reaffirmation. The whole passage is in the area of promise and foretaste,⁶⁶ a continuing cleansing of a purified people (vv.10-12).

In the final text in Hebrews (12:13), the word "healed" is used in a passage of exhortation: "Be healed...." It is the word used so often in Osee, and in Isaias 52:5, "by His stripes we were healed." It is used for many of the healing miracles in Luke, including the group of lepers (17:15). The verses which follow in Hebrews (14-17) show that it is the peace and holiness of the community which is at stake in the corrective exhortation. The "consecration" (v.14) of all may "require the expulsion of a member whose misbehavior threatens to infect the others;"⁶⁷ this is the "root of bitterness" (v.15). Thus it is seen that there is no room in the community for immorality, for as Esau had, by a profanation, renounced the inheritance of the messianic promises,⁶⁸ so would be one who would sell his birthright or baptismal heritage. Only in this way can the community keep together and be

saved. The apparent lack of opportunity for repentance (v.17) again is in terms of the author's concern to prevent defection and not with denial of a penitent seeking reconciliation. From the more universal symbol in Esau the next section goes to the two covenants (vv.18ff.). To the end of the Epistle the notion of unity and universality is unmistakable, and the unity is centered entirely in the Christ, who as Priest includes all. The Synoptic vineyard theme and the corporate sacrificial redemption of the Old Testament are culminated: "Jesus too, in order to purify the people by His blood, suffered a death outside the city gate" (13:11-12). The son of the master of the vineyard was so murdered outside the wall (Mt.21:33ff.).

At the Feast of the Atonement, the high priest sprinkled the blood of the victims on the Holy of Holies, but the flesh of the animals had to be burned outside the camp. Christ, the expiatory victim, realized this prefiguration in His crucifixion outside the walls of the city, by which He sanctified His people as the Servant of God. Christ the High Priest not only objectively delivers all men from sin by His obedience and His sacrifice; His passion itself provides the subjective way through the desert, the purifying way of the obedience of faith. If the priest must lead men to live this trial, he must experience it himself. Thus the Priesthood of Christ implies a rigorous solidarity. Bourgin points out that a possible translation of 2:11, "for both He who purifies and they who are purified spring from one source," is "le sanctificateur et les sanctifiés forment un seul tout."⁶⁹ The obedience of Christ is at once His sacrifice and His trial, which united men to God and Jesus to His brothers. His is the unique combination of the legal institution of the priesthood and the personal call of the prophet. In the Old Testament, the prophets had experienced God's action by "sacramental" and redemptive acts; the priest represented the entire people ritually in the

sanctuary. Thus Christ, embodying His people, becomes both the guide and the means to salvation: prophet, king, and priest are one in the shepherd of the flock.⁷⁰ The closing lines of the Epistle renew the image of the ratification in blood of the everlasting covenant between the shepherd and His sheep, unity in "Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, today, and forever" (13:8).

* * * * *

In summary, the evidence of corporate reconciliation in the Epistle texts which we have studied is very rich. The characteristic notion of hope in St. Paul is based on the present redemption which is, in fact, the seed of the future reconciliation of the individual, of the Church, of all creation. This is an Old Testament messianic notion of salvation and Paul sees that the new people has absorbed all of Israel's privileges. Christ, by incorporating Himself into our sinful race, has reconciled that race to God and adoption into God's family is a present reality. The link of all men to each other and to God is in the "Body" of Christ, both His fleshly and His mystical Body. In the images of the vine and the temple, Paul shows that Christians are the continuation of Israel and the instrument of the collective salvation of the world. In the images of the body and the bride, it is seen that Christ has redeemed and is cleansing and healing a perfect Church for an eschatological reconciliation. For Paul, reconciliation is Christ's act of redeeming love, centered in the cross which joins all people: there is no longer Jew or Gentile but all are one. Remission of sins is joined to mystical union or peace between God and His reconciled people. The Church, redeemed and redeeming, is constantly being reconciled, as one in Christ, to God.

In the Epistle to the Hebrews, the liturgical effort of the

Atonement Day finds its fulfillment. The ability of Christ, the High Priest, has meant the effective reconciliation of the people once and for all. And yet He continually intercedes in the present time for the cleansing and healing of the entire community. One of the distinctive significances of the Old Testament Feast of Atonement was the fact that while the whole people participated, only the high priest was able to enter the Holy of Holies. And as has been seen, his atonement was only partially effective. Catching up the idea of a corporate reconciliation of the community, the Epistle to the Hebrews furthers the notion to its consummation in Christ. For in His unique and absolutely effective, universal redemption, the entire community was, and is continually, being restored. The theology of St. Paul finds sacramental expression in Hebrews: the words of Ephesians are used in a liturgical framework which deals with Christ's death as an expiatory sacrifice for sinners. The unique "Ascension theology" of Hebrews emphasizes a perfect future liturgy in terms of past and present events - the priestly action of Christ. At the center is the High Priest, Christ, who has healed, is healing, and will cleanse and purify a perfect people because they are one with and in Him.

CONCLUSION

This study began with the sacrament of Penance. We have attempted to trace the Scriptural evidence which involves the reconciliation of the Church to God and the testimony for past, present, and future corporate restoration seems very clear. Inevitably the evidence has been the whole story of Christian redemption and our study, necessarily incomplete and artificial, has at least positively indicated the law of salvation in community and the fact of an objective corporate redemption in Christ. Nevertheless, the emphatic eschatological orientation of both salvation and the Church in Scripture, placed within the sacramental economy, provides an opening for making the connection with Penance. On the basis of the positive evidence we have gathered, we will attempt a brief suggestion as to the possible relation between the Scriptural doctrine of corporate reconciliation and the sacrament of Penance.

The evolution of the theology of sin in the Bible has been seen to be paralleled by the development of a theology of repentance.¹ Penance, as preached from the beginning of the Gospel, was ordered to preparation for the coming of the Lord, for the forming of a perfect people for the Day of Judgment.² Sin is an abstacle to the coming of the kingdom; in the Old Testament sin meant the ruin of the nation while repentance and conversion meant its salvation. In the Gospels, Christ's cures are "signs of the coming of the kingdom" while confession of sins, as at the Jordan Baptism, meant a corporate submission of "Jerusalem and all Judea" (Mt.3:5) to a judgment which proclaimed the coming of the great king. The link between the judgment of God and the establishment

of the kingdom is constant in the Bible.³

The Holy Spirit was given to judges and kings to establish peace, and to the messianic king for the great judgment which would restore the paradisiac kingdom. So too is the Spirit given to the Church; it is through the Holy Spirit that the Church exercises her continual judgment, which is that of Christ the Messiah. His power to forgive sin is given to the Apostles (Jn.20:22) when He gives them peace and the Spirit. In the ecclesial community it is the Church who judges, and in terms of admittance to the Eucharist, the sacrament of unity. In the old covenant, sin stained the whole community which was, in turn, purified through its link with God in the altar. The sinner in St. Paul's important Penance text (1Cor.5:1-5) is excluded from the Eucharistic meal,⁴ but it has been noted that this text may be concerned more with the Church than with the individual.⁵ When Penance is seen as the recovery of access to the sanctuary, the evidence of the earthly and heavenly liturgy of the Epistle to the Hebrews raises the sacrament from the individual to the ecclesial plane. The evidence is that sin is an obstacle to the kingdom of God which, on earth, is the Church; Penance is the Church's normal way of restoring access to the liturgy on earth as well as in heaven. Both sin and Penance, which seem to be purely personal acts, are thus seen as affecting the entire movement of humanity towards God.⁶

The theology of St. Paul showed that reconciliation was intimately bound with "peace with God" and with freedom, sonship, fellowship. "The vitality of the work of God in Christ in its bearings upon personal reconciliation and fellowship is equal as it extends to the Church."⁷

The corporate nature of reconciliation, when it is not expressed as the "kingdom," the "church," or the "Body of Christ" is marked in the allegories of the shepherd and the vine, and in the Last Supper discourse in St. John.⁸ Both the Gospels and the Epistles then, preach a koinonia

or abiding in Christ which is experienced "as a member of the Christian community."⁹ It is significant too, that in the Apocalypse, it is the seven "churches" (1:16-17) which are told to repent.

