# SERVANT CHRISTOLOGY

# IN THE

# PETRINE AND JOHANNINE WRITINGS

by

Sister Marian Francis Cook, C.S.J., A.B.

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

Milwaukee, Wisconsin
January, 1966

TABLE OF CONTENTS

# INTRODUCTION

The dominant motif in the whole of the New Testament revelation is the death and resurrection of Christ, suffering as the necessary path to glory. Because this is the basic structure of Christ's life (Ac 24:26), it is also the structure of the life of Christians (Rom 6:3-11). The Church of our own day still defines herself in these terms. De Ecclesia, the Constitution on the Church from Vatican II, speaks of the pilgrim Church as the body of the Lord who died and rose: "...tracing in trial and in oppression the paths he trod, we are associated with his sufferings as the body is with the head, suffering with him, that with him we may be glorified," (Para. 7) She suffers through a life of service, proclaiming Him who came to serve (Para. 5). This service and suffering are rendered by the Church as a whole (Para. 8), as well as by each individual in the Church (Para. 7, 21, 24, 27, 29, 32, 41, 44).

The service and suffering of her head were early explained by the Church in terms of the suffering servant foretold by Deutero-Isaiah. At four places in Acts (3:13, 26; 4:27, 30) and one in Matthew (12:18), Christ is given the explicit title "servant." Though the title as such never gained popularity, still the theme it represented was definitely influential in molding the Christological view of the Scriptural writings. Particularly is this true of the Petrine and the Johannine traditions. It is with these two traditions that this study deals.

Peter and John are believed to have possessed quite similar backgrounds. Both were Jewish, and therefore shared the same rich OT

background. Both are believed to have been disciples of John the Baptist, whose influence would have somewhat molded their messianic expectations. Both received from Christ the same initial, normative understanding of the whole Christian mystery--of Himself, His mission among men, their relation to Him. Both also shared the primitive Christological thought of the Church. Consequently, both Peter and John were heirs of the same understanding of the mission of the suffering servant, such as this originated in the OT, was altered in late Judaism, and was given Christological application by Christ and by the early Church. Despite this common background, however, their use of the suffering servant theme is not identical.

This study proposes to examine the use each makes of servant Christology, to analyze the divergence which will be apparent, and finally to propose, by way of hypothesis, the central factor which is responsible for this divergence. Such a study should yield, not mere juxtaposition of texts, but valuable insight into the meaning and function of Christians in the Church, since it probes the nature and ministry of Christ who is head of that Church.

## CHAPTER I

## ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE SERVANT CONCEPT

When presenting Christ's miracles of healing with their accompanying request for silence, Matthew quotes an Old Testament text which speaks of a servant: "Here is my servant whom I have selected, my beloved, who delights my heart..." (Mt 12:18 ff.; Is 42:1 ff.) This usage of the Isaian text indicates that there was some consciousness on the part of the Church that Christ was fulfilling the mission of the suffering servant. In order to understand the application of the term "servant" to Christ, it will first be necessary to determine the source of the servant theme in the Old Testament. The Jewish understanding of "servant" in general will first be noted, followed by an analysis of the unique servant figure presented by Deutero-Isaiah.[1]

### Old Testament

Servants were known to Israel in her profane existence. II K 8:13 shows a man humbly designating himself as "your servant" in the presence of another. The same term "servant," from the Hebrew ebed,[2] is used to

---

[1] For an exhaustive, scholarly analysis of the servant concept in both Old and New Testaments, see the work of W. Zimmerli and J. Jeremias, The Servant of God, trans. H. Knight from the article "Pais Theou" in Kittel's Theologisches Worterbuch zum NT ("Studies in Biblical Theology," No. 20; Naperville, Illinois: A.R. Allenson, 1957).

[2] The Greek translates ebed as pais or doulos. For the distinction between these two terms, see Zimmerli, Servant, pp. 35-42. The Vulgate translates with filius or puer.

describe a slave in the service of the king (I Sam 21:7), a man in political submission to another (Josh 9:11), or a man serving God within the precincts of the sanctuary (Josh 9:23). In each of these instances the term is used to depict a relationship between persons, with one person belonging to another.

Eventually a transformation of that concept took place, as it became associated with Israel's exodus. Through the whole series of historical events related in the Pentateuch, particularly in the book of Exodus, Israel became a nation--and a nation whose peculiar status was that of a servant-nation in relation to Yahweh. Through the instrumentality of Moses, a small group was called forth from a land of slavery, was prepared and purified by a period of suffering and trial in the desert, was actually created a nation, was given a law by which to live as a nation, and then united in intimacy with the God of the exodus by a covenant.

Two things must be noted here. The first is the wholly gratuitous character of the salvific act and of Israel's status resulting from that act. Neither the sufferings of the Semitic slaves nor the entreaties of the people in the desert prompted and perfected Israel's salvation; it was God's initiative alone. He chose Israel, not because of any worthiness on her part, but simply because of His love: "It was not because you are the largest of all nations that the Lord set His heart on you and chose you, for you are really the smallest of all nations. It was because the Lord loved you..." (Dt 7:7-8) Israel became a great nation through the act of God.

Secondly, the condition under which Israel could become that great nation is significant. At the initial formation of the covenant, Israel learned that loving fidelity to Yahweh's law was required of His

people. (Ex 19:4-8) Indeed, it was for this that Israel was called from Egypt. Moses repeated to Pharaoh the command of Yahweh: "Israel is my son, my first-born. Hence I tell you: Let my son go, that he may serve me." (Ex 4:23) Only by continual commitment to this service would Israel become and remain the great nation.

Hence the notion of service is bound up with the very heart of Israel's relation to Yahweh--the exodus-covenant. The profane understanding of a servant as one person who belongs to another is now permeated with new significance as it is applied to Israel. This Israel, her very being and identity constituted in Yahweh's call, is His servant, ideally responding in total and exclusive obedience, relying on His fidelity with unshakable confidence. She is committed in covenant to His service.

As her understanding of this great formative event grew, and as she pondered and experienced her own position as servant nation, Israel came to designate certain figures in her history as "servant." Thus when she formulated her Scriptures, she spoke of the great patriarchs as "your servants, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob" (Dt 9:27). The same title was given to Moses (Ex 14:31), Joshua (Josh 24:29), David (II K 3:18), and various prophets (IV K 9:7). It might seem that the concept of servant began to shift from a corporate notion to an individual one; however, the individual was servant only because he was a member of Israel, the servant nation. His significance as an individual was derived from his place in the history of the nation as a whole. Moreover, most of the persons whom Israel designates as servant functioned actively in the nation's historical formation and development, particularly in the establishment or renewal of the covenant. Hence, "servant" was not a

derogatory term but rather a distinctive title marking the individual as a special possession of Yahweh, somehow instrumental in His dealings with His people. He was serving Israel in order that Israel might serve Yahweh.

Even though the term "servant" was thus applied to individuals, it still pertained in a peculiar way to the nation as such. It was her obligation to continue serving her God, to remain faithful to her covenant with Him. The prophets continually recalled Israel to this faithful service, interpreting historical calamities to her as divine punishments for her infidelity and insubordination.

The most significant of these historical calamities was the captivity of 587. The southern kingdom was defeated by the Babylonians, the temple of Jerusalem destroyed, the people carried into captivity. According to prophetic insight, this was not a haphazard event but divine intervention in human affairs, the exercise of God's justice on Israel. She had broken God's law, had abandoned her commitment to His service, and therefore the covenant was in jeopardy, perhaps even destroyed. With the cessation of this link with her God, the complete break-down of the nation was an impending threat. Indeed, this seemed to be the case. The land so long promised by God was no longer hers; since it was the gift of the covenant God, it was withdrawn when Israel failed to keep her part of the covenant. The temple was likewise destroyed, causing Israel to fear that the covenant God was no longer dwelling with her.

In the midst of this bleak situation, the prophets sounded a note of hope and encouragement. Israel could profit from this experience, could regain her former status as beloved servant of Yahweh, by turning aside from her infidelity, back to loving obedience to the God who still

loved her and called her. She had simply to repent and recommit herself to God's service, and the covenant would be re-established.

Ezechiel presented this message through the image of a graveyard, the dry bones of which would ultimately rise in new life: the new Israel would rise from the death of Babylon (Ez 37). Jeremias spoke of a new covenant which was to be made with repentant Israel, a covenant modeled on the former Sinaitic covenant but far surpassing it in its spiritual depth and significance (Jer 31:31-34).

But the most outstanding of these prophets of hope was Second Isaiah (Is 40-55) who prophesied toward the end of the Babylonian exile (c. 537). He too sought to console and encourage the chastened remnant of Israel: if she but turned aside from her evil ways and turned again toward her God, her covenant would be re-established and intensified. Her situation at this period in history very much resembled the earlier days when she dwelt in bondage in Egypt. What was necessary for her now was a reconstruction of the same fidelity and self-commitment that she had manifested at the time of the great exodus. Hence, Deutero-Isaiah chose to describe the coming deliverance as a second exodus.

> Comfort, give comfort to my people, says your God.
> Speak tenderly to Jerusalem, and proclaim to her that
> her service is at an end, her guilt is expiated; ...
> A voice cries out: In the desert prepare the way of
> the Lord! Make straight in the wasteland a highway
> for our God! ...Then shall the glory of the Lord be
> revealed, and all mankind shall see it together. (Is 40:1-5)

Israel was again to experience an exodus; she was being called from a land of bondage, and led through the desert into covenant union with her God in her own land. She must even forget the former exodus, with its gifts of food, drink, and passage through the waters, so far surpassing was this new exodus to be (Is 43:18-21). Likewise the great covenant

which was to climax this exodus was to be established in infinite, unending love and tenderness (55:5-10). "This is the lot of the servants of the Lord, their vindication from me, says the Lord." (55:17)

It is at this time that the Old Testament understanding of the servant reached its peak. In the midst of his prophetic promise of the approaching deliverance, Deutero-Isaiah began to project the picture of a servant par excellence who would be uniquely instrumental in effecting this deliverance. He presents his vision of the servant in four poems, generally referred to as the "servant songs."[1] They were initially so designated by B. Duhm late in the nineteenth century; the passages he singled out were 42:1-4; 49:1-6; 50:4-9; and 52:13-53:12.[2]

Before proceeding to an analysis of the nature and mission of the servant as presented in these songs, it would be well to touch briefly on the problem of the identification of the servant. Some passages demand

---

[1] For an analysis and summary of theories regarding the problem of the authorship of the songs, see C.R. North, The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah (London: Oxford University Press, 1956), pp. 156-188. His own conclusion is that they were written by Deutero-Isaiah, possibly somewhat later than the remainder of this prophecy, but certainly within the same background of the closing days of the exile.

H. Cazelles believes that the songs, though actually independent units, were inserted into II Isaiah by the author in order that the mission of the Servant might be related to the mission of deliverance ascribed to the Emmanuel in I Isaiah. "Les Poèmes de Serviteur," Récherches de Science Réligieuse, XLIII (1955), 49.

Even though the songs were perhaps authored independently of the remainder of II Isaiah, still such a thematic and literary relationship exists between these two that this study will treat Deutero-Isaiah as a unit, drawing servant theology principally from the songs, but using the servant references in the remainder of the work to clarify, amplify, and corroborate as necessary.

[2] B. Duhm, Das Buch Jesaia übersetzt und erklärt (Gottingen, 1892); referred to by North, Suffering Servant, p. 127. H. Ringgren, The Messiah in the Old Testament ("Studies in Biblical Theology," No. 18); Chicago: A.R. Allenson, 1956), would lengthen the first song to include vs. 7, the second vs. 9, and the third vs. 11. R. Murphy would agree with Ringgren in extending the limits of the first two songs only: "Second Isaias: The Servant of the Lord," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, IX (1947), 262-274. For a more detailed study of this problem, see North, Suffering Servant, pp. 128-138.

a corporate interpretation. Is 42:19-25 describes the servant as deaf and blind, and then speaks of a people preyed upon and despoiled, Jacob given to despoilers and Israel to plunderers. Likewise, 44:1 addresses the whole nation as servant: "Jacob, my servant, Israel, whom I have chosen," using the same parallel structure as in 42:1, one of the songs proper: "Here is my servant whom I uphold, my chosen one with whom I am pleased..." However, even though these passages explicitly identify the nation as the servant, other passages apparently demand an individual interpretation. For example, 49:1-6 describes a servant who has a mission to Israel herself in addition to the mission to the heathen. The description of the sufferings of the "man of sorrows" (52:13-53:12) would likewise be more correctly referred to an individual. Is a solution possible here?

Many identifications have been proposed: the nation Israel, a remnant, a Messianic figure, a reigning or future king, Cyrus,[1] the prophet himself. Each of these theories, however, leaves problems unanswered. On the other hand, some scholars hesitate to demand an either/or solution --either an individual or a group, either this individual or that. One must bear in mind the ease with which the Hebrew mentality could pass from the conception of an individual to a group or a corporate personality. This characteristic is evident in the Biblical understanding of the first-born as summarizing the whole of the race within himself, or of the king or the high priest as actually being Israel when functioning in his official

---

[1]Cyrus the Persian, the historical figure through whom Babylon is overcome and the Israelites freed, is presented by Isaiah as the "anointed of Yahweh," called and named by Him, and guided by Him in the restoration of Israel (45:1-13). It is possible that Isaiah's understanding of Cyrus and his work constituted the point of departure for his formation and presentation of the servant concept.

capacity. Therefore, it would not have been difficult for Isaiah to have presented a concept which described at the same time both an individual and the nation. Anderson[1] speaks of a conception which "oscillates" between the nation Israel and an individual servant who would fulfill Israel's mission, while Cullmann[2] notes how this concept reflects the representational development of salvation history--from the whole people, through the remnant, to the one. Hence, a fluid conception of the servant is quite possible: Israel is a servant nation, Yahweh's prized possession, through whose sufferings His will is accomplished and His glory manifested to all nations; at the same time, this servant-nation is epitomized and the servant concept heightened in one who will most definitively and most fully accomplish His will and manifest His glory, not only to the whole of Israel but to all nations.[3]

The songs contain a rich theology of the servant. The first song

---

[1]Bernhard W. Anderson, Understanding the Old Testament (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1957), p. 421.

[2]O. Cullmann, The Christology of the New Testament, trans. Shirley Guthrie and Charles Hull (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1959), p. 55.

[3]For a more detailed study see North, Suffering Servant, pp. 192-219. He shows how the conception of the servant within the songs proper differs from that in the other passages: within the songs the servant is anonymous, is more highly individualized, has an active mission, and is characterized in a somewhat different fashion from the servant outside the songs. Moreover, North believes that the songs portray a progressive drama, reaching a climax with the highly individualized portrait of the suffering servant in the last song, a progression which he finds incompatible with the collectivist theory as well as with the corporate-personality theory.

However, that such a progression was actually intended by Deutero-Isaiah cannot be proved. Nor is it unanimously agreed that these four songs were conceived by Deutero-Isaiah as a separate unit. It would seem much more in keeping with the Hebraic mentality to hold that the author could move with ease, and perhaps without clearly defined precision, from the conception of a nation to an individual.

(42:1-4) introduces that servant as one who is chosen by the Lord, continually sustained and cared for by Him, and who is greatly pleasing to Him. Part of Yahweh's care is the gift of His spirit, to enable the servant to vindicate and establish Yahweh's justice. Such a mission is apparently to be a universal one: justice is to be rendered to "the nations" (vs. 1), to the "earth"; the coastlands await it (vs. 4). Attention is paid to the manner in which this mission is to be accomplished: the servant will work in a completely inoffensive and unobtrusive way. Indeed, his work is to be almost hidden: "not crying out, not shouting, not making his voice heard in the streets" (vs. 2). The reference is perhaps to a lack of political grandeur in the servant's work.

Verses 5-7, which some scholars regard as part of this poem, simply expand the preceding. The God who called the servant is more clearly identified as the creator, the giver of life and all gifts. It is He who tenderly grasps the hand of the servant, sustaining, molding, forming him. The servant's work, the establishment of justice, makes of him the "covenant of the people" (vs. 6), the bond by which Israel and the nations will reach unity with their God. His work of establishing the covenant is seen as a liberation. He is a light for the nations, freeing the blind from darkness, releasing the prisoners from the darkness of their confinement (vs. 7). He is to assure the reign of God's justice through freeing the people from evil. Hence, "justice" would necessitate a liberation from evil and a right relationship with God--ideally, the covenant. His work, then, frees from evil and establishes justice, that is, establishes a covenant between the peoples and God.

In the second song (49:1-6), the servant addresses himself to the coastlands. He speaks of Yahweh calling him even from his birth, and of

a name-bestowing which took place from his conception. Another aspect of his work is clarified as he speaks of God's forming activity in his behalf: he was made a "sharp-edged sword," a "polished arrow" (vs. 2). His task is like that of a prophet, whose word is a sword accomplishing the divine intent. According to true prophetic tradition, he would interpret the divine dimension of history to Israel and to the nations, thereby drawing his hearers into proper relation with the God of that history.

Verses 2-3 speak of the servant being prepared by God, but hidden until the time of the actual exercise of his ministry: he was the sword concealed, the arrow hidden in the quiver. However, in the following verses he speaks as if his mission were already accomplished. He has labored, has spent his strength, and although he had feared that his effort was in vain, he has now received his reward. "I am made glorious in the sight of the Lord, and my God is now my strength." (vs. 5) Verse 6 again notes the universal nature of his mission.

If this second song does actually extend through verse 9, then a new detail is added to the picture of the servant. Verse 7 explicitly mentions the reaction of others to the servant as being one of abhorrence and rejection, a reaction which ultimately changes to awe "because of the Lord who is faithful, the Holy One of Israel who has chosen you." This note paves the way for the whole picture of suffering which will be emphasized in the two following songs.

The third song (50:4-9) opens with a reference to the prophetic teaching function of the servant. Not only was the tongue for teaching given him by God, that is, the authorization and ability to teach the justice of God, but even the word that he proclaims is directly and continuously derived from God: "Morning after morning he opens my ear that I may hear..." (vs 4b).