As a continuous and growing experience, fellowship requires as its foundation, a continuous redeeming and restoring ministry of Christ. Based on all that was accomplished on Calvary, it depends in all its heights and depths upon the work of Him who ever liveth to make intercession for us.¹⁰

The "cleansing" of the perfect Church by Christ (Eph.5:26) is the same word as is used for baptismal cleansing in the Epistle to Titus 3:5, and is the word used in St. John's Gospel (13:10) in the washing of the feet, where Christ purifies the group of disciples before the sacrifice of Calvary. The word is used in the Apocalypse in a corporate sense, "Christ washed us from our sins in His blood," (1:5) and this "washing" is the way Yahweh cleansed His bride in Ezechiel 16:4 and 23:40. In Hebrews 10:22, it refers to forgiveness of sin in the Spirit and is in a sacramental context. It is used in the Old Testament with reference to Levitical ceremonies, the consecration of priests (Ex.29:4), the bathing of the high priest on the Day of Atonement (Lev.16:4). The sacramental cleansing of the Church by Christ seems a logical conclusion.

In the Synoptic accounts of the cleansing of the lepers (Mt.8:46), in Luke a group of lepers (17:13), they were told to make an expiatory sin offering similar to the rite for priestly anointing. Here there is possible application to Baptism and Penance, since the pattern of miracles always has to do with the external sign of Christ's ability to perform an interior cleansing. The command to go to the Temple to offer sacrifice involved a sin offering which was a ritual form of excommunication and re-consecration into the covenant people, the worshipping community.¹¹ The Greek word refers to the priest's sacrifice, even though the leper is told to offer it, another sacramental indication.

The sacraments stem from historical roots and while they cannot

be defined by means of general concepts, they must be dealt with in the wholeness of biblical theology and not in isolation. Within the central doctrines of Christology, ecclesiology, eschatology, they are sacraments of a redemptive Incarnation - the extensions of the atonement. The bestowal of the Holy Spirit after or through the Ascension of Christ meant not only the completion of His redemptive work, but the assurance of Christ's universal and saving presence in His Spirit. The crucified and glorified "Body of Christ" is the center of sacramental doctrine,¹² in both Pauline meanings. Because the Church is redeemed and yet sinful, the "groaning" and "waiting" will always be present. The redemption made effective in Baptism contains an unfulfilled "tension-toward" and it means the continual restoration and cleansing by the Redeemer. It is the Body of Christ which He is constantly purifying and which, in the present economy, is essentially Incarnational, sacramental. Penance as a corporate sacrament could be inserted here.

If Baptism and the Eucharist are extensions of the atonement, concerned with incorporation into Christ's Death and Resurrection through the power of the Holy Spirit, they are essentially sacraments of the Church, and Penance finds its place also. In St. John's Gospel (20:22), with the gift of the Spirit, Christ breathed upon the Apostles, giving them the specific power to forgive sins. If this is a precision of a wider power given to the entire Church of "binding and loosing" (Mt. 16: 18),¹³ then perhaps it is an aspect of the total power of the keys which ought to be understood to include the whole of the Church's task of setting men free.¹⁴

In the new age, the sacraments are possible only because of the fact of redemption. The Church is between two worlds, dying and struggling to be reborn. She is known by faith as the spotless bride of Christ and yet her garment is humility and penitence; she is always being reformed and restored. There is a sense in which the sacraments are crea-

tive of the Church.¹⁵ The Fathers called Penance a "second Baptism" and emphasized the relationship between the two sacraments. In the Gospel, John's Baptism meant a group incorporation into the remnant; it meant repentance and forgiveness of sins. Its association with the outpouring of the Spirit in the messianic age is clearly seen in the Baptism of Jesus, and was therefore eschatological. The formation of a purified covenant people, a remnant which would establish the future kingdom, the judgment of Old Testament expectation, were all part of the significance of Jesus' Baptism.¹⁶ And the outpouring of the Spirit which took place was upon the Servant of the Lord, the "corporate" individual of Isaiah 53.¹⁷ Jesus is the Servant who identifies Himself with His repentant nation, to enter into the burden of their sin and, sinless, to make Himself an offering for the sin of the many.

The descent of the Spirit upon Jesus at His Baptism is linked both to the messianic and Servant themes;¹⁸ Baptism, in, at its deepest level, the cross, of which Christ's Baptism is a partial fulfillment, essentially eschatological. So too with the hope of the eschatological outpouring of the Spirit "until Jesus was glorified" (Jn.7:39). Each Synoptic writer too, associates the coming of the Spirit with Pentecost or the Ascension. The sacrament of Penance was only promulgated after the Resurrection¹⁹ (as was Baptism), through the "breath" of Christ and the Holy Spirit, the Spirit which issued from the crucified Body of Christ; this is the Spirit possessed only by Christ's Body, the Church.

...Insofar as God's holy Church is a Church of men and of sinful men, she, with everything that she is and has, is subject to that word of the Lord which reads "Do penance and be converted." Insofar as the Church is deformed, she has to be reformed: ecclesia reformanda.

And insofar as the Church, because of her human frailty and sinfulness, always needs to be better;...she must always be pressing on with all the zeal of the penitent...because she is, and is to remain, the holy Church. Insofar as the Church is constantly, repeatedly deformed, she has to be constantly, repeatedly reformed: semper ecclesia reformanda.²⁰

Reformed can only mean the creative renewal which is the result of deeper union with God in Christ. God has revealed Himself in words and in His Word, Incarnate in flesh, the "Sacrament of God." Both His Word and His words have revealed by signs that His life is given in this world through signs: by His sacraments Christ reconciles to God in Himself His first sacrament, the Church, His bride in all her glory.

NOTES FOR PREFACE

1. Cf. Bernard Leeming, Principles of Sacramental Theology (Westminster, Maryland: Newman Press, 1960), p. 381; A.-M. Roguet, Christ Acts through the Sacraments (Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 1960), pp. 89-92; Henri de Lubac, Catholicism (New York: Longmans, Green co., 1950), pp. 37-38.
2. Pope Pius XII, Humani Generis (Washington, D.C.: National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1950), p. 10, # 21.
3. Bernard Cooke, "Teaching Christ from Scripture," Perspectives V (1960), p. 11.
4. R. A. F. MacKenzie, "The Concept of a Biblical Theology," Proceedings of the Catholic Theological Society of America XX (New York, 1955), p. 49.

NOTES FOR INTRODUCTION

1. Walther Eichrodt, Theology of the Old Testament (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1960), p. 69.
2. G. Ernest Wright, God Who Acts (Naperville, Illinois: Alec Allenson, 1956), pp. 51-52.
3. Edmund Jacob, Theology of the Old Testament (New York: Harper and Bros., 1958), 212.
4. H. Wheeler Robinson, The Religious Ideas of the Old Testament (London: Duckworth, 1956), pp. 38-69.
5. Jacob, Theology, p. 201.
6. Robinson, Religious Ideas, p. 73.
7. Jean de Fraine, Adam et son Lignage: Etudes sur la notion de "personnalité corporative" dans la Bible (Bruges: Desclée de Brouwer, 1959). "Adam and Christ as Corporate Personalities," Theology Digest X (1962), p. 99. The ideas of de Fraine are part of the recent thought current which the present study aims to apply.
8. It was at this time that the increasingly nationalistic Judaism became more prevalent, although the broader outlook was never absent in post-exilic times. Cf. Robinson, Religious Ideas, p. 207.
9. Th. C. Vriezen, An Outline of Old Testament Theology (Oxford: Blackwell, 1958), pp. 283-284.
10. C. Ryder-Smith, The Bible Doctrines of Sin (London: Epworth Press, 1953), p. 56; see also p. 41.
11. Henri Rondet, Notes sur la théologie du péché (Paris: P. Lethielleux, 1957), pp. 20-21.
12. Gottfried Quell, Sin ("Bible Key Words from Gerhard Kittel"; London: Adam and Charles Black, 1951), p. 21; cf. Bruce Vawter, "Missing the Mark," The Way II (1962), p. 22.
13. John L. McKenzie, The Two-Edged Sword (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1956), p. 167.
14. Cf. Robinson, Religious Ideas, pp. 163-165; Vawter, "Missing the Mark," pp. 23-27.
15. A. Gelin, "Messianism," Dictionnaire de la Bible Supplement (Paris: Letouzey et Ane, 1957), V, cols. 1167-1168.

16. The servant figure was never fully assimilated by Judaistic thought about the Messiah; cf. E. O'Doherty, "The Organic Development of Messianic Revelation," Catholic Biblical Quarterly XIX (1957), 16-24.

17. John L. McKenzie, "Messianism and the College Teacher of Sacred Doctrine," Proceedings of the Society of Catholic College Teachers of Sacred Doctrine VI (Chicago, 1960), pp. 39-41.