Such a task necessarily involves suffering, but the servant has turned aside neither from the word God communicated to him nor from the insults and rebuffs inflicted on him by his hearers (vs. 6). The servant is able to remain firm and constant in his mission only because of his great faith in the undying fidelity and strength of God (vss. 7,9).

Up to this point, the image of the servant very closely resembles that of the typical prophet of the Old Testament: one who has been called by God, formed by Him, received His spirit, been entrusted with His word, and has suffered as an inevitable consequence of proclaiming that word. With the fourth and last song, however, a characteristic is added which sharply distinguishes the servant from a prophet.

This last song (52:13-53:12) is the most highly personal and most graphically descriptive of the four. The idea of suffering is predominant. However, it is not a suffering which is a consequence flowing from the teaching function of the servant; rather it is this suffering which <u>is</u> the function of the servant. He actually has a vocation to suffer. It was for this that he was called and formed; it is through this that the justice of God is to be established, and it is through this that he himself is to be glorified.

The song as a whole is well-constructed. It opens with a statement of the glory and renown of the servant, proceeds to describe the path of suffering through which the servant must necessarily travel, and then closes with another description of the glorious reward of the servant,--a perfect interrelating of the themes of suffering and glory.

In the opening section (52:13-15), the prosperity and dignity of the servant is indicated, a prosperity which brings amazement to those who view him (cf. 50:7). Those who were previously awed by the look of his suffering later stand equally awed at the sight of his glory.

In 53:1-9 the suffering is more explicitly described, apparently by a third party.[1] Because affliction and suffering were commonly regarded by Israel as divine punishment for sin, it was customary for the Israelite to spurn and condemn the sufferer. (cf. Job 19:13-22: 22:4-11) However the speakers became aware that the sufferings of the servant were not being visited on him as a result of personal sin: "Yet it was our infirmities that he bore,...upon him was the chastisement that makes us whole, by his stripes we were healed." (vss. 4-5) Two things are involved here: first, the suffering of the innocent, in whom there was no personal guilt, and second, vicarious suffering, wherein the suffering of the one results in the vindication of another. This is the absolutely unique nature of the servant's mission. There is no parallel for this elsewhere in the Old Testament.

Moreover, the servant chose the suffering freely, he "surrendered himself" (53:12), and once having accepted the suffering, bore it silently and patiently: "he submitted and opened not his mouth" (vs. 7). Finally, the total nature of this suffering is noted: the guilt of the many would be expiated only when the servant's suffering had extended unto death. He was as a sheep led to slaughter (vs. 7), was cut off from the land of the living (vs. 8), and assigned a grave among the wicked (vs. 9).

The closing section of the song (53:10-12) indicates that, just as the suffering was part of the servant's mission, so too was the final limit of that suffering, the death. In fact, the divine plan could be

---

[1] Anderson, Understanding, p. 424, believes this third party to be the kings of "the nations," but concludes from this that the sufferings of the servant are for the nations only and not for Israel, since Is 40:2 had stated that Israel had already paid doubly for her guilt. However, 53:8b says that the servant was smitten for the sin "of his people."

accomplished and the servant glorified only through that suffering and death.

> If he gives his life as an offering for sin, he shall see his descendants in a long life, and the will of the Lord shall be accomplished through him. Because of his affliction he shall see the light in fulness of days; through his suffering, my servant shall justify many...(vss. 10-11)

The literary construction adopted here indicates that the sufferings are absolutely essential. There is a very real relation between the suffering and the results of that suffering, namely, the glorification of the servant himself and the vindication and redemption of the many.

Such, then, is the suffering servant of Deutero-Isaiah, a unique figure in Israel's religious consciousness. He was beloved of God, called and formed and sustained by Him. His mission consisted essentially in suffering, total and vicarious. A three-fold result would flow from this suffering. The servant would be rewarded for his utter submission, his unswerving faith in God's fidelity, and his suffering, by his establishment in glory. God Himself would be honored, since the servant's work would cause His justice and goodness to be acknowledged by Israel and the nations. And lastly, Israel and the many would be justified through the remission of their sin, and would again be able to relate to their God through the re-established covenant.

## Late Judaism

During the centuries between the Babylonian captivity and New Testament times, the suffering servant concept underwent some modification.[1] Each train of Judaic thought--Hellenistic and Palestinian--

---

[1]The discussion of this period draws rather heavily from Zimmerli, Servant, pp. 36-78.

handled the Isaian concept somewhat differently. In Hellenistic Judaism, the term pais was used, a term which can be translated either "servant" or "child," thus incorporating the Greek awareness of the nearness of God, and avoiding the derogatory implications of "servant." When dealing with the servant songs specifically, the Hellenistic Jews preferred a collective interpretation. The Septuagint understood Is 42:19: "Who is blind but my servant..." in the plural and translated it thus. The same is true of 42:1, where the Septuagint inserted the name "Jacob." Hence, the Hellenists conceived of the servant as the nation Israel, a nation who dwelt with God as with a Father.

In Palestinian Judaism, on the other hand, the key servant texts were applied to a single messianic figure. In the few cases where the texts obviously demanded a corporate interpretation, the term "servant" was applied to the nation.[1]

Brief mention must be made of the Qumran sect, a unique branch of Palestinian Judaism. In its writings, the function of the servant is ascribed to the sect itself, occasionally to a nucleus within the sect, or possibly to an individual.[2] Another theory holds that the sect identified the servant with the Teacher of Righteousness, but certain scholars point out that the sufferings of the Teacher are more akin to prophetic sufferings.[3] In short, it would seem that the Qumran sect favored a corporate understanding of the servant; it is not at all clear that this servant was seen as messianic.[4]

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 60-78.

[2] John A.T. Robinson, "The Baptism of John and the Qumran Community," The Harvard Theological Review, L (1957), 175-191.

[3] Cullmann, Christology, p. 57.

[4] See also R. Brown, "The Messianism of Qumran," The Catholic Biblical Quarterly, IXX (1957), 53-82.

Nevertheless, the concept of the servant did not play a dominant role in the formation of religious thought--and specifically of messianic expectation--in late Judaism.[1] Certainly the concept as such was present in the Scriptures, and certainly too the devout and pious were familiar with it, but for the most part it was ignored satisfactorily, or was so modified that it fit into the more habitual--and pleasant--categories of thought. It is not surprising that a minority nation, often threatened by religious and political extinction, would find a concept such as this not at all to its liking. It certainly would have preferred to anticipate the coming of a powerful figure who would restore the nation's autonomy and assure its prosperity.

Hence, by the beginning of New Testament times, the suffering servant concept existed only on the fringes of the religious thought, and often then in a watered-down form. Nonetheless, it had been presented, and was available for use by the New Testament writers.

## New Testament

The suffering servant concept possesses an absolute centrality in New Testament theology. Even though the actual use of the term "servant" is infrequent, the thought pattern which is so basic to the servant theology--suffering as a necessary path to glory--underlies the whole of

---

[1] According to Giblet, the concept of a suffering messiah is notably lacking in Rabbinic literature. "Jésus, Serviteur de Dieu," Lumiere et Vie, VII (1958), 13. Cullmann, Christology, pp. 58-60, shows how the Targum of Is 53 destroys the true meaning of the Isaian text in order to "apply the title ebed Yahweh to the Jewish Messiah in such a way that the Servant of God is relieved of his most essential characteristic, his vicarious suffering."

New Testament theology.[1] This is unquestionably the pattern of the Christ-mystery; His suffering was an integral part of His messianic function, not simply an embarrassing and irreconcilable circumstance.[2] The suffering servant concept has even been designated as "the heart of New Testament Christology."[3] It is likewise unquestionable that the servant concept is applied with equal force and dominance to the life of a Christian on the basis of his union with Christ. The pattern of Christ's life becomes the pattern of his own, simply because the Christian begins to live Christ's life, to live in Christ.[4]

---

[1]Mudge writes that, in spite of the technical difficulties involved, "it is impossible to escape a very powerful impression that the servant motif is central to the New Testament message." "The Servant Lord and His Servant People," Scottish Journal of Theology, XII (1959), 115.

There is also an interesting study by R. Funk in which the author attempts to show that the basic pattern of the kerygma is that of suffering/glory, variously expressed as death/life, crucifixion/resurrection, humiliation/exaltation. "Humiliation-Exaltation: The Structure of the New Testament Proclamation," The Drew Gateway, XXX (1960), 143-150.

[2]Mudge, Scottish Journal of Theology, XII, pp. 117-120, asserts that a denial of the central place of this Christology betrays a misunderstanding of the servant theme.

[3]Cullmann, Christology, p. 51.

[4]The application of the servant concept to the Christian is an area of study which would prove rich and profitable. Several studies are currently available, such as the second part of D. Stanley's "The Theme of the Servant of Yahweh in Primitive Christian Soteriology and Its Transposition by St. Paul," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XVI (October, 1954), 385-425; W. Ryan, "The Church as the Servant of God in Acts," Scripture, XV (1963), 110-115; R. Deering, "The Humiliation-Exaltation Motif in I Peter," (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky, 1961).

Such a study cannot be included within the scope of this paper. For the sake of clarity and depth, it has been necessary to limit this study to the application of the servant theme to Christ alone.

Before beginning to study the servant Christology in the Petrine and Johannine traditions, it will be necessary to trace the source from which this Christology rose, that is, why and by whom the servant theology from the Old Testament was carried over into the New Testament. Then an attempt will be made to determine the amount of influence this servant concept exercised on the Petrine and Johannine authors in their understanding and presentation of the person and work of Christ.

It was noted above that the servant concept never played a dominant role in the messianic expectations of Judaism. Even though the Palestinian tradition in late Judaism did interpret several of the servant passages in a messianic fashion, still the title "servant of God" did not achieve any kind of prominence as a title of the messiah.[1] Yet very early in primitive Christianity the messiah was identified as the Servant of God. This identification was not nearly so common in the gentile Church as it was in the Palestinian. The gentiles lacked the Old Testament background which gave rich meaning to the servant concept, and saw in it only the apparent implications of lowliness and degradation. Hence, they preferred such messianic titles as Kyrios, Christos, Son of God. The title is found, though, in a very early stratum of tradition in the Acts of the Apostles, a stratum which can be traced to the Palestinian Church.[2]

---

[1] See above, pp. 16-17. Also, T.W. Manson's description of the nature of Israel's messianic hope, The Servant-Messiah (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1956), 1-35.

[2] "Thus we must seek the home and origin of the title in the first Palestinian community." Zimmerli, Servant, pp. 84-85. This fact is quite significant in observing the popularity and endurance of the title, and in analyzing the use of the title by Peter and John. Stanley, Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XVI, p. 410, holds that the use of this title developed in the Palestinian church, represented by Peter, and in Asia Minor, represented by John.

It is necessary, moreover, to determine the source even within the Palestinian Church. If Judaism as such did not anticipate a suffering messiah, then someone must have been responsible for making the initial identification. Several theories have been presented, one of them tracing the source to the person of Christ Himself, another to the early Church, another to Peter as a specific figure within the early Church.

The theory that Christ was the first to identify Himself as the suffering servant of Isaiah leans very heavily on the statement in Mk 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." Christ's conception of His own mission in terms of the servant was probably influenced by the servant songs of Isaiah.[1] The evangelists, in their turn, identify Christ as the servant at all the key events of His life--baptism, transfiguration, passion predictions, Last Supper, an identification which they learned from Christ Himself.[2] This theory believes that if the early Church had been initially responsible for identifying Christ as the servant, she would have been more concerned to make the servant allusions or quotations more explicit and emphatic;[3] hence, Christ is the source of the identification.

A second theory maintains that the early Church was the first to relate Isaiah 53 to Christ. The servant passages in Mark (9:12b, 10:45, 14:24) are seen as unauthentic; valid references are to be found only in

---

[1]H. Rowley, The Unity of the Bible (London: The Carey Kingsgate Press Limited, 1953), pp. 104-105.

[2]Stanley, Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XVI, p. 410.

[3]T. Preiss, "Le fils de l'homme: probleme du Serviteur de L'Eternel," Etudes théologiques et réligieuses, XXVI (1951), 51-53.

the later Scriptural writings. Accordingly, it was the post-resurrection Church which first presented the servant Christology, drawing the concept from its Old Testament background.[1]

Still another theory holds that it was Peter who was primarily responsible for the servant Christology.[2] This view, however, is not incompatible with the above-mentioned belief that Christ was the originator; it would simply mean that Peter was chiefly instrumental in the spread and development of a teaching which originated with Christ.[3]

A solution to this difficulty can be found in a synthesis. Certainly no one could doubt Christ's familiarity with the Scriptures, or His own perception of and dedication to His messianic mission. It is possible that He would have found the Isaian servant a ready-to-hand prophecy of what He Himself had come to do. This is not to say that He needed those Scriptures in order to acquaint Himself with the nature of His work, but to deny them an integral place in His consciousness and hence in His teaching would be to ignore fact.

Furthermore, to ask whether the explanation of Christ as the suffering servant came from Christ personally or from the early Church establishes a false dilemma.[4] The Scriptures convey neither a completely objective presentation of the teachings and life of Christ, nor a record

---

[1] C. Craig, "The Identification of Jesus with the Suffering Servant," Journal of Religion, XXIV (1944), 240-245. In discussing Christ's own consciousness of His role, Craig states that He knew Himself to be Messiah, chose to be the supreme servant of men, and then learned what was involved from the situation, not from a Scriptural book.

[2] See Ryan, Scripture, p. 111.

[3] This latter seems to be the opinion of Cullmann, Christology, p. 74, and Stanley, Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XVI, p. 394.

[4] See B. Willaert, "Jesus as the 'Suffering Servant,'" Theology Digest, X (1962), 25-30.

of the Church's teachings as isolated from the message of Christ. The Scriptures relate the teachings of Christ as they were interpreted and lived by the community; they are her faith-understanding of the mystery of Christ. Hence, it seems quite possible that Christ spoke of His own life and mission in terms of the suffering servant of God, that the disciples began to understand this only after the resurrection, and that they then incorporated this understanding into their kerygma and ultimately into their Scriptures.[1]

---

[1]This explanation would account somewhat for the variations that exist in the Scriptural presentations of Christ. Some of the writers--Peter, for example--seem to have been more keenly aware of this aspect of the kerygma than other writers were. This interest determined their particular emphasis in presenting the Church's faith.

## CHAPTER II

## PETRINE SERVANT CHRISTOLOGY

The Petrine writings make striking use of servant theology in the presentation of the mystery of Christ. This study will examine that Petrine tradition in Peter's speeches recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, the Petrine epistles, and the gospel of Mark.

### The Acts of the Apostles

The Acts presents several incidents which involved Peter, and several speeches by him. Most scholars accept these passages as being authentic witness to the thinking and teaching of Peter.[1]

Almost immediately after the resurrection the Church sought to explain the mystery of Christ--particularly the "scandal of the cross"--by reference to the servant figure from Deutero-Isaiah.[2] The apostle Peter seems to have found this concept quite meaningful and expressive, and was instrumental in its growth and spread through his own teaching.

---

[1] See J. Dupont, The Sources of the Acts (New York: Herder and Herder, 1964), pp. 40-41.

[2] Cullmann asserts that "this is probably the oldest known solution to the Christological problem." Christology, p. 73. J. Ménard, on the other hand, argues that the identification of Christ as suffering servant was not present in the first Gospel period; he holds that the use of "servant" in Acts is an accidental thing and does not of itself connote sufferings: "Pais Theou as Messianic Title in the Book of Acts," The Catholic Biblical Quarterly, IXX (1957), 83-92.

The validity of several of Ménard's arguments is questionable. One wonders, for example, how an explicit and repeated use of "Servant" (Ac 3:13, 26; 4:27, 30) could be accidental, particularly in view of the Servant thought pattern which underlies the whole first section of this work. Furthermore, the author chose pais rather than doulos to express his thought, thereby remaining faithful to the Septuagint's term for "Servant" in the songs of Isaiah.

That teaching, along with episodes concerning him, was possibly formed into a narrative cycle,[1] used by the kerygmatic preachers of the early Church, and eventually incorporated into the Scriptural book of Acts. The only explicit designations of Christ as "Servant" in Acts are made by Peter himself or at least in his presence; although "Servant" as a Christological title was not common at the time of the actual composition of Acts, its use here was possibly retained in Peter's memory.[2] Hence, it is fairly certain that these speeches faithfully reflect early Petrine theology.

The first speech (Ac 2:14-41) represents the earliest stage of the Church's theological thought.[3] It is presented as Peter's explanation to the Jews who found the apostles' exercise of the Pentecostal gift of tongues so startling.

Since the Pentecost event was the principal concern, and since those whom Peter was addressing were Jews, his speech begins by drawing heavily on Old Testament prophecies dealing with the outpouring of the Spirit which was to occur in the messianic era. After a lengthy quotation from the prophet Joel (Ac 2:17-21), Peter proceeds to show the source of the gift of the Spirit. He speaks of the Jesus of Nazareth whom his hearers knew, of the miracles and signs by which God manifested His approval of Him, of the crucifixion and death with which they were familiar,

---

[1] Cerfaux and others who hold this theory have in mind the Acts of Peter and similar writings concerning Peter and other significant figures in the early Church; cf. Dupont, Sources, p. 58, n. 19.

[2] Cullmann, Christology, p. 74.

[3] See C.H. Dodd, The Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments (New York: Harper and Brothers, n.d.), pp. 21-24.

and finally of the resurrection to which the apostles could bear witness (2:22-28). It is this resurrected Christ, presented exalted at the right hand of God, who is responsible for the gift of the Spirit. Peter summarizes: "Therefore, let all the house of Israel know most assuredly that God has made both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom you crucified." (2:36) And following his exposition, Peter exhorts his hearers to repentance and to baptism"in the name of Jesus Christ for the forgiveness of your sins" (2:38).

"Suffering Servant" is certainly not the essential designation of Christ in this passage. The emphasis is on the risen and glorified Christ, and understandably so. The apostles were just beginning to grasp the shattering fact that the Jesus with whom they had dealt after His resurrection was truly a divine Person, Son of God in the fullest sense of the term, risen Lord, sender of the Spirit. The glorious and exalted Christ consumes the whole of their thought; it is not Christ as Servant but Christ as Lord whom Peter preaches.