18. J. McKenzie, Two-Edged Sword, pp. 207-210.

NOTES FOR CHAPTER I

1. Cf. Carroll Stuhlmueller, "The Old Testament Liturgy and College Sacred Doctrine," Proceedings of the Society of Catholic College Teachers of Sacred Doctrine VI (Chicago, 1960), pp. 61-65.
2. Albert Gelin, The Religion of Israel (New York: Hawthorne Books, 1959), pp. 56-58.
3. Th. Chary, Les prophètes et le culte à partir de l'exil (Tournai: Desclée, 1955), p. 276.
4. J. McKenzie, Two-Edged Sword, p. 272.
5. Jacques Guillet, Themes of the Bible (Notre Dame, Indiana: Fides Publishers, 1960), pp. 78-81.
6. John Bright, A History of Israel (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1959), p. 426.
7. E. Hatch and H. A. Redpath, Concordance to the Septuagint (Graz, Austria: Akademische Druck-Verlagsgesellschaft, 1954), I, p. 638. The Greek words were traced in order to limit the area of study and to establish more surely the meanings intended by the biblical writers. Such a word study will reveal more exactly which Old Testament concepts, as attached to particular words, are chosen by the New Testament writers to express their thoughts.
8. The numbering of the Psalms and the citations from the Psalms are according to The Holy Bible, trans. The Confraternity of Christian Doctrine (Paterson, New Jersey: St. Anthony Guild Press, 1950), henceforth referred to as the Confraternity edition. All the other references to the Old Testament are according to The Complete Bible, trans. J. M. Powis Smith and Edgar J. Goodspeed (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960), unless otherwise noted.
9. Hatch and Redpath, Concordance II, p. 1329.
10. Ibid., p. 890.
11. Ibid. I, p. 530.
12. Norman Snaith, Hymns of the Temple (London: SCM Press, 1951), pp. 20-25.
13. Gelin, Religion of Israel, p. 46.
14. P. Drijvers, Les Psaumes (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1958), pp. 186-210.

15. W.O.E. Oesterley, The Psalms (London: S.P.C.K., 1959), p. 278.
16. Jean Cales, Les Livres des Psaumes (Paris: Beauchesne, 1936), I, p. 506.
17. Ibid. II, p. 302.
18. Drijvers, Psaumes, p. 115.
19. Snaith, Hymns, pp. 48-49; cf. Guillet, Themes of the Bible, p. 213.
20. Ibid., p. 59.
21. La Sainte Bible, trans. École Biblique de Jérusalem, (Paris: Cerf, 1956), henceforth referred to as the Bible de Jérusalem; "Les Psaumes," comm. J. Gelineau, R. Tournay, et al. Other Psalms of collective supplication are 12, 60, 83, 94, 123, 137; cf. p. 728, n. e.
22. John L. McKenzie, "Royal Messianism," Catholic Biblical Quarterly XIX (1957), p. 50.
23. Guillet, Themes of the Bible, p. 210.
24. Cales, Les Psaumes II, p. 54.
25. Snaith, Hymns, p. 7.
26. Gelineau, Bible de Jérusalem, p. 125, n. a.
27. Drijvers, Psaumes, pp. 118 ff.
28. StuhlmueLLer, "The Old Testament Liturgy," p. 73.
29. Gelineau, Bible de Jérusalem, p. 733, n. b.
30. Guillet, Themes of the Bible, p. 210.
31. André Néher, L'essence du prophétisme (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1955), pp. 152-153.
32. Cales, Les Psaumes II, p. 70.
33. Oesterley, The Psalms, p. 369.
34. Gelineau, Bible de Jérusalem, p. 734, n. c; cf. de Fraine, Adam et son Lignage, pp. 145-148.
35. Cales, Les Psaumes II, p. 105.
36. Gelineau, Bible de Jérusalem, p. 738, n. a. Cf. Chary, Les prophètes, p. 81, on the significance of "the Glory" in the cult.
37. Cales, Les Psaumes II, p. 104.
38. Oesterley, The Psalms, p. 382.

39. English version of the Bible, cited in Oesterley, ibid.
40. Roland Murphy, "Old Testament Messianism and Apologetics," Catholic Biblical Quarterly XIX (1957), p. 7.
41. Cf. Chary, Les prophètes, pp. 275-286.
42. Gelin, The Religion of Israel, pp. 61-62.
43. Drijvers, Psaumes, p. 115.

NOTES FOR CHAPTER II

1. Other texts which may be noted are: 13:4, in which "redeem" is used twice, the same Greek word which was frequently used in the Psalm texts and the statements of Second Isaias; 12:6, in which Israel or Jacob is told to "return" to his God. Cf. p. 11 above for the Greek words used, further texts, and references in Hatch and Redpath, Concordance.
2. Norman Snaith, Mercy and Sacrifice (London: SCM Press, 1953), p. 43.
3. Néher, Essence du prophétisme, pp. 247-252.
4. Snaith, Mercy and Sacrifice, p. 33.
5. Ibid., p. 37; this verse which seems to imply mercy is generally regarded as a later addition.
6. Jacob, Theology, p. 185.
7. Snaith, Mercy and Sacrifice, p. 58.
8. de Fraine, Adam et son Lignage, p. 156.
9. Guillet, Themes of the Bible, pp. 123-124; cf. Vawter, "Missing the Mark," p. 22.
10. Snaith, Mercy and Sacrifice, p. 59.
11. P. Saydon, "Sin Offering and Trespass Offering," Catholic Biblical Quarterly VIII (1946), p. 397; cf. Quell, Sin, pp. 10-12.
12. E. Osty, comm. "Osee," Bible de Jérusalem, p. 1215. The French Bible also inserts vpr. 5b, "His judgment will go forth like light" into the hymn between 3a and b.
13. Eugene H. Maly, "Messianism in Osee," Catholic Biblical Quarterly XIX (1957), p. 216.
14. Snaith, Mercy and Sacrifice, p. 62.
15. Maly, "Messianism in Osee," p. 222.
16. Bruce Vawter, The Conscience of Israel (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1961), pp. 124-125.
17. Vawter, "Missing the Mark," p. 20.
18. Osty, Bible de Jérusalem, p. 1219, n. q.

19. The word "redeem" as so often used in Jeremiah and the Psalms in reference to the community, occurs here also.
20. H. H. Rowley, The Biblical Doctrine of Election (London: Lutterworth Press, 1952), p. 52.
21. Snaith, Mercy and Sacrifice, p. 49, n. 51.
22. Cf. Osee, chs. 4 and 5.
23. Guillet, Themes of the Bible, p. 53.
24. Snaith, Mercy and Sacrifice, p. 74.
25. Maly, "Messianism in Osee," p. 220.
26. Guillet, Themes of the Bible, p. 54.
27. Vawter, Conscience of Israel, p. 273.
28. H. H. Rowley, The Faith of Israel (London: SCM Press, 1956), pp. 99-100, 102.
29. Ibid., p. 105.
30. For further texts see 4:14, 31:27-34, 32:37-43, 33:1-27; for references in Hatch and Redpath, Concordance and texts in other prophets and the Psalms which employ the same words, see p. 111, above.
31. Vawter, Conscience of Israel, pp. 275-277.
32. Jeremiah interprets the desert experience chiefly as a time when Israel was morally true to Yahweh; cf. Néher, Essence du prophétisme, pp. 252-253, which points out that each prophet emphasizes the wilderness time in the light of his particular purpose. But for all of them it meant a time of youth, espousals, union with God, and is invariably linked with the image of "virgin Israel."
33. Rowley, Biblical Doctrine of Election, pp. 52-53.
34. A. Gelin, comm. "Jérémie," Bible de Jérusalem, includes the whole section, from 3:1 to 4:4, as an entire oracle; p. 1058, n. k.
35. Adam C. Welch, Jeremiah: His Time and Work (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955), p. 64. Welch treats this passage as ending at 4:2; 4:4, he maintains, is much later and distinct in nature, p. 70.
36. Néher, Essence du prophétisme, pp. 254-255.
37. Welch, Jeremiah, p. 84.
38. Gelin, Bible de Jérusalem, p. 1059, n. l.
39. Guillet, Themes of the Bible, p. 76.
40. Welch, Jeremiah, pp. 62-63.

41. Ibid., p. 71.
42. Gelin, Bible de Jérusalem, p. 1082.
43. Neal M. Flanagan, The Book of Jeremia (New York: Paulist Press, 1961), II, p. 7.
44. Rowley, Biblical Doctrine of Election, pp. 90-94.
45. J. McKenzie, "Royal Messianism," pp. 44-45.
46. Gelin, Bible de Jérusalem, p. 1090, n. a.
47. de Fraine, Adam et son Lignage, p. 102.
48. Gelin, Bible de Jérusalem, p. 1090, n. d. Cf. also vv. 8, 9, 21.
49. A. Gelin, "Jérémie," Dictionnaire de la Bible Supplément IV (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1949), cols. 883-884.
50. J. McKenzie, Two-Edged Sword, pp. 197-198.
51. Vawter, Conscience of Israel, p. 277.
52. Welch, Jeremiah, p. 230; cf. Gelin, "Jérémie," DBS, col. 884.
53. Bright, History of Israel, p. 315, n. 71.
54. Ibid., p. 316.
55. P. Auvray, comm. "Ézéchiél," Bible de Jérusalem, fasc. ed., p. 96.
56. de Fraine, Adam et son Lignage, pp. 155-156.
57. Néher, Essence du prophétisme, p. 252.
58. Many critics believe that this is the beginning of Ezechiel's prophecies, and that the vision took place in Jerusalem. See Louis Bouyer, The Meaning of Sacred Scripture (Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1958), p. 96.
59. Auvray, Bible de Jérusalem, p. 17.
60. Gelin, Religion of Israel, p. 36.
61. R. A. F. MacKenzie, "Biblical Theology," p. 59.
62. A. Médebielle, "Expiation," Dictionnaire de la Bible Supplément III (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1938), col. 85.
63. Theodore H. Robinson, Prophecy and the Prophets (London: Duckworth, 1953), pp. 155-156.
64. Chary, Les prophètes, p. 81.

65. Bouyer, Meaning of Sacred Scripture, p. 97.
66. Auvray, Bible de Jérusalem, p. 47, n. a.
67. Guillet, Themes of the Bible, p. 199.
68. Edward Siegman, The Book of Ezechiel I (New York: Paulist Press, 1961), p. 18.
69. H. W. Robinson, Religious Ideas, p. 86.
70. Jean Steinmann, Le prophète Ézéchiél et les débuts de l'exil (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1953), p. 92.
71. Jacob, Theology, p. 281; "judgment" is characteristic of Ezechiel: 24:27, 25:7, 30:19, etc.
72. Ibid.
73. Siegman, Ezechiel, pp. 26-27. Cf. Néher, Essence du prophétisme, pp. 152-153 on the intimate connection between "land," "spouse," and the covenant.
74. Auvray, Bible de Jérusalem, pp. 17-18.
75. Bright, History of Israel, pp. 317-318.
76. See the closely related text 37:15-28.
77. Steinmann, Le prophète Ézéchiél, pp. 163-164. In Ezechiel's plans for the future Temple (chs. 40-48), his emphasis is on God's kingship; neither the high priest nor the "prince" are given much stress. Cf. Chary, Les prophètes, p. 50.
78. Auvray, Bible de Jérusalem, p. 18.
79. Gelin, "Messianisme," col. 1185.
80. J. McKenzie, "Royal Messianism," p. 45.
81. Gelin, "Messianisme," ibid.
82. Auvray, Bible de Jérusalem, p. 136, n. a.
83. Guillet, Themes of the Bible, p. 213. Cf. de Fraine, Adam et son Lignage, p. 104, who says that the image of Israel as "mother" usually represents a situation of conversion or re-establishment of the people, especially in Second Isaias.
84. Auvray, Bible de Jérusalem, p. 136, n. a.
85. Stuhlmuehler, "The Old Testament Liturgy," p. 62.
86. T. H. Robinson, Prophecy and the Prophets, p. 156.
87. Bouyer, Meaning of Sacred Scripture, p. 94.

88. Ulrich Simon, A Theology of Salvation (London: S.P.C.K., 1953), p. 20.
89. Chary, Les prophètes, pp. 82, 278.
90. Gelin, Religion of Israel, p. 70.
91. Other texts are 52:3, 52:9; see p. 11 above for references in Hatch and Redpath, Concordance.
92. Auvray, comm. "Isaïe," Bible de Jérusalem, p. 1028, n. h.
93. A. Feuillet, "Isaïe," Dictionnaire de la Bible Supplément IV (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1949), cols. 701-706.
94. Bright, History of Israel, p. 337; cf. Is. 51:9-11.
95. Three cases in which Judges are called "saviors" acting as the instruments of God are the only exception; cf. Stanislas Lyonnet, "New Testament Concept of Salvation," Verbum Domini XXXVI (1958), 3-15.
96. Guillet, Themes of the Bible, p. 82.
97. Stuhlmüller, "Old Testament Liturgy," p. 63.
98. Bernhard Anderson, Understanding the Old Testament (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1957), p. 395.
99. Bright, History of Israel, p. 336.
100. Guillet, Themes of the Bible, p. 75.
101. Auvray, "Isaïe," Bible de Jérusalem, p. 1040, n. g.
102. Christopher North, The Suffering Servant of Deutero-Isaiah (London: Oxford University Press, 1956), pp. 20, 41. North is generally considered as the most reliable authority on the subject of the Servant Songs and his view, which is adopted here, on the person of the Servant seems most realistic and most faithful to biblical evidence.
103. Anderson, Old Testament, pp. 418, 420.
104. H. H. Rowley, The Servant of the Lord (London: Lutterworth, 1964), p. 34; the opinion of Peake, Lods.
105. Cf. Joh. Lindblom, The Servant Songs in Deutero-Isaiah (Lund: Gleerup, 1951).
106. Rowley, Servant of the Lord, pp. 50-57, whose views are dependent upon those of North, above.
107. Rowley, Faith of Israel, p. 122.
108. The view of C. North, Servant Songs, pp. 192-209.
109. Eichrodt, Theology III, cited in Vriezen, Theology, p. 300.

110. H. W. Robinson, Religious Ideas, p. 176, who, incidentally, maintains that the Servant is Israel the nation who suffers for others.

111. Snaith, Mercy and Sacrifice, p. 59.

112. Feuillet, "Isaie," DBS, col. 712; the Servant's sacrifice is a perfect synthesis of expiation by substitution and prayer of intercession. However, the problem of penal substitution is itself massive and can only here be indicated as such; no attempt has been made in this study to investigate this precise problem.

113. Anderson, Old Testament, p. 241.

114. Adolphe Lods, The Prophets and the Rise of Judaism (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1955), p. 249.

115. Rowley, Faith of Israel, pp. 185-186.

116. Ibid.

NOTES FOR CHAPTER III

1. Stahlin, cited in Eichrodt, Theology, p. 99.
2. Ibid., p. 130.
3. Ibid.
4. G. Ernest Wright, The Old Testament against its Environment (Naperville, Illinois: Alec Allenson, 1957), p. 106.
5. H. W. Robinson, Religious Ideas, p. 166.
6. Eichrodt, Theology, p. 461. Cf. Jacob, Theology, p. 297.
7. Roland de Vaux, Ancient Israel (New York: McGraw, Hill, 1961), p. 452. This searching and comprehensive study of the institutions of Israel is of profound significance, and together with Eichrodt's Theology of the Old Testament, forms the basis of our brief examination of expiatory sacrifice and the Feast of the Atonement.
8. Saydon, "Sin Offering and Trespass Offering," p. 398; de Vaux, however, says that the distinction is not at all this clear, according to the biblical data: Ancient Israel, pp. 418 ff.
9. H. W. Robinson, Religious Ideas, pp. 141-144.
10. de Vaux, Ancient Israel, pp. 419 ff.
11. Vriezen, Old Testament Theology, p. 289, n. 1.
12. de Vaux, Ancient Israel, p. 460.
13. Néher, Essence du prophétisme, pp. 160-161: it was through ritual that man restored things to their essential unity.
14. Lods, Prophets and the Rise of Judaism, p. 261.
15. H. W. Robinson, Religious Ideas, p. 144.
16. Lods, Prophets and the Rise of Judaism, p. 316.
17. Eichrodt, Theology, pp. 130-131.
18. de Vaux, Ancient Israel, pp. 509-510.
19. Ibid., p. 507.
20. Ibid., p. 508.

21. Ibid.
22. Médebielle, "Expiation," col. 62.
23. Bright, History of Israel, pp. 420-421.
24. Médebielle, "Expiation," col. 61.
25. H. W. Robinson, Religious Ideas, p. 140.
26. Jacob, Theology, p. 296.
27. Eichrodt, Theology, p. 136.