Nevertheless the suffering and crucifixion of Christ had to find a place in this proclamation. Peter sought to show that this suffering was not accidental, that it was not man's doings as opposed to God's will: "Him, when delivered up by the settled purpose and foreknowledge of God, you have crucified and slain by the hands of wicked men" (vs. 23). Although this explanation vaguely parallels the servant prophecy, with the sufferings being a part of the divine plan, still the sufferings of Christ are not yet seen by Peter and the Church as a part of Christ's mission, as a vocation for Him. Rather, God permitted this suffering, the effect of which was reversed by the resurrection and exaltation. (Cf. vvs. 23-24, 36) The mystery of Christ is presented, then, in almost

pendulum fashion: He was a man approved by God--despite this divine approval men killed Him--despite the action of men God raised and glorified Him. All this, moreover, is in accord with the divine plan. To try to see in this Petrine explanation any hint of the vicarious nature of Christ's sufferings would be loading the text, coloring it by later insights of the Church. Peter does not indicate that the sufferings were the cause of the forgiveness of man's sins, nor even that the resurrection bore this redemptive power; his hearers must "repent and be baptized... for the forgiveness of your sins" (vs. 38).

This passage, then, contains only a very germinal form of servant Christology, the implications of which have not been drawn. It permits no conclusions to be drawn as yet.

A second speech by Peter (Ac 3:12-26) occurs in connection with the cure of a cripple at the Beautiful Gate of the temple. Peter attempts to teach the awed crowd that the miracle has been effected by the power of the risen Christ.

In this discourse, Servant theology is explicitly applied to Christ. Peter's whole exposition is framed by the Christological title "Servant," for the term pais occurs in verse 13: "The God of our fathers has glorified his servant Jesus, whom you indeed delivered up..." It occurs again in verse 26: "To you first God, raising up his servant, has sent him to bless you..." This term pais can be equally well translated "servant" or "son." But Peter was addressing the "men of Israel" (vs. 12) to whom the title "servant" was not as degrading as it was to the Greeks. Furthermore, the ideas of suffering and glory are related during the discourse, while verse 18 speaks of prophecies concerning the necessity of the sufferings of Christ. For these reasons, it would seem

that "servant" would be the preferred translation, or at the very least, that "servant" would not be excluded as a possible translation. There is actually no reason why Peter could not have intended to make reference to both senses of the term.

The meaning of Christ's sufferings is more explicitly taught in this passage than in the preceding discourse. It was through the death of Christ, instigated by the Jewish leaders, that God brought to fulfilment the ancient prophecies which spoke of the necessary sufferings of the Christ (vvs. 17-18). Peter was almost certainly referring to the suffering servant prophecies of Deutero-Isaiah.[1] A whole new level of meaning is given to these sufferings when they are viewed in the light of the Old Testament prophecies: they are not merely tolerated by God, not merely a negative event, the effect of which God must reverse through the resurrection. Rather, the sufferings as such form a positive part of the divine plan for man's redemption.

However, the thought does not proceed much beyond that point, since Peter does not explicitly present those sufferings as bearing redemptive power. Verses 16 and 26 indicate that the redemptive power of Christ is made available to men through His resurrection and glorification; no mention is made of the sufferings. Admittedly, verses 18-19 seem to attribute this redemptive power to the sufferings.

---

[1] Perhaps Ps 2 was included in Peter's thought (cf. Ac 4:25-28), a psalm which was commonly interpreted in a messianic fashion. See M. Chevallier, L'Esprit et le Messie dans le bas-Judaisme et le nouveau testament (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1958), p. 45. Although this psalm does speak of sufferings and ridicule undergone by the anointed of the Lord, still these sufferings could never be characterized there as necessary.

> But in this way God fulfilled what he had announced beforehand by the mouth of all the prophets, namely that his Christ should suffer. Repent therefore and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out...

However, the redemptive power of Christ's sufferings could never be argued from this text alone. At most, it forms a bridge to the more developed servant Christology of later years.

In verses 22-25 Peter speaks of Christ as the expected prophet like Moses, but the relationship between the prophet Christology and the servant Christology is not clear. Ménard holds that the prophet Christology was the earlier of the two, and that this Christology saw Christ's sufferings as similar to those of all prophets who suffered as a necessary consequence of their teaching.[1] It is doubtful, however, that this is all that Peter intended, since he had already referred to the prophecies concerning the necessity of those sufferings, presumably the Isaian prophecy of the suffering servant, for whom suffering was not accidental but essential.

Finally, Peter makes reference to the covenant, referring to his hearers in the contemporary Israel as "children...of the covenant that God made with your fathers..." (vs. 25). However, it would be rash to see here any recognition of the relationship between the servant work of Christ and His establishment of the new covenant.

This discourse, then, contains the first explicit designation of Christ by the title "Servant," and a slight clarification of the necessary character of the sufferings of that servant.

Shortly after the above discourse, Peter is called before the Sanhedrin to justify the same cure. In this short speech (Ac 4:8-12) we find a similar conception of Christ. Peter immediately relates the

---

[1] Ménard, Catholic Biblical Quarterly, IXX, pp. 83-92.

crucifixion and resurrection, the suffering and glory. (vs. 10). However a new image is now adopted to graphically depict this relationship: "This is 'The stone that was rejected by you, the builders, which has become the corner stone.'" (4:11) Ultimately this image is derived from two sources in the Old Testament. The first of these is Ps 117 which praises God for His unfailing care for Israel through all her hardships. She was the stone rejected by all the nations, but which God has so repeatedly preserved and glorified. The second source is probably Is 28:16, a passage which emphasizes not so much the rejection of the stone as its prominent position as cornerstone--precious, sure, strong. Peter utilizes both aspects of this image: this is the Jesus whom they had crucified, and who, after His resurrection, stands as the only means of salvation for men (vss. 10, 12). It is an apt description of Christ's position.

It might be noted, however, that this new image still does not present a causal relationship between the sufferings or rejection and the glory; the relationship seems rather to be antithetical, or perhaps simply temporal.

The following passage (Ac 4:23-31) is slightly different from the preceding ones in that this is in a liturgical form. It is a prayer of thanksgiving and petition offered by Peter, John, and the community after the two apostles were released from custody by the Jews.

The passage contains two explicit designations of Christ by the title "servant," each of them using the phrase "thy holy servant Jesus" (vvs. 27, 30). This usage adds interesting data to a study of the developing use of Servant Christology. The very fact that the term is used twice in the same structure or formula in a prayer situation indicates that it had become such a part of the common faith-life of the early

Church that it could be crystallized in a liturgical formula.[1]

During the course of the prayer, Peter and the assembly quote Ps 2:1, the messianic psalm which speaks of the opposition of the "kings of the earth" to the Lord's anointed, thereby showing, not only that Christ is the true messiah, (vs. 27)[2] but also that the sufferings and death of Christ were in accord with God's plan: "...what thy hand and thy counsel decreed to be done" (vs. 28). What is more, even though the psalm verse which is quoted speaks only of the opposition of the kings to the anointed, still his victory must also have been in the mind of those at prayer since this victory forms an essential part of the thought of the psalm. Reference to the first part of the psalm surely evoked the thought of the whole psalm.

Following their miraculous release from prison, Peter and the apostles are called upon to give a defense of their preaching before the Sanhedrin. (Ac 5:29-32) In the few words which Acts records, the death and resurrection of Christ are again linked, though not in any causative fashion. It seems rather that it is the exaltation of Christ, and not the sufferings, which constitutes Christ as "Prince and Savior" (vs. 31). At any rate, the sufferings are not given any functional part in the

---

[1] A similar primitive expression, "through Jesus thy Servant," is found in the Didache 9:2, 3; 10:2, 3; I Clement 59:2-4; Martyrdom of Polycarp 14:1-3; 20:2. All of these are ancient liturgical formulae, usually connected with the Eucharistic celebration of the early Church. See Zimmerli, Servant, pp. 83-84. Cullmann, Christology, p. 75, believes that "servant" as a Christological title was preserved in these Eucharistic prayers because of Christ's explanation of Himself and His work as suffering servant at the last supper.

[2] Chevallier, L'Esprit, p. 80, notes that here the two Christologies, that of the Messiah and of the Servant, are expressly linked, perhaps on the basis of Is 61:1.

constitution of Christ in this royal position.

In addition to mentioning the eminent position given Christ by His glorification, the passage also states quite succinctly the effects of Christ's mission for men: He was exalted to be Prince and Savior, and to "grant repentance to Israel and forgiveness of sins" (vs. 31). The parallelism between this and the prophecy of Is 53:5, 11-12 is too explicit and too striking to be ignored. Surely Peter expressly intends to demonstrate Christ and His mission as the true fulfilment of the suffering servant prophecy.

One final Petrine discourse (Ac 10:34-43) which yields servant Christology occurs in conjunction with the conversion of the centurion Cornelius. The primary insight of the whole of Chapter 10 is the universal nature of the Church, an insight which is likewise prominent in Peter's presentation of Christ's mission.

Peter's discourse is a typical example of the kerygma of the early Church.[1] It begins with Christ's baptism in the Jordan, wherein Christ was anointed with the Spirit and with power,[2] and then, strengthened by God, went about "doing good and healing all..." (vs. 38; cf. Ac 2:22). This Jesus was put to death by the Jews, but was raised to life by God (vs. 39-40) and was established by Him as judge (vs. 42). This office of judging, according to Peter, is not to be exercised exclusively for Israel but for all men who would have it: "To him all the prophets bear witness, that through his name all who believe in him may receive forgiveness of sins" (vs. 43 cf. vss. 34-35). Christ's work, like that of the servant of Isaiah, is to be exercised in favor of all mankind.

---

[1] Dodd, Apostolic Preaching, pp. 21-24.

[2] Chevallier, L'Esprit, p. 80, believes that the reference here is to Christ's messianic anointing at His baptism.

It will be well to summarize the servant Christology of Acts. It was the risen Lord who dominated the thought of the earliest days of the Church. The resurrection had made a staggering impact on the primitive community, almost totally absorbing it in contemplation of this mystery. Peter's kerygmatic proclamations recorded in Acts faithfully represent that Christological view. Each of the speeches attributed to him regard Christ as risen Lord, exalted in glory, established as judge, and made source of the Spirit.

Because of this emphasis, one would hardly be tempted to seek a Servant Christology here, were it not for a four-fold application of "servant" as a Christological title within this relatively brief section of the book of Acts.[1] Its repetition argues for a deliberate use of the title, seeming to indicate that at least some elements of a Servant Christology are being used by Peter.

When the thought of these speeches is compared with the servant prophecies from Isaiah, it becomes obvious that a Servant Christology here remains in a quite undeveloped form. The suffering of Christ is not at all emphasized, and virtually no mention is made of its redemptive power. The most that can be said is that the suffering was recognized as being in accord with God's plan, such as this plan was known through the Old Testament Scriptures. Moreover, the ultimate purpose of Christ's work is recognized as the redemption of men through forgiveness of sins, but the speeches do not identify this with the work of the Servant.

However, it is significant that two of the four uses of the title "servant" occur in a prayer situation. This apparently indicates that servant Christology had been incorporated into the liturgical life of the

---

[1]Further support is found in the primitive identification of Christ with the Isaian servant in Acts 8. See Zimmerli, Servant, p. 91.

early Church. Since the Church's worship expresses the content of its faith, it seems apparent that the servant Christology had begun to take a rather meaningful place in the faith-consciousness of the Church.[1]

Hence, the Petrine speeches in Acts do indicate the presence of a servant Christology, but as yet in a notably undeveloped form.

## I Peter

Scholars are far from agreement in identifying the author of this work. The epistle itself claims to have been written by one "Peter, an apostle of Jesus Christ..." (1:1), a tradition which the common faith of the Church has held firmly. Yet there are some difficulties. The meaning of 5:12 is not clear: "By Silvanus, the faithful brother as I account him, I have written to you..." The indefinite nature of Silvanus' position--as interpreter, scribe, editor, or disciple--reveals nothing about the extent of his influence on this work. Moreover, no date for the writing is indicated by the text itself.

In view of this uncertainty, all that is possible is an opinion based on a literary analysis of the work itself, and on a comparison of the historical situation depicted in the epistle with the data of secular history. But even after such a study, scholars have propounded widely differing viewpoints. The weight of tradition is surely on the side of the view which holds that Peter himself authored the letter, either writing it personally or through the instrumentality of a contemporary disciple

---

[1] For an opposing view, see M. Hooker, Jesus and the Servant (London: SPCK, 1959), who is quite reluctant to see the use of pais in Acts as any indication of an early Christian identification of Christ with the Servant. In the whole of her work, Miss Hooker seems to accept only explicit citations of the servant prophecies, ignoring implicit background references to the servant theme. One is forced to question the validity of this approach, believing that the over-all thought of a particular NT writing could well have been molded by the servant theme without containing an explicit citation of the passages from II Isaiah.

such as Silvanus. Since Peter's death is believed to have occurred during Nero's persecutions, the epistle must have been written shortly before 64 AD.[1]

The epistle is addressed to the churches of the Diaspora in Asia Minor (cf. 1:1). The presentation of doctrine is subservient to its more immediate aim, namely, practical exhortation to genuine Christian living in the contemporary situation. That situation was apparently one of opposition and persecution. Whether this persecution arose from pagan neighbors or the civil authorities is not clear.[2] There are unmistakable baptismal overtones in the epistle,[3] seeming to indicate that Peter wished

---

[1]Such is the opinion of R. Leconte in his introduction to the epistle in La Sainte Bible: Les Epitres Catholiques (Paris: Les éditions du Cerf, 1961), pp. 93-95. The same conclusion is reached by C. Bigg after a detailed textual, historical, and theological study: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude. The International Critical Commentary (2d ed. rev.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1956), p. 87.

A more radical opinion is held by F. Beare, The First Epistle of Peter (Oxford: B. Blackwell, 1947), p. 19. He concludes that the epistle was not written before the end of the first century, and in fact, that the religious atmosphere depicted is that of the mid-second century. The author, he believes, reconstructed the personality of Peter, but presents the more developed theological thought of the post-Apostolic age. A. Leaney likewise favors non-Petrine authorship, "I Peter and the Passover: An Interpretation," New Testament Studies, X (1964), 242.

Though a detailed study of this problem would be beyond the scope of this paper, some justification of our adherence to the more traditional view might be sought from the very fact that it is traditional. The Church was convinced enough of the apostolic nature of the epistle that she inserted it into her canon, and that conviction has gone unchallenged until fairly recent times. Such a conviction cannot be dismissed lightly.

[2]Jewish-Christian relations do not seem to be posing a problem for these Christians; in fact, Christian women are even praised as being daughters of Sara (3:6). On the other hand, several passages indicate that pagans, former associates, are harassing the Christian converts: 1:14, 18; 2:12; 4:1-4. Perhaps this difficulty was intensified by civil authorities.

[3]Numerous studies of the nature of this work--epistolatory vs. liturgical--have been made. See such standard commentaries as Beare, First Epistle; Bigg, Critical and Exegetical Commentary; Selwyn, The First Epistle of St. Peter (London: Macmillan and Co., 1947); also M.-E. Boismard, "Une liturgie baptismale dans la prima Pétri," Révue

to show Christians the implications of their baptismal commitment and to urge them to be faithful to that commitment in the present hardships.

The tone of this writing is completely different from that seen in Acts. Here, the contemporary situation of the Christians to whom the letter is being addressed is very much at the heart of the writing, governing the content and the style. The author's intention is to convey hope and encouragement to these Christians in their trial, and to transmit instruction to them for meeting this difficulty in genuine Christian fashion. This is no longer a kerygmatic proclamation addressed to non-Christians, but a practical exhortation to perseverance and to Christian conduct. The development of a specific Christology, then, is only secondary to its pastoral aim. Hence, this study must necessarily begin with an observation of the primary message of the epistle, and then proceed to draw forth from that message its Christological insight.

The work exhibits a strong eschatological bent: the Christians are urged to suffer patiently, to remain firm in the faith, because the end is near. They have been begotten again unto "a living hope, unto an incorruptible inheritance" (1:3-4), and this reward is "ready to be revealed in the last time" (1:5). The suffering of their present situation is only a temporary thing, having for its purpose the testing of their faith, preparing them for the coming great day (1:6-7). They are now sojourners (1:17), strangers and pilgrims (2:11), but they must not lose heart on their journey since "the end of all things is at hand" (4:7). "The time

---

Biblique, LXIII (1956), 182-208 and LXIV (1957), 161-183. The work of C. Moule, "The Nature and Purpose of I Peter, "New Testament Studies, III (1956-1957), 1-11, summarizes the opinions of several scholars, including F.L. Cross, whose work, I Peter, a Paschal Liturgy, has proved so controversial. An opinion contrary to Cross's can be found in Thornton, "I Peter, a Paschal Liturgy?" Journal of Theological Studies, N.S., XII (1961), 14-26.

has come for the judgment to begin with the household of God" (4:17). Therefore, they must stand firm, and after only a little suffering, the God who has called them will reward them (5:11).

A Christian code of ethics is presented, based on this expectation of an imminent end. In order to keep themselves ready for the great event to come, Christians must remain firm under persecution, responding to it in true Christian fashion.[1] Peter presents the example of Christ as the ultimate norm for their conduct in this crisis, something which was not a part of his evangelizing in Acts. Christ suffered and ultimately reached glory; Christians should now join Him in suffering, confident that they too will reach glory.

"Draw near to him, a living stone, rejected indeed by men but chosen and honored by God. Be you yourselves as living stones, built thereon..." (2:4-5) The same image of the stone is drawn into play here as was utilized earlier in Acts 4:11, but it does not adequately clarify the relationship between the sufferings of Christ and those of Christians. However the theme of the rejection and glory of Christ is present, and if Christians are urged to come to Him and build themselves up on Him, this must also imply that they suffer as He did.[2]

A second passage will develop this theme much more clearly:

> Christ also has suffered for you, leaving you an example that you may follow in his steps: 'Who did no sin, neither was deceit found in his mouth.' Who, when he

---

[1]This thought pattern governs the whole of the epistle, but it is interesting to note the frequency with which a mention of the end-times is followed by a moral injunction: 1:22; 2:1, 11-12; 4:7-11; 5:5-9.

[2]It may push the text too far to see the notion of suffering in it, but taken in the context of the whole epistle, "rejection" can probably be seen as a reference to suffering. 4:12 even states that Christians are "partakers of the sufferings of Christ."

> was reviled, did not revile, when he suffered, did not threaten, but yielded himself to him who judged him unjustly; who himself bore our sins in his body upon the tree, that we, having died to sin, might live to justice; and by his stripes you were healed. For you were as sheep going astray, but now you have returned to the shepherd and guardian of your souls. (2:21-25)

This is a crucial passage. Peter quotes freely from the servant text of Is 53, obviously seeing Christ as the servant, and giving Him as an example or pattern for suffering Christians. The "example" or "pattern" which Christ furnishes for the Christian is not the very impersonal and objective model which the word conveys to us. Peter chooses a word which could be used to describe a writing-copy, a child's copybook, in which a skeletal outline is to be filled in, or a pattern repeatedly traced or drawn in order that the child's handwriting may be patterned after that of the model.[1] Hence, recognizing Christ as the suffering servant, Peter then presents Him as model to suffering Christians, understanding that in following His example , they will somehow be joining Him. Their knowledge of this union should govern their conduct in suffering.

Christ as example for the sufferings of Christians is again presented in 3:17-4:1. Although this passage does not make specific reference to the Isaian servant, still the allusion is obvious. Christians who are made to suffer unjustly should do so; "Christ also died once for sins, the Just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God" (3:18). Having been put to death in the flesh, He was then raised to the right hand of God and exalted there in power, "swallowing up death that we might be made heirs of eternal life" (3:22). Christians, then, should bear even those sufferings which are unjustly inflicted, for Christ has made salvation and reward

---

[1] R. Deering, "Humiliation-Exaltation," pp. 238-241. Peter's word is ὑπογραμμός.

available to them.[1]

One final exhortation is found in 4:12-13. Here the Christians are urged to actually rejoice in their sufferings, since by them they are "partakers of the sufferings of Christ" (vs. 13), confident that just as surely as Christ passed from suffering to glory, they too will "also rejoice with exaltation in the revelation of his glory" (vs. 13).

Hence, Christ in His sufferings is to be their example, their strength, their source of hope and encouragement.

Such advice to the Christians in their time of need provides a fairly adequate picture of Peter's Christology. Christ is envisioned as the risen and triumphant Lord, possessor and source of the salvation which men desire. However, He reached such glory and accomplished the redemption of men by way of suffering. What is operative in this epistle, then, is a servant Christology, something which is surely apropos for the needs of the communities addressed. The servant Christology found earlier in Acts became apparent on the basis of the explicit use of the title "servant." Although Christ is not addressed by that title in this epistle, still the explicit quoting of Is 53, and the repeated relating of suffering and glory suggest a servant Christology.

Bearing in mind the earlier servant Christology which was evident in Acts, it is necessary now to determine the extent to which that concept is developed in this writing. A strong similarity is to be expected, particularly if this is a Petrine writing, proceeding as it does from the early days of the Church, and reflecting so closely the kerygma of that

---

[1]Verse 21 indicates that this salvation is made available to the Christian at his baptism; this fact, however, does not assure the absence of suffering, as 4:1 and the personal experience of Peter's audience indicate.

Church.[1] Various aspects of that servant Christology shall be examined: the place of suffering in the final accomplishment of the servant's work, the servant's mission as including the whole of His life, the servant's work as related to covenant, the universality of the servant's work, and the use of the servant Christology in the liturgy.

The servant Christology in Acts was notably deficient in clarifying the value of the suffering itself in the over-all mission of the servant; on the other hand, the first epistle of Peter tends to develop this aspect of the Isaian prophecy to a somewhat greater degree.

The opening verses of the epistle, though they contain no explicit servant reference, attribute the efficacy of the redemption to the resurrection of Christ: Christians have been begotten again "through the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, unto a living hope..." (1:3) Later, Peter speaks of the prophets through whom the Holy Spirit "foretold the sufferings of Christ, and the glories that would follow." (1:11) The relationship here between suffering and glory would seem to be no more than a temporal one.

The same is true of 2:4ff. The stone image in this passage does not lend itself to any other interpretation. It is not said that the stone was chosen by God because of its prior rejection by men; it was simply a stone which had at one time been rejected by men, but was now the object of God's choice and honor, and it is this choice on the part of God which gives value to the stone.

---

[1] Dodd, Apostolic Preaching, p. 44, writes that I Peter is a work "which seems in some respects nearer to that of the primitive Church, as we divine it behind the early chapters of Acts, than anything else in the New Testament." See also W. Van Unnik, "First Letter of Peter," The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, ed. Geo. A. Buttrick, et al., III (1962), 765.

Other passages, however, do allot a more integral and valuable place to the sufferings in the final effecting of the servant's mission.

> You know that you were redeemed from the vain manner of life handed down from your fathers, not with perishable things, with silver or gold, but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot. Foreknown, indeed, before the foundation of the world, he has been manifested in the last times for your sakes. Through him you are believers in God who raised him up from the dead and gave him glory, so that your faith and hope might be in God. (1:18-21)

This passage surely attributes redemptive power to the death of Christ. And following in verse 21, the faith and hope of the Christian, and hence his redemption, are said to spring from the resurrection. Apparently then, this passage brings together the death and the resurrection as joint causes of redemption.

Another explicit attribution of salvific power to Christ's death is found in 2:24, a passage modeled very closely on the servant song of Is 53: "...who himself bore our sins in his body upon the tree, that we, having died to sin, might live to justice; and by his stripes you were healed." The sinless one has taken the sins of mankind to himself, and through His suffering and death has healed the sin of humanity and effected its justification.

A last reference, one that is very similar to the preceding, is to be found in 3:18: "Because Christ also died once for sins, the Just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God." The vicarious suffering of the Just One has cleansed the unjust and brought them to God. But following in verse 21, man's salvation seems to flow from the resurrection, for baptism saves the Christian "through the resurrection of Jesus Christ; who is at the right hand of God, swallowing up death that we might be made heirs of eternal life..." However, so close a linking of the two--death and resurrection--would not permit us to separate them when speaking of

the degree of their salvific power.[1]

It can be said, then, that the redemptive power of Christ's suffering and death is surely known to Peter and the early Church, and can be explicitly developed when there is need for such a development. On the other hand, this understanding is not yet used to full capacity.[2]

A second characteristic of Peter's use of servant Christology is its restricted application to Christ's suffering and death only. Neither the prophetic function of the servant (Is 50:4-9) nor the prior calling, formation, and protection of the servant (Is 42:1-4; 49:1-5) is applied to the historical life and ministry of Christ.[3] The pre-existence of Christ is mentioned in 1:20: "Foreknown, indeed, before the foundation of the world..." However, the link between this and any Isaian passage, such as 49:1, is so tenuous that a servant reference here is doubtful.

A third aspect of the servant Christology to be examined is its relation to covenant-making. The epistle contains many references to the exodus, probably due to the baptismal theology which Peter develops.[4] The people are redeemed from the vain manner of life by the blood of a spotless lamb (1:18). The exodus typology is developed in an even more

---

[1]For the interpretation of this difficult passage, see Beare, First Epistle, pp. 144-145; Bigg, Critical Commentary, pp. 162-163.

[2]Cf. Beare, First Epistle, p. 34, who says that the significance of Christ's death is not stressed as much as the pattern it provides for man's conduct.

[3]Dodd states that the primitive Jerusalem kerygma, of which Peter is a notable example, conceived of the life of Jesus as a preparation for the great eschatological event, not as a part of that event; Apostolic Preaching, p. 46.

[4]For a study of the baptismal theology contained in this epistle, see the references above, p. 34, note 3.

detailed fashion in 2:4-11, using such ideas as the stone,[1] the offering of sacrifice, the formation of a "chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a purchased people" (2:9), a people who receive the mercy of God.[2] These passages, involving as they do references to the exodus and to the establishment of the covenant through the offering of sacrifice, offer great possibilities for a rich development, interrelating the themes of exodus, covenant, servant, and Christian baptism. In such a development, Christ would be seen as the redeeming lamb, (elsewhere identified as the Servant), who draws His people from slavery, forms them into God's people by uniting them with Himself, and establishes a covenant for them with God precisely by that union with Himself. This is the work of the servant: he was to be the covenant of the people, freeing them in the new Exodus, establishing justice (cf. Is 42:6-7). However, despite the great possibilities present here, only the groundwork for this theological development was laid; its implications were not at all drawn.[3]

The universality of the servant's mission is not treated in this epistle. Negatively, it can be noted that His mission is not limited to the Jews alone, but more than that cannot be said. Apparently no Judaeo-

---

[1]Although the primary thought here concerns Christ as foundation stone of the new Church, yet Boismard believes that, in view of the exodus references in this whole passage, the stone must also refer to the rock struck by Moses in the desert; Révue Biblique, LXIII, pp. 194-195.

[2]See Boismard's work, ibid., for a paralleling of these passages with references from the books of Exodus, Deuteronomy, Osee, Isaiah.

[3]F. H. Chase comments, somewhat bluntly, that Peter seems to have had a deep realization of broad facts but not of their inner significance and promise. "Peter, First Epistle," Dictionary of the Bible, ed. James Hastings, III (1907), 795. However, theological thought has always been known to proceed slowly.

See also L. Fillion, "Pierre (Premiere Epitre de Saint), Dictionnaire de la Bible, ed. F. Vigoroux, V, (1895), 394, who holds that Peter fails to develop various points of doctrine, not because he was unfamiliar with them, but simply because his purpose in writing did not demand such elaboration.

Christian problems existed for these Christians at the time the epistle was directed to them, and it was their needs which, to a large extent, governed the choice of content.[1]

To summarize. Both similarity and dissimilarity between the Christology of this epistle and that of the Acts of the Apostles are expected. If the origin of this epistle can be traced back to that same Peter who molded the kerygmatic proclamations found in Acts, then its Christology should develop along much the same lines. On the other hand, if there is a lapse of time between the Petrine theology presented in Acts and that presented here--and there apparently was a lapse of at least two decades--then some growth in understanding the earlier Christology should be apparent in this later work.

In the epistle itself, the author--and the Church as a whole--face a need of the moment. Seeing Christians caught in a time of persecution and suffering, Peter is forced to develop some kind of theology of suffering, that is, forced to find an answer to the problem of suffering--its place in the life of the Christian, the manner in which a Christian should react to it, his attitude toward it, his source of strength in enduring it. It is a servant Christology which is seen as providing the answer.

Though the glory of the risen Christ is kept very much in focus in I Peter, particularly as this is the greatest source of hope and strength for these Christians, still the sufferings of Christ are now given more

---

[1] It was noted, in connection with Acts, that a conception of Christ as the servant had to some extent entered into the liturgical prayer-life of the community (cf. Ac 4:24-30). If it is true that I Peter is a liturgical form used in the administration of baptism in the early Church, and particularly if the epistle is actually a homily given by the celebrant at such a baptismal celebration, then it could be said unquestionably that a servant Christology had been firmly entrenched within the faith-life of the early Christians, for this faith-life was both expressed and intensified by their liturgical worship.

explicit attention. Christ Himself suffered, and suffered patiently. This very manner in which He suffered was a part of the process by which He reached glory for Himself and by which salvation was made available for men. This was His mission as servant (cf. Is 42:2; 50:5-6; 53:7), and as such was a part of the process by which He reached glory for Himself and by which salvation was made available for men. This Christology, different from the earlier form in emphasis and in the degree of development and insight, was shown to be applicable to the life of the Christian sufferer.

In appraising the servant Christology in I Peter from the vantage point of the Church's later insight, it is possible to notice some deficiencies. At this point, the Church's gaze is still concentrated on the sufferings, death, and resurrection of Christ as constituting His servant's mission; she has yet to grasp the servant-dimension of the whole of his life.

Furthermore, the Church has yet to develop in any extensive way the exact outcome of the servant's work; that is, she has yet to see Christ as forming a new people of God established in new and more glorious covenant-union with that God.

Lastly, the Church's understanding at this point has not yet totally unfolded the universal character of the servant's work. This awareness would grow as the Judeo-Christian conflict intensified, and as the Church became increasingly aware of her own universal mission.

## II Peter

As was the case with I Peter, scholars also dispute the authorship and dating of II Peter. A somewhat radical opinion holds that this writing was authored by Peter himself but prior to his writing of I Peter. This would place II Peter sometime between 60 and 63 AD.[1] Most scholars,

---

[1]Bigg, Critical and Exegetical Commentary, pp. 242-247.

however, deny Petrine authorship to this epistle, placing it at various times after Peter's death: at the end of the apostolic age, in 125, in 170, or even sometime within the second century.[1] One scholar notes that the epistle's concern to establish Petrine authorship for itself is overdone, while the contents betray its later dating.[2] It seems, then, that II Peter was composed sometime during the second century, and because the author believed it to convey the spirit of Peter, the latter's name was prefixed.

Even were it possible to establish this writing as genuinely--or at least more convincingly--Petrine, still its content in no way manifests a servant Christology. The epistle presents genuine Christian doctrine in opposition to heretical teachers (ch. 2), stressing particularly the reality of the second coming of Christ (ch. 3). As a pledge of the reality of this coming, the author refers to the transfiguration "on the holy mount" (1:18), in which occur the words, "This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased" (1:17). The possibility of servant overtones in this phrase will be discussed later;[3] in this present content no servant Christology is intended, for the event is related to the second coming of Christ.[4]

## The Gospel of Mark

According to a theory which now enjoys a rather general acceptance by scholars, the gospel of Mark was the first of our canonical gospels,

---

[1] See Leconte's discussion of this problem and of the various solutions proposed: La Sainte Bible, pp. 131-134. Also, A. Barnett, "The Second Epistle of Peter," The Interpreter's Bible, ed. Geo. A. Buttrick et al., XII (1957), 164.

[2] Barnett, ibid., summarizes these internal indications of late dating: a) use of Jude; b) the author's inclusion of himself in a generation in which "the fathers" were known only through tradition (3:24); c) the recognition of Paul's writings as scriptural (3:16); d) allusion to heretical misuse of Paul's letters (3:16).

[3] See below, pp.50-51.

[4] See Barnett, The Interpreter's Bible, XII, 184.

taking shape between the years 64-70.[1] Prompted by the needs of the Christian community of his time,[2] the evangelist formulated an account of the Good News, "the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God." (Mk 1:1).

One aspect of the study of the Marcan sources which is particularly pertinent here is the ancient tradition of Mark's dependence on Peter. Eusebius, the historian of the early Church, already bears witness to it in his Church History, (III, 39, 15). He there quotes Papias, bishop of Hierapolis (ca. 140):

> This also the presbyter used to say: "Mark, indeed, who became the interpreter of Peter, wrote accurately, as far as he remembered them, the things said or done by the Lord, but not however in order." For he (Mark) had neither heard the Lord nor been His personal follower, but at a later stage, as I said, he had followed Peter, who used to adapt the teachings to the needs of the moment, but not as though he were drawing up a connected account of the oracles of the Lord: so that Mark committed no error in writing certain matters just as he remembered them. For he had only one object in view, namely to leave out nothing of the things which he had heard, and to include no false statement among them.[3]

It is thought that Papias was expressing a belief commonly held in the province of Asia at the beginning of the second century.[4] Justin Martyr

---

[1] On the dating of Mark, see R. Huby, L'Evangile selon saint Marc. La Sainte Bible (Paris: Les éditions du Cerf, 1953), p. 12; E. Gould, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Mark. The International Critical Commentary (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1896), xvii; and other standard commentaries. A representative of the earlier theory--namely, that Mark's gospel followed that of Matthew--is J. Chapman, Matthew, Mark, and Luke (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1937).

[2] C. Cranfield, The Gospel According to St. Mark (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959), p. 15, cites as Mark's purpose: "to supply the catechetical and liturgical needs of the church in Rome, to support its faith in the face of the threat of martyrdom, and to provide material for missionary preachers." See also F. Filson, A New Testament History (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1964), p. 363.

[3] Quoted by F. Grant, "The Gospel According to St. Mark," The Interpreter's Bible, ed. Geo. A. Buttrick et al., VII, 630.

[4] Cranfield, Gospel, p. 3.

bears witness to the close connection between Mark and Peter; so too do the Anti-Marcionite Prologue (ca. 160-180), Irenaeus (ca. 180), and the Muratorian Canon (ca. 200).[1]

Scripture attests to some kind of relationship between Mark and Peter. According to I Pet 5:13, Mark was with Peter at the time of the composition of the first epistle,[2] while Ac 12:12 likewise indicates some connection. Nevertheless, few scholars today accept the Papian tradition without some modification. Usually, one of three positions is adopted. The first is the more conservative position, viewing Mark as a mere scribe through whom Peter's theology assumed written form.[3] The second would recognize that Mark had several sources at his disposal. He drew ultimately from the primitive kerygma existing in the Palestinian church, (and hence expressed not the thinking of any one individual but that of the whole community). With this he used various written sources at his disposal, plus his own unique source, namely, the Petrine theology with which he was familiar.[4] The third position would hold that there was no direct influence of Peter's thinking on Mark, except in so far as Peter helped form

---

[1] Cited by Cranfield, Gospel, pp. 4-5.

[2] Bigg, Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Peter, pp. 80-83, thinks this is John Mark, the evangelist. See also Farrer, A Study in St. Mark (Westminster: Dacre Press, 1951), pp. 20-21.

[3] Chapman, Matthew, pp. 8-12. This author, who regards Matthew as the earliest gospel, even suggests that Mark simply recorded Peter's conversational reading aloud of Matthew's gospel; pp. 38, 92.