NOTES FOR CHAPTER IV

1. Cf. G. Dejaifve, "L'Église catholique et repentance oecuménique," Nouvelle Revue Théologique LXXXIV (1962), 225-239.
2. Guillet, Themes of the Bible, pp. 107-117, 128.
3. Vincent Taylor, Forgiveness and Reconciliation (London: Macmillan and Co., 1956), pp. 226-227.
4. David Stanley, "The Conception of Salvation in Primitive Christian Teaching," Catholic Biblical Quarterly XVIII (1956), p. 236. Cf. Vincent O'Keefe, "Towards Understanding the Gospels," Catholic Biblical Quarterly XXI (1959), p. 183, on the relation between the Gospels and the sermons in the Acts of the Apostles.
5. Ibid., p. 240.
6. Ibid., pp. 241-243. Cf. Ethelbert Stauffer, New Testament Theology (London: SCM Press, 1955), p. 153, which lists seven basic names which the primitive Church gave herself: ecclesia, people of God, flock of Christ, God's planting, God's building, ecclesia femina, corpus Christi.
7. F. X. Durrwell, The Resurrection (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1960), p. 31.
8. Cf. Stanislas Lyonnet, "De Notione Redemptionis," Verbum Domini XXXVI (1958), 129-146.
9. Joseph Bonsirven, Le règne de Dieu (Paris: Aubier, 1957), p. 72.
10. Ibid., p. 15.
11. Guillet, Themes of the Bible, p. 87.
12. J. McKenzie, "Messianism and the College Teacher," pp. 45-47.
13. Ibid., p. 49.
14. Stanislas Lyonnet, "The Saving Justice of God," Theology Digest VIII (1960), pp. 81-82.
15. Cf. Lyonnet, "New Testament Concept of Salvation," p. 5.

NOTES FOR CHAPTER V

1. W. F. Moulton and A. S. Gedden, A Concordance to the New Testament (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1950), p. 607.
2. Ibid., p. 97.
3. Ibid., p. 931.
4. Ibid., p. 371.
5. Ibid., p. 466.
6. David Stanley, "The Conception of the Gospels as Salvation-History," Theological Studies XX (1959), p. 578.
7. Ibid., pp. 579-581.
8. Confraternity edition.
9. Oscar Cullmann, The Christology of the New Testament (London: SCM Press, 1959), p. 137. This study, while not entirely acceptable to Catholics, has been generally acknowledged by Catholic scholars as an outstanding work on the New Testament titles of Christ.
10. David Stanley, "The Conception of Salvation in the Synoptic Gospels," Catholic Biblical Quarterly XVIII (1956), pp. 348-349.
11. Ibid., p. 349.
12. Harold Roberts, Jesus and the Kingdom of God (London: Epworth Press, 1955), p. 24.
13. William Manson, Jesus the Messiah (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1956), p. 144.
14. Vincent Taylor, The Names of Jesus (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1953), pp. 25-34.
15. W. Manson, Jesus the Messiah, pp. 158-165.
16. Bonsirven, Le règne de Dieu, p. 198.
17. W. Manson, Jesus the Messiah, p. 181.
18. T. W. Manson, The Teaching of Jesus (Cambridge: University Press, 1931), p. 232.

19. See pp. 3-4 above. Cf. Cullmann, Christology, p. 154, who says Jesus' use of the Son of Man title was deliberately ambiguous. Rather, it would seem that Christ's use of the title rendered it a profoundly rich concept, capable of many levels of meaning.

20. de Fraine, "Adam and Christ," p. 101.

21. Roberts, Jesus and the Kingdom, p. 32.

22. Alan Richardson, An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament (London: SCM Press, 1958), pp. 136-137.

23. Bonsirven, Le règne de Dieu, p. 187.

24. Roberts, Jesus and the Kingdom, pp. 39, 41.

25. E. Kenneth Lee, "Unity in Israel and Unity in Christ," Studies in Ephesians, ed. J. N. Sanders (London: Mowbray, 1956), p. 43.

26. Cullmann, Christology, p. 161. Cf. R. N. Lightfoot, The Gospel Message of St. Mark (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1952), p. 42: The Son of Man title is the final term of the Old Testament series of remnant, Servant, the "I" of the Psalms, and the Son of Man. The title is restricted to Christ in His mission to create the Son of Man, the kingdom of the saints, "to realize in Israel the ideal contained in the term."

27. W. Manson, Jesus the Messiah, pp. 182-183.

28. Stanley, "Concept of Salvation in the Synoptics," p. 352.

29. W. Manson, Jesus the Messiah, p. 182.

30. Richardson, Theology of the New Testament, p. 220.

31. Roberts, Jesus and the Kingdom, pp. 59-60.

32. Cf. T. W. Manson, The Sayings of Jesus (London: SCM Press, 1954), pp. 216-217, 250, on the Son of Man theme of Daniel 7 and the idea of judgment as given by God to the "saints of the Most High;" the twelve tribes are either the Jewish people or the spiritual Israel, the Church.

33. Confraternity edition. A second text listed by Moulton and Geddén, 9:56, is declared an addition by E. Osty, comm. "L'Évangile selon Saint Luc," Bible de Jérusalem, p. 1357, n. f., and is not in the Goodspeed Bible.

34. A. R. C. Leany, A Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Luke (New York: Harper and Bros., 1958), p. 241.

35. Ibid., pp. 96-97.

36. Both the Jerusalem Bible and the Goodspeed Bible omit it. Floyd Filson, A Commentary on the Gospel of St. Matthew (New York: Harper and Bros., 1960), p. 200, says that it is included in some manuscripts and is probably borrowed from Luke 19:10.

37. David Stanley, The Gospel of St. Matthew ("New Testament Reading Guide," Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 1960), p. 62.
38. Moulton and Gedden, Concordance, p. 97.
39. Leany, The Gospel of St. Luke, p. 262.
40. Cf. Murphy, "Old Testament Messianism," pp. 13-15; Feillet, "Isaie," DBS, col. 712.
41. W. Manson, Jesus the Messiah, pp. 141, 155.
42. Ibid., pp. 173-175. Cf. de Fraine, "Adam and Christ," p. 99.
43. These are the views of Jean Giblet, "Jésus, Serviteur de Dieu," Lumière et Vie XXXVI (1958), 5-34. Cf. A. E. J. Rawlinson, The New Testament Doctrine of the Christ (London, Longmans, Green and Co., 1949), p. 49.
44. Moulton and Gedden, Concordance, pp. 928-929.
45. Stanley, "Concept of Salvation in the Synoptics," p. 355.
46. Moulton and Gedden, Concordance, p. 931.
47. See Salvador Munoz Iglesias, "Literary Genre of the Infancy Gospel in St. Matthew," Theology Digest IX (Winter, 1961), 15-20.
48. Stanley, The Gospel of St. Matthew, p. 10. Cf. Néher, Essence du prophétisme, p. 229, on the significance of the Emmanuel prophecy.
49. Ibid., p. 13.
50. Myles Bourke, "Literary Genus of Matthew 1-2," Catholic Biblical Quarterly XXII (1960), 160-175; Theology Digest IX (1961), p. 20.
51. G. A. Danell, "The Idea of God's People in the Bible," The Root of the Vine, ed. Anton Fridrichsen (London: Dacre Press, 1953), p. 36.
52. Stanley, "Concept of Salvation in the Synoptics," pp. 357-360.
53. Stanley, The Gospel of St. Matthew, pp. 46-47.
54. Oscar Cullmann, The Early Church (London: SCM Press, 1956), p. 118, says there is no reason to doubt the authenticity of the words or to regard them as a later insertion of the early Church; but the use of the future tense should be noted.
55. Karl L. Schmidt, The Church ("Bible Key Words from Gerhard Kittel;" London: Adam and Charles Black, 1950), p. 39.
56. Ibid., p. 40; see also p. 66.
57. Bonsirven, Le règne de Dieu, p. 198.

58. Moulton and Gedden, Concordance, p. 607.
59. Ibid., p. 371.
60. René Laurentin, Structure et théologie de Luc I-II (Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1957), pp. 93-95.
61. Stanley, "Concept of Salvation in the Synoptics," pp. 360-361.
62. Carroll Stuhlmueller, "The Gospel according to St. Luke," Worship XXXIII (Nov., 1959), p. 637.
63. Laurentin, Structure de Luc I-II, p. 90.
64. Leany, Gospel of St. Luke, p. 24.
65. Osty, Bible de Jérusalem, p. 1354, ns. d,e,f.
66. Sahlin, cited in Leany, Gospel of St. Luke, p. 24.
67. Laurentin, Structure de Luc I-II, p. 95.
68. Carroll Stuhlmueller, The Gospel of St. Luke ("New Testament Reading Guide;" Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 1960), p. 17.
69. Laurentin, Structure de Luc I-II, p. 90.
70. Ibid., pp. 152-154.
71. Quell, Sin, p. 69; cf. Stuhlmueller, "The Gospel of St. Luke," Worship, pp. 640-641.
72. Ibid., p. 89.
73. A. Feuillet, "The Incarnation: Mystery of Salvation," Theology Digest VIII (1960), 76-80. Cf. Stanislas Lyonnet, "Redemptive Value of the Resurrection," Ibid., 89-95.
74. Taylor, Forgiveness and Reconciliation, p. 192.
75. Moulton and Gedden, Concordance, p. 929; cf. John 3:17, 5:34, 12:47; also "heal" in 12:40, a citation from Isaias 6.
76. Ibid., p. 606.
77. D. Mollat, "L'Évangile selon Saint Jean," Bible de Jérusalem, p. 1413, n. k. (Cf. Osee 6:6 and 1 Jn. 1:3).
78. C. H. Dodd, The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, (Cambridge: University Press, 1955), p. 350.
79. Raymond Brown, The Gospel of St. John ("New Testament Reading Guide;" Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 1960), p. 55.
80. Médebielle, "Expiation," col. 213-214.