[4] See, for example, B. Bacon, The Beginnings of the Gospel Story (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1909), xix; Farrer, Study, pp. 20-21; Filson, New Testament History, p. 83; Cranfield, Gospel, p. 11; F.J. McCool, "Revival of Synoptic Source-Criticism," Theological Studies, XVII, pp. 484-486.

the common teaching and faith of the Church.[1] The consensus of scholarly opinion seems to find the second position most tenable, thereby recognizing a peculiar and genuine Petrine influence in Mark's gospel, while yet allowing Mark to function as a true evangelist. Papias' statement is seen as representing the concern of the early Church to establish the validity of a writing by claiming for it apostolic authority.[2]

The wealth of vivid detail found in various places in Mark's gospel, characteristic of an eye-witness account, is seen as indicative of Petrine influence behind the gospel. Cranfield even hazards a guess as to which passages are directly due to Peter's influence,[3] but the evidence for this is not at all conclusive. It would seem that the most that could be said is this: Peter's personal understanding of the mystery of Christ, as well as the content and method of his preaching, were quite normative in the development of the early Palestinian kerygma. Not only does this particular kerygma underlie Mark's account of the good news,[4] thereby assuring some degree of Petrine influence behind this gospel, but there was possibly also some personal contact between Peter and Mark which would assure an additional degree of influence. Furthermore, the second century tradition

---

[1] F. Grant, The Earliest Gospel (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1943), pp. 34-57.

[2] McCool, Theological Studies, XVII, p. 484.

[3] The passages he cites, (Gospel, p. 11), are these: 1:16-20, 29-31, 35-38; 5:21-24, 35-43; 9:2-8, 14-27; 10:17-27, 35-45; 14:27-31, 32-42, 54, 66-72. But of these passages, only two bear servant Christology: 9:2-8 and 10:35-45. These will be analyzed later.

[4] Grant writes: "The underlying tradition in the gospel of Mark, and its view of Jesus, is fundamentally Palestinian--this all historical critics now recognize." Earliest Gospel, p. 173. Dodd calls attention to Mk 1:14-15 as being a brief statement of the same kerygma found in Peter's speeches in Acts; Apostolic Preaching, p. 24.

that Petrine influence underlies Mark's gospel cannot be lightly dismissed. On the basis of this reasoning, then, the Christology of Mark's gospel shall be examined, in order to exhaust every source in which Petrine servant Christology may be found.

Very early in the first chapter of the gospel, Mark presents the baptism of Jesus, an account in which a servant reference is usually recognized. John the Baptist, the forerunner of the messiah, is introduced in the terms of Is 40:3, the beginning of Deutero-Isaiah's prophecy of the new Exodus in which the servant plays a significant role. Christ presents Himself to receive this "baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins" (1:4). On coming up from the water, He beholds the heavens opening, sees the Spirit descending and remaining, and hears the voice addressing Him: "Thou art my beloved Son, in thee I am well pleased" (1:11).

Jewish thought had already seen a relation between the awaited messiah and the spirit: the messiah was to possess the fulness of the spirit for himself (cf. Is 11:2),[1] and was to communicate that spirit to men to inaugurate the messianic times (cf. Is 44:3; Joel 3:1-2; Ez 36: 26-27). On the basis of this, the account in Mark points to the Church's appreciation of the messianic significance of the descent of the Spirit on Christ at the Baptism.[2] But on the other hand, this descent of the Spirit possibly also bears some significance for a servant Christology, since the initial servant song had pictured the servant as one who would receive the Lord's spirit for the effecting of his mission (Is 42:1-2). That the evangelist did intend such an implication here is supported by

---

[1]Chevallier sees this as one of the most significant texts in the development of messianic thought; L'Esprit, p. 45.

[2]See Cranfield, Gospel, p. 53.

the servant overtones in the following verse.

The words of the "voice from heavens" (1:11) echo the opening of the first servant song: "Here is my servant whom I uphold, my chosen one with whom I am pleased" (Is 42:1). There is also possible a relationship to a verse from a messianic psalm: "The Lord said to me, 'You are my son; this day I have begotten you.'" (Ps 2:7)[1] The word "servant" in the Isaian text is the Hebrew ebed; both the Septuagint and Matthew 3:17 translate the term as pais, "servant" or "son."[2] Mark, on the other hand, translates with huios, which is specifically "son." This variation has caused quite a disagreement among scholars. Depending on which term is accepted, "servant" or "son," the evangelist will be seen as either accepting or rejecting a Christological application of "servant."[3] The messianic aspect of the passage, seen in the manifestation of the spirit, suggests that the central reference is to the messianic psalm with its use of the term "son."[4] On the other hand, some significance must be attached to the similarity which exists between the sequence of ideas in Isaiah and in Mark: the identification of the servant (or son) is followed by a statement of the Lord's pleasure. It would surely be possible to make the

---

[1] Cullmann would see the Isaian text as the central reference here: "We may consider it certain that the words of the voice from heaven are really a citation of this passage in Isaiah." He regards the paralleling with the psalm as only a possibility; Christology, p. 66.

[2] Ibid.

[3] A summary of various opinions on this question is presented by A. Feuillet, "Le baptême de Jésus d'après l'évangile selon S. Marc," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XXI (1959), 478-486.

[4] In addition, Feuillet, ibid., p. 482, proposes that the Trinitarian context of the passage suggests that "son" is to be referred. However, the lack of Trinitarian emphasis in the whole of the gospel indicates that such a theory is imposing later insights upon the mind of the early Church.

minimal statement that a reference to the Isaian servant cannot be excluded from an exegesis of Mark's text.[1]

In a more positive vein, these two meanings, "servant" and "son," need not be seen as mutually exclusive. Indeed, this is the paradox of the whole New Testament: the Son is at the same time the servant. At this moment of baptism, that Son inaugurates His servant-vocation; hence, "son" and "servant" are closely linked.[2] It is quite possible that Mark intended to relate these two concepts. He formulated his account in the light of post-resurrection faith, a faith which enabled him and the early Church to begin to grasp the significance of the baptismal event. Mark, then, could have taken the thought and structure from the Isaian servant text, but utilized the ambiguity between "servant" and "son" to write huios. In thus catching the implications of both "servant" and "son," he could identify Christ as the divine Son who begins to fulfill His servant-function at His baptism.

The gospel designates Christ as the servant, not simply at the moment of His sufferings and death, but already at the commencement of His ministry. He publicly presents Himself to receive the baptism of repentance, thus identifying Himself with sinful men for whom that bap-

---

[1] Zimmerli, Servant, pp. 81-82, suggests that originally the reference was to Is 42:1 only, and that even before Mark the ambiguous pais was clarified by huios in the Hellenistic territory where pais was avoided as a Christological title. "If that is correct then it would be confirmed that the designation of Jesus as pais theou belongs to a very old (pre-Marcan) layer of the tradition."

[2] Cranfield writes: "In response to his self-dedication to the mission of the Servant, made in his submission to baptism, he is given a confirmation of his own consciousness of being the Son of God, that is at the same time a confirmation of his servant-vocation." Gospel, p. 55. See also Feuillet, Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XXI, p. 482; W. Manson, Jesus the Messiah (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1946), p. 155.

tism was a personal necessity. The relation between this act of identification and the mission of the servant is obvious. Moreover, Christ here undergoes a "baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins" (1:4), something which foreshadows the final effect of the servant's work: "He shall take away the sins of many, and win pardon for their offenses." (Is 53:12)

Having made the initial identification of Christ as servant, Mark relates the public ministry, during which he includes three predictions of the approaching passion, 8:31-33, 9:29-31, 10:32-34. Each speaks of the necessity of the sufferings and death of the Son of Man, and ends with a declaration of His resurrection. The first prediction says simply that He "must suffer many things, and be rejected..." (8:31), but each successive prediction gives more explicit details of these sufferings.[1]

The title by which Christ designates Himself in these predictions is not "Servant" but "Son of Man." The evangelists are so consistent in retaining this title as Christ's self-designation that, with a fair amount of certitude, it might be said that Christ found this to be the term most expressive of His self-understanding. An analysis of the term is not pertinent here; suffice it to say that all aspects of Christ's nature and work are summarized in this term, including the aspect of the suffering servant.[2]

Since the context of each prediction contributes something to the

---

[1]One suspects that these additional details are the product of hindsight, with details from the historical event of the suffering and death of Christ incorporated into the account. See B. Willaert, "Jesus as the 'Suffering Servant,'" Theology Digest, X (1962), 25-30.

[2]There are numerous writings available on the meaning of the term "Son of Man." See, for example, Manson, Jesus, p. 157; M. Black, "Servant of the Lord and Son of Man," Scottish Journal of Theology, VI (1953), 1-11; Cullmann, Christology, pp. 137-192; Preiss, Etudes Théologiques et réligieuses, XXVI, pp. 51-69; Cranfield, Gospel, p. 275.

servant Christology presented, each must be examined separately.

The structure of that part of the gospel which contains the first prediction (8:31-32) cannot be without significance. From the time of the baptism, the evangelist has emphasized the salvific power of the man Jesus. Miracles predominate. Christ feeds the five thousand (6:34ff), walks on the water (6:45ff), heals the sick (6:53ff), opens the ears of a deaf mute (7:31ff), feeds the four thousand (8:1ff), cures a blind man (8:22ff). The narrative then reaches the climactic point at which the apostles acknowledge Christ as messiah: "Peter answered and said to him, 'Thou art the Christ.'" (8:29) And immediately the theme of the suffering required of the Son of Man is introduced to be incorporated into their messianic understanding. "And he began to teach them that the Son of Man must suffer many things..." (8:31). Since the popular messianic expectation ignored the suffering servant prophecy and concentrated solely on the glorious characteristics of the messiah, it was essential that the theme of suffering be brought to the fore. The messiah would reach glory only after suffering, rejection, and death. Then, as if to emphasize the absolute necessity of the way of the servant, the succeeding verses apply the same truth to the lives of those who follow Him (vs. 34-36). Hence, this prediction attempts to supplement the recognition of Christ as messiah with an understanding of Him as servant-messiah.

The context of the second prediction (9:29-31) likewise relates the themes of glory and suffering for the messiah. Immediately after the preceding narrative, Mark relates the transfiguration: for a brief moment, the future glory of the servant-messiah becomes evident. As Christ stands transfigured, speaking with Moses and Elias, the cloud of divine glory overshadows them, and the voice from heaven speaks: "This is my beloved Son; hear him." (9:6)

This account obviously echoes the baptismal account. In the baptism, Christ presented Himself for the inauguration of His messianic servant mission, and received divine confirmation of His commitment. Here at the transfiguration, having just been proclaimed the messiah by His disciples, and having tempered their messianic understanding through an emphatic statement of His mission to suffer, He stands now on the threshold of the actual fulfilment of that mission. At this moment of renewed self-commitment to His task, the divine confirmation is spoken, and the glory which will follow His sufferings is visibly manifest.

The servant theme can be detected here for several reasons. Initially it can be seen on the basis of the similarity between this account and that of the baptism where servant overtones were present. Secondly, as the group descends the mount of transfiguration, reference is made to the prophecies concerning the necessary sufferings of the Son of Man: "how then is it written of the Son of Man that he should suffer many things and be despised?" (9:11) The word used here for "despised" is that which occurs twice in Is 53:3, the central servant song; this suggests that a reference to the servant is intended.[1] Finally, the constant interplay of the themes of suffering and glory, evident through this whole section of the gospel, would seem to indicate that the servant image functions quite strongly behind the text. Indeed, this very account of Christ's glory is both preceded and followed by a prediction of His sufferings and death.

The third prediction (10:32-34), the most detailed and also the most urgent, occurs as Christ and the fearful disciples are "on their way, going up to Jerusalem." (10:32) It serves as introduction to a section

---

[1]Cranfield, Gospel, p. 298. The word is ἐξουδενηθῇ.

which is particularly rich in servant Christology.[1] The section begins with the request by James and John to share in Christ's glory. His reply, stressing suffering as the prerequisite for that glory, reiterates the servant theme even for Christ Himself. Then, if the disciple is to follow Christ, he too must make even the structure of Christ's life his own. Christ would reach His glory only by drinking of the cup and submitting to the baptism of suffering.[2] This was a necessity for Him; it is equally so for the disciple.[3]

The following verses sketch the servant-attitude which Christians must adopt: "Whoever wishes to become great shall be your servant..." (10:43), an injunction based ultimately on the example of Christ: "for the Son of Man also has not come to be served but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for many." (10:45) This statement is a succinct expression of the meaning and purpose of the life of the Son of Man. Despite the dignity of that Son of Man, still He comes in the form of a servant, giving His life in service of many.

His service involves suffering, as is evident from the relationship between the Marcan passage and the fourth servant song, Is 52:13-53:12.[4] The servant was to dedicate his life to the service of others,

---

[1]That section, 10:35-45, is one which Cranfield believes to be Petrine; Gospel, p. 337.

[2]This passage relates the baptism of Christ to His death, since it conceives of the death as a baptism. See Cullmann, Christology, p. 67. This fact is a further justification for relating the baptism of Christ to His servant function: He is Servant not only in the actual passion and death, but all through His life, reaching back even to the baptism.

[3]The extension of the sufferings of Christ to Christians is similar to that found in I Pet 4:13. A similarity also exists between Mk 10:42 and I Pet 5:3, where it is a question of an authority which is far removed from service.

[4]Strachan writes: "The words undoubtedly are meant to recall

a service which involved the giving of his life (53:10), the surrender of himself to death (53:12). The Son of Man also came "to serve, and to give his life..." (Mk 10:45). He gives His life for "the many," (Is 53:11, 12; Mk 10:45), as a ransom for them.[1] Therefore, the Son of Man is the servant whose whole work is to serve the many by giving His life in suffering and death in order that they may be freed from their sins.[2]

Brief mention must next be made of the parable of the vine-dressers (Mk 12:1-12), since servant Christology is indirectly contained there. The parable primarily inveighs against the Jews' continual rejection of the approaches of God toward them, including His final gesture, the sending of the "beloved son," (a phrase which immediately echoes the baptism and transfiguration accounts). In commenting on the rejection of the son,

---

the prophecy of the suffering servant in Is 52:13 - 53:12." "The Gospel in the New Testament," The Interpreter's Bible, ed. Geo. A. Buttrick et al., VII (1957), 18.

On the other hand, C.K. Barrett, who rejects almost all Isaian influence in the gospels, suggests that Mark could have creatively developed these sayings out of the current understanding of the Son of Man. "The Background of Mark 10:45," New Testament Essays, ed. A.J.B. Higgins (Manchester, England: Manchester University Press, 1959), pp. 9-15.

One wonders how Barrett would reconcile his position with the fact that the evangelist expressed, not simply his own personal insight into the mystery of Christ, but the common understanding and teaching of the Church. Mark, then, could not be seen as creating these sayings.

[1]Although Mark's word for ransom, loutron, is not the same as that used in Is 53:10, it is used in Num 18:15 of the price for the redemption of the first-born. Preiss notes that ransom and expiation were linked in rabbinical writing in late Judaism: Etudes théologiques et réligieuses, XXVI, pp. 54-55.

[2]The word Mark uses for "to serve," diakonos, suggests service at table. It is possible that Mark intended this passage to be related to the last supper account, wherein Christ is seen serving them at table, fully exercising His mission of servant by establishing the new covenant. Note that Luke's account heightens the relationship by inserting the parallel to Mk 10:35-45 into the last supper account itself (Lk 22:24-30). John accomplishes the same purpose by placing the service of footwashing and its accompanying exhortation within the context of the supper (Jn 13: 1-17). See Preiss, ibid., pp. 62-65.

Christ evokes the stone image: "The stone which the builders rejected, has become the corner stone: by the Lord this has been done, and it is wonderful in our eyes." (Ps 117:22; Mk 12:10) It was noted, in connection with I Peter, that the stone image was evoked when speaking of the suffering and glorification of Christ; the polarity between the rejection by man and the glorification by God make this an apt servant image. Its utilization in connection with this parable serves to complement the parable's emphasis on suffering and rejection, and is simply one more indication of servant Christology present in Mark.