80. Dodd, The Fourth Gospel, p. 361.
82. C. K. Barrett, The Gospel according to St. John (London: S.P.C.K., 1955), p. 363. Cf. Stauffer, New Testament Theology, who indicates that the foot-washing scene takes the place of the Supper in the Synoptics as pointing to the imminence of Calvary.
83. M. E. Boismard, "Jésus, Sauveur, d'après Saint Jean," Lumière et Vie XV (1954), pp. 403-404.
84. See Oscar Cullmann, Early Christian Worship (London: SCM Press, 1953), pp. 105-110.
85. Dodd, The Fourth Gospel, p. 401.
86. Bruce Vawter, "The Johannine Sacramentary," Theological Studies XVII (1956), p. 158.
87. Ibid.
88. Barrett, The Fourth Gospel, p. 367.
89. Dodd, The Fourth Gospel, p. 402.
90. Boismard, "Jésus, Sauveur," pp. 398, 401.
91. Richardson, Theology of the New Testament, p. 259.
92. Brown, The Gospel of St. John, p. 78.
93. Barrett, The Gospel of St. John, p. 395; cf. John 6 for a similar transition from faith to sacrament.
94. Dodd, The Fourth Gospel, pp. 410-411; (Psalm 79-80 contains a like figure which, in the Hebrew, equates the vine and the "son of man.")
95. Quell, Sin, pp. 73-74.
96. Rondet, Théologie du péché, pp. 30-48.
97. Bonsirven, Le règne de Dieu, pp. 70-72.
98. W. Manson, Jesus the Messiah, p. 127.
99. Bonsirven, Le Règne de Dieu, p. 181, n. 65.
100. Guillet, Themes of the Bible, p. 206.
101. Bonsirven, Le règne de Dieu, p. 206.
102. Ibid., p. 197.
103. David Stanley, "Kingdom to Church," Theological Studies XVI (1955), p. 25. Cf. O'Keefe, "Understanding the Gospels," pp. 179-180.

104. Ibid., p. 17.

105. Lucien Cerfaux, The Church in the Theology of St. Paul (New York: Herder and Herder, 1959), p. 389. Cf. Cullmann, The Early Church, p. 152, on the evolution of Paul's thinking which did not modify his certainty that the kingdom was imminent.

NOTES FOR CHAPTER VI

1. Taylor, Forgiveness and Reconciliation, p. 17.
2. Ibid., pp. 1-13.
3. Ibid., p. 48.
4. Cf. Lyonnet, "New Testament Concept of Salvation," pp. 3-15.
5. Stanislas Lyonnet, "Conception Paulinienne de la Rédemption," Lumière et Vie VII (1958), 35-66; "St. Paul and a Mystical Redemption," Theology Digest VIII (1960), p. 84.
6. Richardson, Theology of the New Testament, p. 219.
7. Lyonnet, "St. Paul and Mystical Redemption," p. 85.
8. Ibid., pp. 87-88.
9. Cerfaux, The Church in St. Paul, pp. 46-48.
10. Moulton and Geddén, Concordance, p. 929.
11. Ibid., p. 535.
12. Ibid., p. 97.
13. Ibid., p. 606.
14. Vincent Taylor, The Epistle to the Romans (London: Epworth Press, 1955), p. 38.
15. G. K. Barrett, The Epistle to the Romans (New York: Harper and Bros., 1957), p. 107.
16. See also 1 Cor. 7:11 and 2 Cor. 5:18; it is interesting that the latter text uses "reconcile" in a corporate sense, of Christ's redemptive act while the former uses the word in reference to the reconciliation of husband and wife.
17. Taylor, Forgiveness and Reconciliation, pp. 208-212.
18. Cullmann, The Early Church, pp. 117, 119.
19. Barrett, Epistle to the Romans, p. 167; cf. Thomas Barosse, "Death and Sin in the Epistle to the Romans," Theology Digest IV (1956), p. 25.

20. John A. T. Robinson, The Body (Naperville, Illinois: Alec Allenson, 1957), p. 30.
21. Ibid., p. 31.
22. Handley C. G. Moule, The Epistle to the Romans (London: Pickering and Inglis, n.d.), p. 229.
23. Ibid., p. 308.
24. Barrett, Epistle to the Romans, p. 223.
25. Barnabas M. Ahern, The Epistles to the Galatians and to the Romans ("New Testament Reading Guide;" Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 1960), p. 75.
26. Cerfaux, The Church in St. Paul, pp. 60, 62.
27. Lucien Cerfaux, Christ in the Theology of St. Paul (New York: Herder and Herder, 1959), p. 303.
28. Taylor, Forgiveness and Reconciliation, p. 183.
29. Barrett, Epistle to the Romans, p. 225.
30. Anders Nygren, The Epistle to the Romans (London: SCM Press, 1955), p. 404.
31. Lee, "Unity in Israel," Studies in Ephesians, p. 64.
32. D. E. H. Whitely, "Christology," Studies in Ephesians, p. 61.
33. J. Robinson, The Body, p. 45.
34. Cerfaux, The Church in the Theology of St. Paul, p. 64.
35. Taylor, Forgiveness and Reconciliation, p. 78. Cf. P. Benoit on Eph. 2:16 (Bible de Jérusalem), cited in Durrwell, The Resurrection, p. 195, n. 3: "This single body in which Christ reconciles the enemy peoples is first of all His individual and physical body, sacrificed on the Cross. But it is also the Mystical Body, whose centre or head is that physical body, in which all the members are gathered together, once Jews and Gentiles, now at last reconciled."
36. P. Benoit, comm. "Épître aux Colossiens," Bible de Jérusalem, p. 1555, ns. b, d.
37. Taylor, Forgiveness and Reconciliation, p. 81.
38. J. Robinson, The Body, p. 71.
39. Ibid., p. 76.
40. Cerfaux, The Church in the Theology of St. Paul, p. 321.
41. J. Robinson, The Body, pp. 60-65.

42. Cerfaux, The Church in the Theology of St. Paul, p. 297.
43. Cerfaux, Christ in the Theology of St. Paul, p. 350.
44. Cerfaux, The Church in the Theology of St. Paul, p. 350.
45. Schmidt, The Church, pp. 7, 16, 19.
46. P. Benoit, comm. "Épître aux Éphésiens," Bible de Jérusalem, p. 1548, n.b.
47. Schmidt, The Church, p. 22.
48. J. Robinson, The Body, p. 53. Cf. Durrwell, The Resurrection, p. 176, who points out that because Paul always sees man as a unity, "even in his material being, the Christian is a member of Christ, and it is of Christ in His physical being that we are members in our bodies." And yet it is not a mere physical union of which Paul speaks but a far higher union in the order of "spirit," a more real union.
49. Cited ibid., p. 82.
50. Cerfaux, The Church in the Theology of St. Paul, pp. 345-346, 354, 185.
51. B. F. Westcott, cited in J. Robinson, The Body, p. 83.
52. J. McKenzie, "Messianism and College Doctrine," p. 49.
53. C. Spicq, comm. "Épître aux Hébreux," Bible de Jérusalem, p. 1490.
54. Lyonnet, "St. Paul and a Mystical Redemption," p. 86.
55. Cf. Alfred Wikenhauser, New Testament Introduction (New York: Herder and Herder, 1956), pp. 465-470, for an analysis of style and scholarly opinion on the authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews.
56. Taylor, Forgiveness and Reconciliation, p. 192.
57. John F. McCormell, The Epistle to the Hebrews ("New Testament Reading Guide;" Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 1960), p. 10.
58. Moulton, Gedden, Concordance, p. 466.
59. Spicq, Bible de Jérusalem, p. 1578, n.f.
60. McCormell, Epistle to the Hebrews, p. 30.
61. B. F. Westcott, The Epistle to the Hebrews (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans Co., 1955), p. 190.
62. Cf. Chary, Les prophètes, p. 50.
63. Durrwell, The Resurrection, pp. 66-72.

64. Westcott, Epistle to the Hebrews, p. 259.
65. Richardson, Theology of the New Testament, p. 222. Cf. P. Benoit, "L'Ascension," Revue Biblique, LVI (1949), 161-203; "The Ascension of Christ," Theology Digest VIII (1960), 105-110.
66. McConnell, Epistle to the Hebrews, p. 48. Cf. Durrwell, The Resurrection, p. 318: as the "Jews were sanctified by the blood of the victim after the sacrifice of the Covenant, so are Christians. Baptism is the expression of that sprinkling."
67. Ibid., p. 61.
68. Spicq, Bible de Jérusalem, p. 1586, n.c.
69. Claude Bourgin, "Le Christ-Prêtre et la purification des péchés selon l'Épître aux Hébreux," Lumière et Vie XXXVI (1958), p. 89.
70. Ibid.

NOTES FOR CONCLUSION

1. L. Johnston, "Sin and Repentance," Scripture XIII (1961), 1-12, in New Testament Abstracts VI (1961), p. 88.
2. A. Lefevre, "Péché et pénitence dans la Bible," La Maison-Dieu LV (1958), pp. 9-10.
3. Ibid., p. 15.
4. Ibid., p. 21
5. Thomas Worden, "The Remission of Sins," Theology Digest VIII (1960), p. 46.
6. Lefevre, "Péché et pénitence," pp. 21-22.
7. Taylor, Forgiveness and Reconciliation, p. 130.
8. Cf. Lucien Cerfaux, The Four Gospels (Westminster, Maryland: Newman Press, 1960), p. 89; cf. also Feuillet, "The Incarnation," p. 80, on the relation of "life" in John to the "kingdom" of the Synoptics.
9. Taylor, Forgiveness and Reconciliation, p. 128.
10. Ibid., p. 143.
11. Bernard Cooke, "Synoptic Presentation of the Eucharist as Covenant Sacrifice," Theological Studies XXI (1960), p. 11.
12. Neville Clark, An Approach to the Theology of the Sacraments (London: SCM Press, 1956), p. 76.
13. Bonsirven, Le règne de Dieu, p. 181.
14. Max Thurian, Confession (London: SCM Press, 1958), p. 51.
15. Clark, Theology of the Sacraments, p. 84.
16. G. W. H. Lampe, The Seal of the Spirit (New York: Longmans, Green, 1951), pp. 31-32.
17. Clark, Theology of the Sacraments, p. 12.
18. Andre Feuillet, "Le Baptême de Jesus d'après l'Évangile selon Saint Marc," Catholic Biblical Quarterly XXI (1959), on the relation of Baptism, the Servant, and "son" as applied by Osee to the people, pp. 481-482.

19. Bonsirven, Le règne de Dieu, p. 181

20. Hans Küng, The Council, Reform and Reunion (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1961), pp. 35-36.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Scripture

Vetus Testamentum Graece Juxta LXX Interpretes Constantinus Tischendorf.
2 vols. Lipsiae: Brockhaus, 1860.

Cambridge Greek Testament for Schools and Colleges. Cambridge:
University Press, 1933.

The Holy Bible. Trans. The Confraternity of Christian Doctrine.
Paterson, New Jersey: St. Anthony Guild Press, 1950.

La Sainte Bible. Trans Ecole Biblique de Jerusalem. Paris: Les
Editions du Cerf, 1956.

The Complete Bible. Trans. J. M. Powis Smith and Edgar J. Goodspeed.
Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960.

Books

Ahern, Barnabas M. The Epistles to the Galatians and to the Romans.
"New Testament Reading Guide." Collegeville, Minnesota:
Liturgical Press, 1960.

Anderson, Bernhard. Understanding the Old Testament. Englewood Cliffs,
New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1957.

Barrett, C. K. The Epistle to the Romans. New York: Harper and Bros.,
1957.

_____. The Gospel according to St. John. London: S.P.C.K., 1955.

Bonsirven, Joseph. Le règne de Dieu. Paris: Aubier, 1957.

Bouyer, Louis. The Meaning of Sacred Scripture. Notre Dame, Indiana:
University of Notre Dame Press, 1958.

Bright, John. A History of Israel. Philadelphia: Westminster Press,
1959.

Brown, Raymond. The Gospel of St. John. "New Testament Reading Guide."
Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 1960.

Cales, Jean. Les Livres des Psaumes. 2 vols. Paris: Beauchesne, 1936.

- Cerfaux, Lucien. Christ in the Theology of St. Paul. New York: Herder and Herder, 1959.
- _____. The Church in the Theology of St. Paul. New York: Herder and Herder, 1959.
- _____. The Four Gospels. Westminster, Maryland: Newman Press, 1960.
- Chary, Th. Les prophètes et le culte à partir de l'exil. Tournai: Desclée, 1955.
- Clark, Neville. An Approach to the Theology of the Sacraments. London: SCM Press, 1956.
- Cullmann, Oscar. The Christology of the New Testament. London: SCM Press, 1959.
- _____. Early Christian Worship. London: SCM Press, 1953.
- _____. The Early Church. London: SCM Press, 1956.
- Dodd, C. H. The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel. Cambridge: University Press, 1955.
- Drijvers, P. Les Psaumes. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1958.
- Durrwell, F. X. The Resurrection. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1960.
- Eichrodt, Walther. Theology of the Old Testament. Vol. I. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1960.
- Filson, Floyd. A Commentary on the Gospel of St. Matthew. New York: Harper and Bros., 1960.
- Flanagan, Neal M. The Book of Jeremia. 2 vols. New York: Paulist Press, 1961.
- Fraine, Jean de. Adam et son Lignage: Études sur la notion de "personnalité corporative" dans la Bible. Bruges: Desclée de Brouwer, 1959.
- Fridrichsen, Anton et al. The Root of the Vine. London: Dacre Press, 1953.
- Gelin, Albert. Key Concepts of the Old Testament. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1955.
- _____. The Religion of Israel. New York: Hawthorne Books, 1959.
- Guillet, Jacques. Themes of the Bible. Notre Dame, Indiana: Fides Publishers, 1960.
- Hatch, E. and H. A. Redpath. Concordance to the Septuagint. 2 vols. Graz, Austria: Akademische Druck-U. Verlagsanstalt, 1954.
- Huesman, John E. The Book of Isaia. Vol. II. New York: Paulist Press, 1961.

- Jacob, Edmund. Theology of the Old Testament. New York: Harper and Bros., 1958.
- Küng, Hans. The Council, Reform and Reunion. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1961.
- Lampe, G. W. H. The Seal of the Spirit. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1951.
- Laurentin, René. Structure et théologie de Luc I-II. Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1957.
- Leany, A. R. C. A Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Luke. New York: Harper and Bros., 1958.
- Leeming, Bernard. Principles of Sacramental Theology. Westminster, Maryland: Newman Press, 1960.
- Lightfoot, R. N. The Gospel Message of St. Mark. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1952.
- Lindblom, Joh. The Servant Songs in Deutero-Isaiah. Lund: Gleerup, 1951.
- Lods, Adolphe. The Prophets and the Rise of Judaism. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1955.
- Lubac, Henri de. Catholicism. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1950.
- _____. The Splendour of the Church. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1956.
- McConnell, John F. The Epistle to the Hebrews. "New Testament Reading Guide." Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 1960.
- McKenzie, John L. The Two-Edged Sword. Milwaukee: Bruce and Co., 1956.
- Manson, T. W. The Sayings of Jesus. London: SCM Press, 1954.
- _____. The Teaching of Jesus. Cambridge: University Press, 1931.
- Manson, William. Jesus the Messiah. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1956.
- Moule, Handley C. G. The Epistle to the Romans. London: Pickering and Inglis, n.d.
- Moulton, W. F. and A. S. Geddén. A Concordance to the New Testament. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1950.
- Néher, André. L'essence du prophétisme. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1955.
- North, Christopher R. Isaiah 40-55: An Introduction and Commentary. London: SCM Press, 1952.
- _____. The Suffering Servant of Deutero-Isaiah. London: Oxford University Press, 1956.