Mark's account of the institution of the Eucharist reveals Christ involved in the actual exercise of His servant mission. That which Christ had declared as of necessity for Himself--that He give His life as a ransom for many (10:45)--is here begun. He gives His life first in symbol, using bread and the cup, praying over the cup: "This is my blood of the new covenant, which is being shed for many." (14:24) Here again is a reference to the "many" for whom Christ exercises His function. It is a vicarious work that He performs, as Isaiah had foretold.[1]

What is particularly significant, though, is the content of that work. The blood which is shed for the many is the blood of the new covenant. There is an obvious relationship between this covenant and that established on Sinai (Ex 24:3-8). There too blood had been instrumental in bringing man to salvation through union with God; here it is not merely the blood of an animal but the freely-given blood of Christ which establishes a new covenant. Furthermore, Is 42:6-7 had spoken of the servant

---

[1] C.R. North, "Servant of the Lord," The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, ed. Geo. Arthur Buttrick et al., IV (1962), 293, sees this "many" as reminiscent of that in Is 52:14-15 and 53:11-12. See also Cranfield, Gospel, p. 427.

as a "covenant of the people," that is, as the one who would effectively accomplish the uniting of man to God. This union could be established when the sins of the many were taken away (Is 53:12), as they would be when the servant had given his life (53:10). Therefore, the covenant could be established only in the exercise of the Servant's task, in suffering and death and ultimate glorification.[1]

The gospel narrative depicts Christ as continuing during the entire passion what He began here at the last supper. Although the text does not explicitly designate Him as "servant" during the suffering, still the general pattern of thought and the events narrated indicate the presence of a servant Christology functioning behind the account. Christ makes reference to the sheep being scattered when the shepherd is attacked (14:27): Isaiah had described men as sheep going astray, each to his own way (53:6). The submission of Christ is emphasized in His acceptance of the Father's will (14:36): Isaiah had earlier described the servant as willingly submitting to his mission (50:5-6). Christ endures silently and patiently, causing Pilate to wonder (15:5): the servant had been predicted as working and suffering in silence (42:2-3, 53:7). The mockery and derision accorded Christ during the suffering (15:29-31) hearken back to that directed to the "man of sorrows" (Is 53:3). And finally, Christ's

---

[1] Cullmann holds that these two notions--the establishment of a covenant, and the vicarious work of the servant for the many--are the two key notions connected with the ebed Yahweh. He sees it as significant that all four accounts of the institution of the Eucharist include these two elements, despite their diversity in other respects. Since a servant Christology was not the dominant conception of Christ at the time the accounts were written, the writers were apparently preserving faithfully a meaning derived from Christ Himself, namely, that at the last supper Christ was exercising His servant role to the utmost, establishing the covenant through giving His life for the many; Christology, pp. 64-65. See also V. Taylor, "The Origin of the Marcan Passion Sayings," New Testament Studies, I (1954-1955), 163-167.

death with the wicked is explicitly related to the Isaian servant by a quotation of Is 53:12: "And he was reckoned among the wicked." (Mk 15: 28) In view of all this, it seems evident that a servant Christology lies firmly embedded beneath the Marcan account of the last supper, passion, and death of Christ.[1]

The gospel of Mark does not use "servant" as a Christological title, undoubtedly because it was never a preferred Christological designation in the New Testament,[2] and also because the title would have been offensive to Mark's gentile audience. However, since the gospel does contain one direct quotation of an Isaian servant passage in connection with the death of Christ (Mk 15:29), together with frequent references and allusions to the servant theme, the presence of a servant Christology is quite certain. Moreover, the fact that these servant references occur at the most significant moments of the life of Christ is an indication that the servant theme played a rather decisive role in forming the Christological insight of this gospel. At the very beginning of His ministry, Christ is recognized as the servant; His baptism stands as the inauguration and divine confirmation of His servant mission. Since Christ is designated as the servant at this moment when His work among men is beginning, perhaps it is justifiable to see servant Christology as a stream of thought flowing

---

[1] Craig maintains that Mark drew details and references for the passion from Ps 22 rather than from Deutero-Isaiah. "The Identification of Jesus with the Suffering Servant," Journal of Religion, XXIV (1944), 245.

The similarity between this psalm and the Marcan account cannot be denied, but on the other hand, neither can one deny the similarities with the Isaian text. The presence of details drawn from the psalm should not eliminate the possibility of Isaian influence; quite conceivably, Mark could have drawn from both sources.

[2] It is used only in Mt 12:18 in addition to the four places in Acts (3:13, 26; 4:27, 30). Zimmerli, Servant, p. 80, states that all five passages are derived from an ancient tradition.

beneath the surface of the gospel, so that His whole life becomes the progressive exercise of that mission, culminating in its final accomplishment in the great Jerusalem events. At various moments during this ministry, the servant theme comes more obviously to the surface, particularly in the passion predictions, the transfiguration account, the constant relating of suffering and glory, and the direct statement by Christ in 10:45 of the nature and purpose of His work: "The Son of Man also has come not to be served but to serve, and to give His life as a ransom for the many." Finally, the servant's mission is fully accomplished in the closing events of Christ's life, when He becomes the "covenant for the people," (Is 42:6), and actually gives His life for the many. Servant Christology can be seen, then, not as the dominant theme of the gospel, but as one of its underlying motifs.

Assuming that there is Petrine influence behind this gospel account, it will be valuable to relate this servant Christology to that contained in the other Petrine writings. The servant theme here has been developed to quite an extent beyond that found in the two previous writings. This difference is understandable in the case of Acts, for in the years intervening between Acts and this gospel, the servant theme had been probed in greater detail, and then seen in relation to the total developing Christology.

However, it is not a lapse of time which can account for the difference between the servant Christology of this gospel and that of I Peter, for these two writings appeared at approximately the same time. Certainly the purpose of each writing should largely account for the differences. The purpose of I Peter was practical and exhortative, and only those aspects of the Christian mystery are developed which serve as background

or incentive for the exhortation. Therefore, only the sufferings and death of the servant are developed in the epistle. Mark's gospel, on the other hand, was not nearly so limited, but proposed to present the mystery of the Christ, the good news, for the edification and strengthening of the faith of the gentiles. This very purpose would call for the presentation of a more comprehensive Christology, and would enable him to present Christ as exercising His servant mission during the whole of His life. He could also present more explicitly the meaning or purpose of Christ's work, particularly in the statement in 10:45, and in the words of the last supper: "This is my blood of the new covenant, which is being shed for many." (14:24) Hence, this gospel picks up the aspects of the servant Christology observed in the two other writings where Petrine influence was found, and adds significant insights of its own.

## Relation to Total Christology

The preceding study has been concerned with analyzing the servant Christology of those writings in which Petrine influence is believed to be present. It has concluded that servant Christology is present in these works, but that this particular concept did not totally dominate their Christological view. In order to complete the study, it is necessary to determine the place that servant theme held within the over-all Christology of these writings.

Peter's speeches in Acts were intended to provide an initial explanation of the Christian mystery. They represent the very earliest stage of the Church's theological thought, and therefore contain a very rudimentary Christology.[1] The earthly Jesus is presented as a most unique

---

[1] F.F. Bruce, The Acts of the Apostles (London: The Tyndale Press, 1951), p. 96, gives as guarantee of the primitive nature of these speeches

figure. He was anointed with the Spirit, and went about doing good because God was with Him (10:38). He was a "man approved by God...by miracles and wonders and signs" (2:22). He was the messiah (4:25-27), the awaited prophet like Moses (3:22-23), the one who fulfilled even the special task of the suffering servant (3:13 etc.).

This Jesus was raised and exalted, given the Spirit to impart to men (2:32), established as judge of living and dead (10:42). It was He whom God "made both Lord and Christ..." (2:36) This glorified Lord dominated the Church's thought at this period; the fact that He was a divine Person was overwhelming for her. Certainly there was no intention on her part to deny the divinity of Christ during His earthly life; she simply had not yet posed that question for herself.

The title "servant" is used to designate this Jesus during His earthly life; it is never used of the glorious Lord who now lives and judges and sends the Spirit. Neither 3:26 nor 4:30 conceives of the present work of Christ as part of His servant mission; He is simply the one who has fulfilled the servant function, and through whom blessings and cures are now brought to men. Therefore, "servant" as a Christological title seems to express the Church's understanding of the earthly work of Jesus of Nazareth.[1]

I Peter was written to answer a later need, to strengthen and

---

the lack of Pauline emphasis on Christ's pre-existence, His relation to the Father, His sin-bearing, justification, the moral and spiritual power of the resurrection, and the sanctifying influence of the Spirit.

[1]It is precisely this Christology, undeveloped as it is, which is incorporated into the worship-life of the Church. The servant Christology present in the prayer formula in Ac 4:27ff reflects the primitive character of the Church's faith. The titles "Jesus Christ" or "Christ" do not appear. Rather, when the Church thinks of the servant, she thinks of Jesus fulfilling that role during His earthly life, and she speaks of Him simply as "Thy holy servant Jesus."

encourage Christians in time of persecution and suffering. It is still the glorified Lord who dominates the Church's thought when this epistle is written. The resurrection and the present redemptive work of the Lord are emphasized, and He is very obviously the divine Lord. Though no effort is made to show that He was divine also during His earthly life, still He is no longer spoken of as "Jesus of Nazareth," as the "man approved by God," as the prophet, even as the long-awaited messiah. Rather He is consistently given the divine titles "Christ," "Jesus Christ," or "Lord Jesus Christ." Perhaps this is indication that a strong distinction between Jesus of Nazareth and the glorified Lord is no longer being made, and that an incarnational theology is developing, through which the Church is beginning to see more clearly that in Christ, God and man are perfectly united in one person.[1] Certainly, if this understanding is present at all, it is still quite vague and indefinite, though perhaps limited somewhat by the author's pastoral purpose.

Through the explicit quoting of Is 53 in reference to the suffering and death of Christ (2:21-25), and through numerous other references to the Isaian servant, it becomes obvious that a servant Christology is present in I Peter, within the more comprehensive Christology indicated above. Yet even in this epistle, the servant concept seems to designate only the earthly work of Christ, and more specifically, His suffering and death. Perhaps "servant" was avoided as a title here because it bore the connotations associated with it in Acts,[2] and was therefore considered

---

[1] If this incarnational view is present, then perhaps one has the key for understanding what Peter intends when he speaks of Christ as "example" (2:21) for the Christians, who are "partakers of the sufferings of Christ" (4:13). Men can unite with Him who is man as well as God, and thus share his sufferings.

[2] Perhaps the same connotations are present in I Pet 3:18: "Put to death indeed in the flesh, but brought to life in the spirit..."

inadequate to express the Church's deepened Christological insight, particularly her deepened understanding of His divinity. Nevertheless, because a servant Christology is seen as a valid and fruitful understanding of the work of Christ, its basic thought is retained as a background for the epistle.[1]

The emergence of a more adequate grasp of Christ's divinity, detected to a certain extent in I Peter, finds fuller expression in the gospel of Mark. The gospel is structured so as to witness to that divinity. The narrative opens by proclaiming: "The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God" (1:1), and then proceeds to manifest this divinity through a whole series of events and miracles. Christ receives the Spirit of God (1:10), heals a multitude of sick (1:34 etc.), forgives sins--an act which, according to the Scribes, only God can do (2:1-12), teaches with authority (1:22), multiplies bread (6:34ff and 8:1ff), walks on the water (6:45ff), is transfigured by His future glory (9:1ff), and is acclaimed by the heavenly voice (1:11 and 9:6). Such testimony to the divinity of Christ rises in crescendo until the climax is reached, and the centurion at the foot of the cross bears witness: "Truly this man was the Son of God." (15:39) Hence, Mark presents the Christ whom they had known, whom they had observed acting in this manner, and whom they had killed, as very obviously a man, but at the same time very truly God.

As was the case with I Peter, here too "servant" is avoided as a title. It is apparently judged inadequate to express the Church's

---

[1]Again we see this deepened faith-understanding finding expression in the worship of the Church--a worship in which sacraments were beginning to emerge--for this very epistle was a part of her baptismal theology.

deepened insight into the nature of the Christ who had fulfilled the servant's mission, and hence the title is not given Him. However, the servant concept remains as a formative element in the background of the gospel.[1]

---

[1]This servant concept, incorporated as it is into a more expanded Christology, finds expression in the worship-life of the Church. Servant overtones are woven into the very fabric of the account of the institution of the Eucharist, an account used by the Church in her celebration of the Lord's Supper.

## CHAPTER III

## JOHANNINE SERVANT CHRISTOLOGY

### The Gospel of John

The fourth gospel is by far the most outstanding work in the Johannine tradition; it is that gospel which will be studied here to determine the nature and extent of the Johannine servant Christology.[1]

The gospel which stands last in the Church's canon is traditionally held to be the work of the apostle John, son of Zebedee and brother of the apostle James. He is described in the gospel as "the disciple whom Jesus loved." (20:2) Tradition holds, moreover, that John was made bishop of Ephesus, and wrote this gospel toward the end of the first century.[2] The gospel's internal evidence for Johannine author-

---

[1]There is no strong Christological presentation in the other Johannine writings. The Son of God Christology in I John is presented only to refute error, or as inspiration and source for Christian conduct in the world; II John contains only a brief mention of a Son of God Christology; III John presents no Christology at all. Although the Apocalypse does present Christ as the one who now reigns after having redeemed men through His sufferings and death, as the Lamb standing slain, still the emphasis is on Christians as servants (Apoc 22:3) in their present and future world.

[2]See the extensive treatment of the problem by C.K. Barrett, The Gospel According to St. John (London: SPCK, 1955), pp. 83-119; also other standard commentaries, such as D. Mollat, L'Evangile de Saint Jean. La Sainte Bible (Paris: Les éditions du Cerf, 1953), pp. 50-64; A. Feuillet, "Le quatrième Evangile," Introduction à la Bible, ed. A. Robert and A. Feuillet (Tornai: Declée and Co., 1959), pp. 644-662; J. Bernard, Gospel According to St. John. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1928), pp. lxviii-lxxi; E. Hoskyns, The Fourth Gospel (London: Faber and Faber Limited, 1947), pp. 86-106.

ship, in addition to evidence from early Christian or secular sources, has frequently been weighed against a notable absence of such evidence in other reliable sources. However, critics generally agree that none of the evidence is conclusive enough to permit any more than a hypothetical opinion about authorship. The theory proposed by many critics--and adopted here--is that the gospel was written by a disciple of the beloved apostle John, and so much reflects the spirit of that apostle that his name has become traditionally associated with it.[1] This theory dates the gospel sometime between 90 and 140 AD, probably during the last decade of the first century.[2]

The background out of which this gospel rose was the world of Hellenistic Judaism.[3] It was a world characterized by religious and philosophical ferment: eclecticism was the order of the day. Elements of eastern philosophy and mysticism are discernible, together with a form of Platonism which placed great stress on spirit and the things of the spirit as opposed to things material. Stoicism, with its pantheistic doctrine of the Logos, also achieved popularity. Likewise evident is a great revival of mystery religions.

In addition to this agitation and development within the sphere of Greek religious philosophy, there are also trends of development within

---

[1] See, for example, Barrett, Gospel, pp. 113-114; Mollat, L'Evangile, pp. 50-62; R. Tasker, The Gospel According to St. John (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1960), pp. 11-20.

[2] Barrett, Gospel, pp. 113-114.

[3] Much of the following summary is drawn from Barrett, Gospel, pp. 3-82. The statements made here are obviously based on the theory of authorship adopted above.

the OT tradition. Apocalyptic writing became quite prominent during this period, Gnostic or pre-Gnostic wisdom speculation exerted its influence, and Rabbinic Judaism manifested the influence of non-Jewish thought, particularly in the Greek and Latin terms which would appear in its writings.

John could not have remained impervious to these religious and philosophical currents of thought, and traces of their influence can probably be seen in his gospel. His prologue identifies Christ as the Logos through whom all things were created and by whom men were to be enlightened and become sons of God (1:1-14). The Christ he presents is not of the world as are those opposed to Him (8:23). He stresses the necessity of knowledge for man's approach to God (17:3), and of an initiatory sacramental rite (3:1-15). Apocalyptic elements are evident in John's picture of a kingdom which is not of this world (3:3, 5; 18:36), and a future resurrection and judgment (5:28-29).

There is some difficulty in determining the purpose for which John wrote, something which is necessary if one is to correctly perceive the message of the gospel and its contribution to the development of theological thought. There are some indications that John's purpose was simply pastoral, namely to present Christians with a pattern for their life in the world. Due to the developing eschatological thought of the Church, Christians came to realize that the present age, between the glorification of Christ and the parousia, bore a positive place in the history of salvation. Their eyes were turned from the anticipation of the future age to the present age of the Church; John wrote to guide them in this transition.[1]

Other elements in the gospel indicate that John's purpose was

---

[1] See B. Vawter, "The Johannine Sacramentary," Theological Studies, XVII (1956), 152-153.

catechetical as well as pastoral. John had thoroughly absorbed the Christian faith, both in its original statement and in its later development. He then sought to translate what had been couched in Semitic thought-patterns and terminology into contemporary terms, meaningful both for Judaism and the Greek world.[1]

Another opinion holds that John wrote specifically for the Jews of the Diaspora, seeking to demonstrate that Christ is the fulfillment of true Judaism.[2] It must be admitted, though, that John was not an exclusivist. Even if his gospel was directed primarily at Hellenic Judaism, still it defined a salvation which, in the last analysis, is available to all men.

In summary, then, the gospel of John must be recognized as playing a significant role in the development and spread of the Christian mystery. John stood firmly within the Christian tradition, absorbing its truth and its spirit, and translating it into contemporary terms for the benefit of his Judeo-Hellenic world.

The servant image is discernible in this gospel, despite the absence of "servant" as a Christological title. The foundation for this theme is laid at the very beginning of the gospel, where the service which the Word performs is grounded in the incarnation itself. The prologue presents the eternal, divine Word, dwelling with God, possessing all life, being source of life, light, and salvation for men. In order to accomplish

---

[1] Barrett, Gospel, pp. 107-108, 117. Also R.H. Lightfoot, St. John's Gospel (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956), p. 5.

[2] John A.T. Robinson, "The Destination and Purpose of St. John's Gospel," Twelve New Testament Studies (Naperville, Illinois: Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1962), pp. 107-125.

this work among men, the divine Word becomes flesh. He comes to the world, to His own, but is rejected by them. Yet even in the midst of this humiliation and rejection--and precisely because of it--the Word-become-flesh reveals the divine glory. This is a marvelous expression of the paradox of the NT--the Word of God assuming the humiliation and suffering involved in the redeeming incarnation, and thereby revealing God's glory.

Certainly the theme of service is present here. The contrast between glory and humiliation is quite evident, as is the genuine service which the Word performs in favor of men. Other passages show that the glory which He manifests, not only in His very being (1:14), but also in His miracles (2:11) and in His death and exaltation (16:23; 17:4-5), involves His obedient performance of His task, in submission to His Father's will. Hence, this Word stands as Son and as servant;[1] the paradox of the NT is centered in Him.

The account of John the Baptist's witness to Christ is a passage which, according to many Johannine scholars, contains a designation of Christ as suffering servant.[2] Although John does not relate the actual baptism of Christ, his account in 1:29-36 is certainly a presentation of the theological meaning of this event. John the Baptist's statement identifies Christ: "Behold, the lamb of God, who takes away the sin of the world." (1:29, 36) After stating his own position in relation to Christ, the Baptist continues:

---

[1] See Barrett, Gospel, pp. 138-139.

[2] See, for instance, F.M. Braun, "La vie d'en haut," Révue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques, XL (1956), 16. Also, A. Corell, Consummatum Est (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1958): "From the theological point of view, there is unmistakable reference in it to the Suffering Servant of Isaiah." (pp. 55-56)

> I beheld the Spirit descending as a dove from heaven, and it remained upon him. I did not know him, but he who sent me to baptize in water said to me, "The one on whom you see the Spirit come down and remain, is the one who is to baptize in the holy Spirit." And I did see it, and I testify that he is the chosen one of God. (1:32-34)

At first glance, the phrase "who takes away the sin of the world" is the only apparent indication of a servant Christology in this passage. Christ is identified as the one who is to remove the world's sin, who is to take that sin to Himself, identify Himself with it, and then somehow effect a vicarious satisfaction or expiation for it. The allusion to Is 53:12 is clear: "...and he shall take away the sins of many, and win pardon for their offenses."

However, a linguistic study of the same verse has yielded further indications of a servant Christology. The Baptist designates Christ as the "lamb of God." The meaning intended by this "lamb" is not clear, particularly since late Judaism did not commonly describe the Savior as a lamb. Zimmerli[1] finds the proper understanding of this term by falling back on the Aramaic background of the gospel,[2] where both "lamb" and "servant, boy" are possible translations. Accordingly, this verse quite possibly designates Christ as servant.

---

[1] Zimmerli, Servant, pp. 82-83. see back of book for complete title

[2] That there is an Aramaic background for this gospel is generally accepted by Johannine scholars, but there is a great variety of opinions about the precise extent of its influence. A few scholars (Burney, Torrey) have held that the present text of this gospel is a translation of an earlier Aramaic text. Barrett, Gospel, pp. 8-11, weighs the evidence of Aramaic characteristics in the text, and concludes as follows: "It does however seem probable that John, though not translating Aramaic documents, was accustomed to think and speak in Aramaic as well as in Greek....Perhaps it is safest to say that in language as in thought John treads, perhaps not unconsciously, the boundary between the Hellenic and the Semitic." (p. 11)

However, not all critics accept a servant reference in this term "lamb," despite the fact that Is 53:7-8 describes the servant as a lamb. Lightfoot, for example, denies the possibility on the grounds that Is 53: 7-8 speaks of a shearing rather than a slaughter of the servant-lamb.[1] However, Is 53:7 reads, "...like a lamb led to the slaughter or a sheep before the shearers"; moreover, death is explicitly mentioned in vs. 12. Dodd also rejects a servant reference, asserting that John nowhere uses the Isaian doctrine of the servant's expiatory death, and in fact deliberately avoids linking expiation with Christ's death.[2] However, even though John does not assert explicitly that Christ's death was expiatory, surely that is the contextual meaning of passages which describe that death as life-giving for men.[3]

Still others deny the existence of a servant reference in John's use of "lamb," preferring to see here a reference to the lambs offered in the daily temple sacrifices, even though these were not atoning,[4] or more probably, to the paschal lamb.[5] This opinion bears some weight. Since the Passover is a dominant theme in this gospel, it is quite possible that John intended to designate Christ as the perfect paschal lamb through whose blood the new and perfect Passover was to be effected. This interpretation is supported by Jn 19:36, where a reference to the

---

[1] Lightfoot, St. John's Gospel, p. 97.

[2] C.H. Dodd, Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953), p. 236.

[3] Cf. 3:14-16; 10:10--18; 11:49-52; 12:23-33.

[4] Hoskyns, Fourth Gospel, pp. 169-170.

[5] H.H. Rowley, The Unity of the Bible (London: The Carey Kingsgate Press Limited, 1953), p. 134.

paschal lamb is shown to be fulfilled in Christ's death,[1] as well as by earlier NT writings which speak of Christ as the lamb: I Cor 5:7 and I Pet 1:19.

If it is admitted that John intended to make reference to the paschal lamb,--and it seems that such an admission must be made--a servant reference is not thereby excluded. John had read Mark,[2] whose baptismal account had designated Christ as the servant.[3] Moreover, he was surely familiar with the primitive thought of the Church which had seen Christ as the suffering servant (cf. Ac 3:13, 26; 4:27, 30; 8:26-40). These two facts, in addition to the servant references discernible in the rest of the baptismal account, all argue in favor of a servant interpretation.

It would seem, then, that the most accurate interpretation of this text is one which permits a reference to both the paschal lamb and the suffering servant.[4] According to John, Christ is identified at His baptism as the servant whose work is to be accomplished through His paschal death.

In verse 32 John the Baptist bears witness to the fact that the Spirit descended on Christ at this moment of baptism, and that it dwelt on Him. In view of the servant reference found in the mention of the

---

[1] It is difficult to find support for Dodd's statement: "It is therefore unlikely that readers could be expected to catch an allusion to the Passover here, in the absence of any clear indication in the context, or indeed in the gospel at large." Interpretation, pp. 234-235.

[2] See Barrett, Gospel, p. 34.

[3] See above, pp. 49-52. = 21 on p 16

[4] Many scholars resolve the problem by allowing both references. See, for example, Mollat, La Sainte Bible, Jn 1:29, note "e"; Cullmann, Christology, pp. 71-72; R. Brown, "Three Quotations from John the Baptist in the Gospel of John," The Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XXII (1960), 292-298.

lamb or servant who removes the world's sin, it is possible that the evangelist intended to show this as the fulfilment of Is 42:1, the servant song depicting God's spirit being given to the servant as he is chosen by God and sent forth to exercise his mission. The obvious parallelism between these two gifts of the spirit contributes to a recognition of servant Christology in John's baptismal account.

An even more striking indication of the servant theme is to be found in the Baptist's concluding statement: "And I have seen and have borne witness that this is the chosen one of God." The introductory servant poem had related the terms "servant" (ebed), and "chosen one" (bachir). (Is 42:1) The Septuagint had translated this bachir with eklektos. What is significant here is that, although Mt 12:18 had translated with agapetos, a very old and well-documented text of John reverts to eklektos, the word which is closer to the OT text.[1] Other Johannine manuscripts use huios here, but several reputable scholars believe this to be a later harmonization of the text with the Synoptics.[2] John's use of eklektos is particularly significant in view of the earlier clarification of pais ("servant" or "son") by the use of huios (specifically "son") in the Marcan account of the baptism (1:11), and also in view of the Johannine emphasis on Son of God Christology. This, then, is a rather clear indication that John intends to refer here to the servant poem.

In summary, then, these four elements in the passage--the reference

---

[1] Cullmann, Christology, pp. 66-68.

[2] See A. Legault, "Le baptême de Jésus et la doctrine du Serviteur souffrant," Sciences ecclésiastiques, XIII (1961), 149-150. The author indicates his agreement with Jeremias, Mollat, Boismard, Cullmann, Loisy, and Harnack.

to the lamb, the removal of the world's sin, the descent of the Spirit, and the chosen one of God--combine to offer fairly clear evidence of a servant Christology functioning behind this baptismal account in John. Admittedly this is not the only thought pattern operative here. The messianic implications of the event, recognized already in the Marcan narrative, are certainly not discarded by John. A Son of God Christology is probably present also, since this account stands in such close proximity to the prologue. Nevertheless, the servant theme cannot be overlooked. John sees the baptism as the moment when the Word made flesh begins the active fulfilment of His mission of service among men.

Situated within the account of Christ's conversation with Nicodemus, there is a description of the nature and effects of Christ's work which possibly contains some degree of servant Christology. "And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the desert, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up, that those who believe in him may not perish, but may have life everlasting." (3:14-15) Reference is being made to the Israelites' journey through the desert during the great exodus. Those who looked upon the brazen serpent which Moses raised on a standard were cured of the deadly serpent bites from which they suffered. (Num 21:4-9) The event was recalled by the people as a part of the great salvific act by which God had brought His nation to life.

It is not the serpent as such but the lifting up of the serpent which John parallels with Christ's being lifted up. He too must be lifted up in order to bring life to all who look on Him with faith. The word John uses to express this lifting up is ὑψοῦν, a word by which he expresses a two-fold meaning: to lift up on the cross and to exalt. John's familiarity with the Aramaic is a possible source of this ambiguous

meaning, since there both meanings are present, something which is not normally true of the Greek.[1] In this way John is able to bring together the sufferings and death of Christ, on the one hand, and His resurrection and exaltation on the other. But it is precisely this bringing together of suffering and exaltation which is interesting here, since the earlier gospels had not done this. It is possible that John was influenced by Is 52:13, the great poem describing the suffering and death of the servant, which speaks of him thus: "Lo ! my servant shall prosper. He shall be exalted and lifted up, and shall be very high." If such an Isaian influence is present, one can suspect that John's understanding of the work of Christ was somewhat molded by the OT servant image.

Servant Christology reaches a new level of development here. In Mark and the other synoptics, the suffering and glory of Christ are two distinct things, with one standing prior to the other in time. Here, John identifies the two by including them both under one word, thereby expressing a new insight. Christ's suffering and death are no longer seen as a separated causal force in man's redemption, somewhat after the manner of an instrumental cause, but as being an actual constituent of that redemption. According to John's view, Christ's death <u>is</u> His glorification, and this composite act is at once man's redemption; it is the lifting up which itself brings everlasting life to believing man. This new appreciation of the meaning of Christ's death is undoubtedly a result of the more penetrating Christology which had been developed by the end of the first century. A more unified, and in that sense, simplified understanding of the nature of Christ, such as was evident in the prologue, was bound to have repercussions on the Church's understanding of the sufferings and death of Christ. He

---

[1] Barrett, <u>Gospel</u>, pp. 9, 178-179. The same suggestion is made by Lightfoot, though in connection with the "lifting up" mentioned in ch. 12; <u>St. John's Gospel</u>, p. 252.

was the Word of God become man, and the mark of His divinity was on His whole life. Consequently, the suffering and death of this divine Person are man's redemption.

Some significance can be seen in John's choice of an exodus image through which to express his understanding of Christ's work among men. Deutero-Isaiah had projected his suffering servant image against the background of the prophecy of the new exodus, situating the servant's work firmly within the context of that exodus. Certainly the exodus theme is prominent in John's gospel, in the manna, the figure of Moses, the gift of water, the giving of the new commandment, the covenant-situation indicated in the last discourse, the lamb, the Passover feasts. In view of this exodus theme, it is possible that John recognized Christ as the servant who was uniquely instrumental in that new exodus which was His own Passover.

Hence, although this passage contains no explicit references to the servant theme, yet that theme is functioning implicitly in the passage, shaping its thought and its conceptual pattern, and possibly influencing its terminology in the use of ὑψοῦν.

Since the mention of the lifting up of the Son of Man in 3:14 was seen as a possible servant reference, the repetition of this expression in 8:28 should be noted. In 8:21-30, John is presenting Christ's claim to divinity in the midst of the Jews' continual anxiety to learn His identity. It is quite obviously the Word of the prologue who speaks here. He is "from above," "not of this world"; those who reject Him will not be brought to life but will die in their sins. He has been sent from the true Father, and speaks what He has received from the Father. The Father remains with Him, because the Son always does the things that

are pleasing to Him.

A quite similar thought is expressed in 5:19-30, where Christ's relation to His Father is also described. The only word which He speaks in judgment is one which He has received from the Father; and the reason: "...I seek not my own will, but the will of Him who sent me." (5:30)

Both passages are a description of the divine Word as He lives among men, but it is only at His lifting up that His true nature will be recognized by men. "When you have lifted up the Son of Man, then you will know that I am he, and that of myself I do nothing: but that I preach only what the Father has taught me." (8:28)

It is possible to recognize the similarity between this description of the incarnate Word and Isaiah's description of the suffering servant. The servant whom God sends does not speak on his own authority, but is given a well-trained tongue by God, and "morning after morning" receives the word he is to speak (Is 50:4). God finds this servant quite pleasing, and remains with him as his support and strength (42:1). But it is only when he is raised up and exalted by God that he will be recognized by men for what he is (52:13).

Certainly it is not the servant theme which forms the essential content of this Johannine passage, but rather the Son of God theme. The emphasis is predominantly on Christ's divinity. Nevertheless, it is possible that the servant theme played at least a minimal role in the formation of the Johannine Son of God Christology. The ground for this transition from servant Christology to Son of God Christology had already been prepared by the early Christian hesitation between pais and huios as a Christological designation, with a gradual movement toward the latter (cf. Mk 1:11). Here, the prologue had stated that the glory of Christ

was manifest even from the incarnation, but it is in the lifting up of this Son of Man that men come to fully recognize this glory. Hence it is in the exercise of the Word's service of men that His true nature becomes evident: "...then you will know that I am he, and that I preach only what the Father has taught me." (Jn 8:28) In His great act of service, He will be recognized, not simply as the servant foretold by Isaiah, but as the divine Son fulfilling the role of the servant.

A similar reference to the "lifting up" of the Son of Man is to be found in chapter 12, a passage which in many ways is quite close to the account of the passion. The gospel narrative has moved rapidly toward the great closing events of Christ's life: all the incidents bear on this great ending, explaining, preparing for, moving toward it. Lazarus has been raised from the dead, the Jewish council has met to decide the fate of Jesus, He has been anointed at Bethany, and has moved in triumphant procession into the city of Jerusalem amid messianic acclaim. Just as Mark's earlier gospel had tempered Peter's messianic recognition by the prediction of the necessary suffering of the messiah (Mk 8:27-31), so here too the messianic recognition is followed by a similar reference to sufferings.

In 12:20-36, John introduces into the narrative an account which greatly augments the movement toward the passion. Some Greeks had come to Jerusalem to worship at the Passover feast. The approach of these non-Jews[1] represents the initial fulfillment of the Pharasaic complaint:

---

[1]Most commentators believe that the persons represent the Gentile world: see M.-J. Lagrange, Evangile selon Saint Jean (Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1948), p. 329; Hoskyns, Fourth Gospel, p. 423; Bernard, Gospel, p. 429; Lightfoot, St. John's Gospel, p. 240; Barrett, Gospel, p. 350. However, Robinson, "Destination," pp. 111-112, 120, identifies these Greeks as the Jews of the Diaspora. The problem does not bear heavily

"Behold, the entire world has gone after him" (12:19); it also anticipates the drawing together of all things in Christ resulting from His being lifted up (vs. 32). The significance of the moment is seen in the statement: "The hour has come..." (vs. 23), that hour so often anticipated and referred to as imminent. It is the hour toward which the whole existence of Christ had been tending, an hour composed of two elements--glorification and suffering. It is the hour of the glorification of the Son of Man (vs. 23) and of the Father (vss. 27-28); it is likewise the hour of the suffering and death of the Christ (vss. 32-33).

That this death is a necessary constituent of the hour, that it is essential in the glorification, is emphasized through the image of the grain of wheat. Though good in itself, the grain exists in isolation, unproductive, closed in upon itself. In order that new life may spring forth from it, that it may be fruitful, productive, life-giving, it is essential that the grain cease to exist as such. It must "die" in order that a plentitude of life might come from it. What is the law of life in the order of nature is likewise the law of life for the Word in His human nature, and also of those who wish to be identified with that incarnate Word. Life comes through death. An existence closed in upon itself becomes a sterile existence. "Unless the grain of wheat falls into the ground and dies, it remains alone. But if it dies, it brings forth much fruit." (vs. 25) The hour of the Son of Man is effective and fruitful only because it involves His death.

---

on our study, except in so far as its solution could limit the apparent universality of Christ's work expressed in 12:32. But Robinson himself notes that his interpretation in no way suggests that John limits salvation to the Jews; he wrote primarily for a specific audience--Hellenistic Judaism--and expressed the Christian mystery in terms meaningful for that group. (pp. 121-122)

The intense difficulty involved in the option for death is evident in 12:27-30, but it is precisely this difficulty which reveals an essential characteristic of Christ's hour. The passage in question is evidently John's account of the agony in the garden of Gethsemani.[1] Faced with the stark reality of the necessity of His death, Christ cries out: "Now is my soul troubled. And what shall I say? Father, save me from this hour! No, this is why I came to this hour. Father, glorify thy name!" (vs. 27) The momentary anguish of His nature at the thought of death is immediately repressed by the fact that it is this hour which is the very term of Christ's existence. This hour governed both His incarnation and the whole course of His earthly life; it is the goal of His entire existence. Standing in the face of it, Christ makes evident His perfect submission to the whole reality of that goal: "Father, glorify thy name!" It is that total acceptance of His existence as willed by God which is at the heart of Christ's hour; it is essential to His being lifted up in service of many.

It is obvious, then, that this passage contains the same identification of death and exaltation, suffering and glory, which was seen in the earlier passages dealing with the lifting up of the Son of Man. Although the passage does have application to the life of Christians (cf. vs. 26), its primary reference is to Christ and His work. The end of His whole existence as man, an end which specifies the entire nature of that existence, is the hour. It is an hour in which evil is overcome and judgment rendered (vs. 31), an hour bearing the rich harvest of life for many

---

[1]This fact is recognized by most commentators; see, for example, Bernard, Gospel, pp. 435-436. In addition, some find references to the transfiguration, which John fails to present as an independent incident; see Hoskyns, Fourth Gospel, pp. 424-425.

through the death of the single grain, since they are to be drawn to Him in His death and His life (vss. 25, 32). But even before the hour is seen in its results of judgment and life, it is seen in itself as an hour of suffering and death and lifting up on the cross, as an hour of perfect, free commitment to the divine command, and as an hour of glorification for the Father as well as for His Son. Moreover, it is not an hour made up of three successive stages--submission, death, glorification--but an hour in which He submits to His death and glorification in one act: He is simply "lifted up" from the earth.

Consequently, this passage defines the whole meaning of the life of Christ in terms of His service.[1] As was noted above, it is quite possible that this conception of the meaning of Christ was influenced by the OT servant prophecies. The servant foreseen there was one who would give himself in service to death, would be lifted up and exalted, and would win life for many. The linking of death and exaltation within the one word "to lift up," (cf. Is 52:13), and the explicit quotation of Is 53:1 in the verses immediately following the passage under consideration give more specific evidence of the presence of this OT image. John is there reflecting on the incredulity of the Jews and their rejection of Christ, and he quotes the beginning of the last servant song in which the rejection of the servant is described: "Lord, who has believed our report, and to whom has the arm of the Lord been revealed?" It would seem that John intended to make explicit reference to the Isaian thought since the quotation was, strictly speaking, not necessary. The quotation from Is 6:9f, which John utilizes in the following verse (vs. 40) was adequate

---

[1]Barrett writes: "God is glorified in the complete obedience of his servant, and the servant who does not his own will but the will of him that sent him desires only the glory of God." Gospel, p. 354.

of itself to convey the thought. Apparently, then, John does have in mind the fourth servant song. Hence, the Isaian servant image was, to some extent at least, present in the formation of his thought concerning the work of Christ.