- Nygren, Anders. The Epistle to the Romans. London: SCM Press, 1955.
- Oesterley, W. O. E. The Psalms. London: S.P.C.K., 1959.
- Orchard, Bernard, et al. A Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1953.
- Pope Pius XII. Encyclical Humani Generis. National Catholic Welfare Conference, Washington D.C., 1950.
- Quell, Gottfried, et al. Sin. "Bible Key Words from Gerhard Kittel." London: Adam and Charles Black, 1951.
- Rawlinson, A. E. J. The New Testament Doctrine of the Christ. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1949.
- Richardson, Alan. An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament. London: SCM Press, 1958.
- Robert, A. and A. Tricot. A Guide to the Bible. Westminster, Maryland: Newman Press, 1951.
- Roberts, Harold. Jesus and the Kingdom of God. London: Epworth Press, 1954.
- Robinson, H. Wheeler. The Religious Ideas of the Old Testament. London: Duckworth, 1956.
- Robinson, John A. T. The Body: A Study in Pauline Theology. Naperville, Illinois: Alec Allenson, 1957.
- Robinson, Theodore H. Prophecy and the Prophets. London: Duckworth, 1953.
- Roguet, A.-M. Christ Acts through the Sacraments. Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 1960.
- Rondet, Henri. Notes sur la théologie du péché. Paris: P. Lethielleux, 1957.
- Rowley, H. H. The Biblical Doctrine of Election. London: Lutterworth Press, 1952.
- _____. The Faith of Israel. London: SCM Press, 1956.
- _____. The Servant of the Lord. London: Lutterworth Press, 1954.
- Ryder-Smith, C. The Bible Doctrine of Sin. London: Epworth Press, 1953.
- Sanders, J. N. et al. Studies in Ephesians. London: A. R. Mowbray, 1956.
- Schmidt, Karl L. The Church. "Bible Key Words from Gerhard Kittel." London: Adam and Charles Black, 1950.
- Siegan, Edward. The Book of Ezechiel. 2 vols. New York: Paulist Press, 1961.

- Simon, Ulrich. A Theology of Salvation. London: S.P.C.K., 1953.
- Skinner, John. Prophecy and Religion. Cambridge: University Press, 1955.
- Sloyan, Gerald S. The Gospel of St. Mark. "New Testament Reading Guide." Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 1960.
- Snaith, Norman. Hymns of the Temple. London: SCM Press, 1951.
- _____. Mercy and Sacrifice. London: SCM Press, 1953.
- Stanley, David. The Gospel of St. Matthew. "New Testament Reading Reading Guide." Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 1960.
- Stauffer, Ethelwert. New Testament Theology. London: SCM Press, 1955.
- Steinmann, Jean. Le prophète Ézéchiel et les debuts de l'exil. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1953.
- Stuhlmuehler, Carroll. The Gospel of St. Luke. "New Testament Reading Guide." Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 1960.
- Taylor, Vincent. The Epistle to the Romans. London: Epworth, 1955.
- _____. Forgiveness and Reconciliation. London: Macmillan, 1956.
- _____. The Names of Jesus. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1953.
- Thurian, Max. Confession. London: SCM Press, 1958.
- Vaux, Roland de. Ancient Israel. New York: McGraw, Hill, 1961.
- Vawter, Bruce. The Conscience of Israel. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1961.
- Vriezen, Th. C. An Outline of Old Testament Theology. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1958.
- Welch, Adam C. Jeremiah: His Time and Work. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955.
- Westcott, B. F. The Epistle to the Hebrews. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans Co., 1955.
- Wikenhauser, Alfred. New Testament Introduction. New York: Herder and Herder, 1956.
- Wright, G. Ernest. God Who Acts. Naperville, Illinois: Alec Allenson, 1956.
- _____. The Old Testament against its Environment. Naperville, Illinois: Alec Allenson, 1957.

Articles and Periodicals

- Barosse, Thomas. "Death and Sin in the Epistle to the Romans," Theology Digest IV (1956), 24-27.
- Benoit, Pierre. "The Ascension of Christ," Theology Digest VIII (1960), 105-110.
- Boismard, M. E. "Jésus, Sauveur, d'après Saint Jean," Lumière et Vie XV (1954), 401-410.
- Bourgin, Claude. "Le Christ-Prêtre et la purification des péchés selon l'Épître aux Hébreux," Lumière et Vie XXXVI (1958), 67-90.
- Bourke, Myles. "Literary Genus of Matthew 1-2," Catholic Biblical Quarterly XXII (1960), 160-175.
- Cooke, Bernard J. "Synoptic Presentation of the Eucharist as Covenant Sacrifice," Theological Studies XXI (1960), 1-44.
- _____. "Teaching Christ from Scripture," Perspectives V (1960), 11-16.
- Dejaifve, G. "L'Église catholique et repentance œcuménique," Nouvelle Revue Théologique LXXXIV (1962), 225-239.
- Feuillet, André. "Le Baptême de Jésus d'après l'Évangile selon Saint Marc," Catholic Biblical Quarterly XXI (1959), 468-490.
- _____. "The Incarnation: Mystery of Salvation," Theology Digest VIII (1960), 76-80.
- _____. "Isaïe," Dictionnaire de la Bible Supplément IV. Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1949.
- Fraine, Jean de. "Adam and Christ as Corporate Personalities," Theology Digest X (1962), 99-102.
- Gelin, A. "Jérémie," Dictionnaire de la Bible Supplément IV. Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1949.
- _____. "Messianisme," Dictionnaire de la Bible Supplément V. Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1957.
- Giblet, Jean. "Jésus, Serviteur de Dieu," Lumière et Vie XXXVI (1958), 5-34.
- Iglesias, Salvador Munoz. "Literary Genre of the Infancy Gospel in St. Matthew," Theology Digest IX (1961), 15-20.
- Johnston, L. "Sin and Repentance," Scripture XIII (1961), 1-12, in New Testament Abstracts VI (1961), 88.
- Lefevre, A. "Péché et pénitence dans la Bible," La Maison-Dieu IV (1958), 6-22.

- Lyonnet, Stanislas. "New Testament Concept of Salvation," Verbum Domini XXXVI (1958), 3-15, private translation.
- _____. "De Notione Redemptionis," Verbum Domini XXXVI (1958), 129-146, private translation.
- _____. "The Redemptive Value of the Resurrection," Theology Digest VIII (1960), 89-95.
- _____. "St. Paul and a Mystical Redemption," Theology Digest VIII (1960), 83-85.
- _____. "The Saving Justice of God," Theology Digest VIII (1960), 80-82.
- McKenzie, John L. "Messianism and the College Teacher of Sacred Doctrine," Proceedings of the Society of Catholic College Teachers of Sacred Doctrine VI (Chicago, 1960), 34-53.
- _____. "Royal Messianism," Catholic Biblical Quarterly XIX (1957), 25-52.
- MacKenzie, R. A. F. "The Concept of a Biblical Theology," Proceedings of the Catholic Theological Society of America XX (New York, 1950), 48-55.
- Maly, Eugene. "Messianism in Osee," Catholic Biblical Quarterly XIX (1957), 213-225.
- Médebielle, A. "Expiation," Dictionnaire de la Bible Supplément III. Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1938.
- Murphy, Roland. "Old Testament Messianism and Apologetics," Catholic Biblical Quarterly XIX (1957), 5-15.
- O'Doherty, E. "The Organic Development of Messianic Revelation," Catholic Biblical Quarterly XIX (1957), 16-24.
- O'Keefe, Vincent. "Towards Understanding the Gospels," Catholic Biblical Quarterly XXI (1959), 171-189.
- Saydon, P. "Sin Offering and Trespass Offering," Catholic Biblical Quarterly VIII (1946), 393-399.
- Stanley, David. "The Conception of the Gospels as Salvation-History," Theological Studies XX (1959), 561-589.
- _____. "The Conception of Salvation in Primitive Christian Preaching," Catholic Biblical Quarterly XVIII (1956), 231-254.
- _____. "The Concept of Salvation in the Synoptic Gospels," Catholic Biblical Quarterly XVIII (1956), 345-363.
- _____. "Kingdom to Church," Theological Studies XVI (1955), 1-29.
- Stuhlmuehler, Carroll. "The Gospel according to St. Luke," Worship XXXIII (1959), 633-641.

Stuhlmuehler, Carroll. "The Old Testament Liturgy and College Sacred Doctrine," Proceedings of the Society of Catholic College Teachers of Sacred Doctrine VI (Chicago, 1960), 80-82.

_____. "Teaching the Sacraments from Scripture," Perspectives V (1960), 17-24, 39.

Vawter, Bruce. "The Johannine Sacramentary," Theological Studies XVII (1956), 151-166.

_____. "Missing the Mark," The Way II (1962), 19-27.

Worden, Thomas. "The Meaning of Sin," Theology Digest VIII (1960), 42-44.

_____. "The Remission of Sins," Theology Digest VIII (1960), 45-50.