Nevertheless, his understanding far surpasses that OT concept. Verse 32, for example, indicates that all are drawn to the servant-Christ, an idea totally lacking in the OT prophecy. Undoubtedly, this NT insight flows from the recognition of the true nature of this servant. The whole Johannine gospel is very much at pains to manifest Christ's union with, and even identity with, the Father. Consequently, He is a divine servant, in whom the notion of service was entirely transformed.

The discourse on the good shepherd in chapter 10, though it contains no explicit servant Christology, undoubtedly presents an explanation of the meaning and effect of Christ's death, and therefore a description of the service which the Word performs on behalf of men. The first part of the discourse presents a contrast between the death-intent of thieves and robbers and the life-intent of the good shepherd. The former come to steal, kill, and destroy; the shepherd comes "that they may have life, and have it more abundantly." (10:10) The following verse clarifies this gift of life. The shepherd does not simply give promise of life, nor manifest only a willingness to give life, but He actually accomplishes His purpose through the surrender of His own life. ὑπὲρ, usually carrying the significance of death (cf. 6:51; 10:11, 15; 11:50ff; 18:14; etc.), indicates here a sacrificial death for the benefit of others.[1] He gives life to the sheep by surrendering His own life.

---

[1]Barrett, Gospel, p. 311.

Verses 17 and 18 contain an interesting insight into the work of the shepherd in relation to His very nature.

> For this reason the Father loves me, because I lay down my life that I may take it up again. No one takes it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have the power to lay it down, and I have the power to take it up again. Such is the command I have received from my Father.

Here the death of Christ is directly related to His resurrection: He lays down His life precisely in order that the resurrection in all its redemptive power can take place.[1] Moreover, He acts in perfect freedom, governed solely by His personal choice to do so. This freedom is stressed very much in verse 18, though the verse also indicates that this death is chosen in response to a command of the Father. This is the same divine imperative which found expression in the typical synoptic statement: "The Son of Man must suffer..." (Mk 8:31).[2] Consequently, John understands the death and resurrection of Christ as an act of perfectly free obedience to the divine command. But it is precisely this understanding which permits John to relate the work of Christ to His incarnation and therefore to His very nature. God willed that His Son effect the redemption of men (cf. 3:16), a command or will which is then somehow involved in the very act by which the Son is constituted the Son. Moreover, the Son's response to that command is also involved in His very constitution as Son: "For this reason the Father loves me, because I lay down my life..." (10:17) Consequently, John sees the love of the Father for the Son and the Son's response in full obedience and submission as reciprocally dependent on each other.[3] The service which the Word, the good shepherd,

---

[1]Bernard, Gospel, p. 364.

[2]Hoskyns, Fourth Gospel, pp. 379-380.

[3]Barrett, Gospel, p. 313.

renders on behalf of men is somehow bound up with His very nature; He is the servant-Son.

Chapter 10 thus examines the nature of Christ's work for men under the image of the good shepherd. Prompted by loving concern for the sheep and by a freely obedient response to the Father's command, the shepherd gives His life and takes it up again, and in so doing wins abundance of life for the sheep. The passage reveals John's depth of insight into the Christ-mystery, for in it he relates Christ's service of men to His very nature. It was God's loving command which prompted and specified the incarnation. By the same token, Christ's response to that love and that command is involved in His very nature. His is a redemptive incarnation.

Certainly there is no explicit servant Christology present here. However, because of the description of Christ's work as a giving of His life for the life of many, and because He did this in free response to the divine command, it is possible that the servant theme lies in the background of this passage, while on the surface a servant Christology is subsumed into a larger, more extensive Son of God Christology.

In connection with the explicit stating of the fact that Christ's service involves a giving of His life that others may have an abundance of life (cf. 10:10-11), brief mention must be made of a similar statement in the Eucharistic discourse (Jn 6:52). There, frequent mention is made of "life." The people had tasted the bread miraculously multiplied, but were immediately urged to seek other, life-giving bread, "...that which endures unto life everlasting, which the Son of Man will give you." (6:27) That bread far surpasses the manna; it is the bread "which comes down from heaven and gives life to the world" (vs. 33); it is, in fact,

Christ himself. "I am the living bread that has come down from heaven." (vs. 51)

The gift, however, was not a metaphorical one--"...the bread that I will give is my flesh for the life of the world" (6:52)--but rather a gift as real as the death and exaltation of Christ which are required for that gift. This verse indicates that Christ's work among men involves a giving of His flesh to death, an interpretation which is supported by the passover framework of the whole discourse, as well as by the use of ὑπὲρ which is indicative of a sacrificial death. The verse also gives testimony to the fact that this gift of His life is intended to bring life to the world.

This passage is, admittedly, some distance removed from an explicit servant Christology, but it does serve to clarify the nature and purpose of Christ's service among men, once it has been recognized that Christ does perform the task of the servant.

Another expression of the mission of service which Christ received from His Father is present in the use of the word "to sanctify" in 10:36 and 17:17,19. The term itself, though not common in the NT, indicates a setting aside, a dedicating of someone to a sacred mission, a dedication which involves the bestowal of the required gifts for the proper fulfillment of the mission.[1] The term as such does not bear sacrificial implications, though the context of its use in 17:17 and 19 is that of the sacrificial death of Christ, particularly evident in the use of ὑπὲρ.[2]

---

[1] Lagrange, Evangile, p. 291.

[2] Barrett, Gospel, p. 426. Barrett refers to Jn 11:50-52; 10:13; and Mk 10:45. Cf., however, Hoskyns, Fourth Gospel, p. 503, who does see sacrificial overtones in the word itself.

In any event, the word designates a setting aside of the person in an irrevocable manner. Consequently, the word is most appropriate to use as a description of Christ, both in His nature and His work. In 10:36 He speaks of Himself as being sanctified or dedicated by the Father, and sent into the world as messenger, thereby giving witness to the divine origin of His mission, as well as His own unique relation to the Father. The reference in chapter 17 is similar. Standing as great high-priest at the last supper, He prays that His disciples will be consecrated just as He was, since He is sending them into the world in His name. "And it is for their sake that I consecrate myself, that they also may be consecrated by the truth." (17:19) His own consecration to the Father's service is done for their sake and in view of their consecration: He is dedicated so that they may be united with Him in that dedication.

This thought would seem to bear servant overtones, for Christ is described in terms of His being consecrated by God to the divine service, (the usage in 17:19 does not greatly alter the meaning, even though Christ there speaks of consecrating Himself), set apart for this sacred mission, and sent forth from the Father for the actual accomplishment of that mission. The theme of service is recognizable here.[1] It is apparent from the context of both passages, however, that more than a merely human service is meant. The subject discussed in 10:22-39 is Christ's relation to the Father, and therefore His divinity; chapter 17 deals with

---

[1] Barrett, Gospel, p. 426, writes: "To consecrate oneself is the act of a servant of God, who makes himself ready for his divinely appointed task..." Barrett's recognition of a servant theme here is specially significant in view of his reluctance to admit Isaian influence in the gospels at large; see above, p.55, note.4 .

the same theme, but specifically relates to His great redemptive mission. Hence, the service to which He is dedicated is more than that of the official figures in OT history,--king, priest, prophet--more even than that of the suffering servant of Isaiah; His service is unique since it is that of the Son who is God.

In the aftermath of the miracle of Lazarus' resurrection, John presents a very brief account of a meeting of the Jewish council (Jn 11: 47-53). Disturbed by the signs of Jesus and by the interest and receptivity of the people, the council determines the death of Christ. The narrative is a superb example of Johannine irony: the chief priests complain that if the activity of Jesus remains unchecked, "all will believe in him, and the Romans will come and take away both our place and our nation." (11:48) Seeking to remove their consternation, Caiphas, the high-priest that year,[1] speaks of expediency in having one man die for the people rather than the whole nation having to perish (vs. 50). John comments that his political wisdom was the vehicle of inspired prophecy. Jesus was indeed to die for the nation. Moreover, the effects of His death were to accrue, not only to the nation, but to the scattered children of God who were to be brought into one by that death (vs. 52). The reference here is perhaps to the Jews scattered among the Greeks by the dispersion, but the phrase surely also included the gentile world.[2]

---

[1]Bernard notes that the office of high priest was theoretically held for life, but in the practical order was dependent on the whim of civil authority; Gospel, p. 404. John's statement that he was high priest "that year," therefore, does not reveal ignorance of the historical situation, and cannot be used as evidence for late dating or non-Johannine authorship.

[2]See Bernard, Gospel, pp. 406-407.

The incident related here is derived from a tradition stemming from a Palestinian Jewish-Christian circle. The Jewish influence is evident in the appreciation of the prophetic power of the high priest, and in the conscious solidarity with Israel as a whole; the Christian influence can be seen in the appreciation of Christ's death as a ransom.[1] In any event, it becomes for John an expression of the significance of Christ's death, namely, that it will bring life and unification to all those who are the children of God. This unity, the "gathering into one," bears some resemblance to another statement describing the effect of Christ's death: "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all things to myself." (12:32) John seems to indicate that it is in the uplifted Christ, the suffering and exalted Christ, that men are to be united.

Accordingly, the passage is a reiteration and extension of the thought introduced in the prologue: the Word was sent among men to bring them life, and to make them sons of God (1:3-4, 12). It is an elaboration of a Christological understanding which has been formed by the servant theme: Christ gives His life for the benefit of the many.

A final passage to be considered is that which relates the footwashing incident (13:1-20). It is not without significance that this passage introduces the entire final section of the gospel, a section which begins with a reference to the Passover, and continues with the account of the suffering, death, and resurrection which were involved in that Passover. The footwashing stands as a symbolic statement or acted

---

[1] C.H. Dodd, "The Prophecy of Caiphas (Jn 11:47-53)," Neotestamentica et Patristica, V. vi, ed. W.C. Van Unnik et al. (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1962), pp. 134-143.

parable of the meaning of the Passover; the significance of the whole passion is made evident through the action and word of Christ as He washes the feet of the disciples. Conversely, the incident itself derives its whole meaning from the passion: it is both built on and interpretive of it.

Verses 1 and 3 stand as general introduction both to this particular account and to the entire closing section of the gospel. "Before the feast of the Passover, Jesus, knowing that the hour had come for him to pass out of the world to the Father, having loved his own who were in the world, loved them to the end." (vs. 1) The gospel narrative here reaches a climax: the hour so long anticipated had arrived. Christ is presented as one who is totally conscious of His nature and destiny, freely moving toward that destiny, prompted by the most intense love for "His own." Some clarification of this Christological portrait is given in verse 3: "...Jesus, knowing that the Father had given all things into his hands, and that he had come forth from God and was going to God, rose from the supper..." As John sees it, Christ understands in a total way who He is. He sees Himself, not only as one tending toward union with the Father, but more specifically as one who shares all things with the Father, drawing His existence in every way from Him, and tending back toward full existence in Him. In other words, the Christ whom John sees as entering here on the actual exercise of the redeeming mission is the Christ who is fully aware of His divinity in total union with the Father, aware of His full authority over all existence, and aware of the nature of the mission entrusted to Him by the Father.

John seems to emphasize the striking contrast between the actual identity of Christ and the meanness of the task He performs in the

footwashing. Knowing Himself to be the divine Son exercising full authority over all existence, He still performs this menial service for the disciples. Though verses 2-5 might perhaps be interpreted as meaning that Christ performed such service despite His exalted position, the more accurate interpretation would seem to be that Christ served precisely because of His status. Knowing Himself to be in perfect union with His Father, He rose to wash the feet of the disciples. Then, if this interpretation be correct, it becomes quite obvious that the service of the Son is an indispensable part of His nature and His mission: service is an integral element in His redemptive incarnation.

The type of service which John narrates is that which is peculiarly characteristic of a servant or slave. The Midrash on Abraham's dismissal of Hagar indicates that the girding with the towel was a commonly accepted designation of a slave,[1] and I K 25:41 speaks of the washing of another's feet as the most characteristic action of a servant. Christ chooses, then, the most humbling of tasks to dramatize in symbolic form the service which His passion and death are to be for men, and not only to dramatize but also to actually begin His service of men which is their salvation. The extent of His humble service is further emphasized by the fact that it is performed within the context of a fraternal meal, a situation characterized by brotherly love and equality rather than by abnegation of one person before others. The presence of Judas is particularly striking in this situation, emphasizing still more the service which Christ renders, even to a betrayer.

The significance of this incident is much debated by Johannine scholars. Some view it as merely furnishing an example of humility and charity, a moral exhortation; others detect varying degrees of sacramental

---

[1] Hoskyns, Fourth Gospel, p. 437.

symbolism in connection with baptism, penance, and even the Eucharist.[1] Certainly the incident of the footwashing is applied to the life of the Christian, particularly in verses 14-16. Nevertheless, the primary insight reveals the divine Son in the midst of a symbolic gesture of service in favor of man. Always it is the divine Son who acts, the Son who knows full well that He is the Son. However, He knows too that He has been sent by the Father into the world, and that the hour has come for His return to the Father. Knowing this, and acting on that knowledge, He inaugurates the return to the Father by this gesture of service, a gesture which stands as visible commentary on the more comprehensive gesture of service which is to be the actual gift of His life for men.[2] Furthermore, His service neither negates His divine supremacy nor obliterates His glory; rather, His glory is made evident in the midst of service and because of that service: "Now is the Son of Man glorified, and God is glorified in him." (13:31)

Servant Christology is quite obvious in this passage; it is perhaps the most striking use of that Christology in the whole gospel. It is not, however, the same servant Christology which was popular in the earliest days of the Church, but one which is in accord with the Church's

---

[1] A discussion of this problem is not to the point here; an adequate summary of the various positions can be found in Hoskyns, Fourth Gospel, pp. 436-437. See also J.A.T. Robinson, "The Significance of the Foot-Washing," Neotestamentica et Patristica, V. vi, pp. 144-147.

[2] If the meal at which this incident occurred was in fact the Eucharistic meal, then another level of signification becomes apparent. The footwashing then stands as visible commentary on the Eucharistic gift of self in the bread and wine, thereby identifying Christ's service at this time with the establishment of the new Covenant. This identification marks the fulfillment of an insight which was first introduced by Deutero-Isaiah (see above, p.11), only implicitly presented in Peter (pp.41-42), and more explicitly developed in Mark (pp.57-58).

later, more developed understanding of the incarnate Word and His mission among men. Christ fulfills the function of the servant, but does so according to His nature as Son of God.

## Relation to Total Christology

This study has isolated and analyzed the servant Christology of the fourth gospel. It remains yet to situate this more clearly within the over-all Christological insight of the gospel. What this total Christology is becomes evident in 20:31, a succinct statement of the gospel's purpose: "But these (signs) are written that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing you may have life in his name." John desires to have men recognize Jesus as the Christ, the Son of God.[1] He is apparently quite concerned to show that Jesus is the awaited Messiah, the Christ, but in a way far surpassing all Jewish expectations. He is the Christ who is the Son of God. This latter stands, then, as most basic and most radical Christology of the gospel.

John introduces his Christ in the prologue as the pre-existent divine Word, perfectly one with the Father, possessing fulness of life, and active somehow in the creation of all things in existence. Taking flesh to Himself, He becomes the God-man, God living as man, God incarnate. As such He lives among men, manifesting His glory and revealing His Father.

It is this incarnate God, God's Son and His Word, who moves through the whole of the gospel, performing the mission for which He was sent,

---

[1] According to Robinson's theory, John's central purpose was to present Christ as the fulfillment of Judaism, as the Christ in the fullest sense of the term, as the Messiah. This Christology, he believes, is closely related to that of the Son of God, with the former greatly influencing the development of the latter. "Destination," pp. 114-115.

manifesting His Father and leading men to Him. He prompts in men a faith-response to Himself and His Father, leading them from a recognition of His human existence (9:11) into an awareness of His messianic and prophetic nature (9:17; 12:13), and finally into faith in Himself as Son of God (9:35-38; 11:27; 20:28). But always He stands as divine, as transcendent, the one "from above" who is not "of this world" (cf. 3:31-36; 5:18-47; 8:21-58; 10:31-39; 17:10, 21).

It is in the general context of this Christology that the servant theme is presented. Christ is sent from the Father and dedicated to a mission of service; He is God's messenger who speaks only the word of the Father and exercises only the judgment of the Father. His mission is one of service to the Father through loving obedience to His command, and service of men through the ultimate gift of His life in order that they might have the fulness of genuine life. The gospel presents this service as an integral part of His revelation of the Father. Through His service He sacramentalizes--in the fullest sense of that term--God's love for man, and seeks man's faith-response. His service has then, in the Johannine view, an integral place in the very redemptive incarnation itself. It does not stand isolated from His whole meaning as Son of God, nor does it even stand parallel to His nature as Son. Rather, service is essential to His Sonship.

John, however, avoids "servant" as a Christological designation. Several explanations of this fact can be conjectured. Perhaps the most basic reason is that "servant" was not a common Christological title in the Church of John's day, and he wrote to express the sacred tradition rather than to alter it. Secondly, the title would have been rather meaningless to John's readers. If these were Gentiles, then the title

would certainly have been avoided, suggesting as it did lowliness and degradation. Even among Jews the title was not popular, since it was not a part of their common messianic thought. Thirdly, John was evidently in touch with the theological and philosophical thought currents of his day, and could undoubtedly foresee the misunderstandings which the title would have occasioned. Since the title had been used in the very early Church to designate the earthly work of the man Jesus,[1] it is possible that John's use of it could have played into the hands of the Adoptionists for whom Christ was a man who was made God at some point of His earthly life. Furthermore, because the Greek world saw in the term lowliness and inferiority, the Gnostics could have utilized it as support of their doctrine of a lesser deity. Fourthly, it is possible that Jn 14:15 contributes some explanation of John's avoidance of the title "servant." That verse, addressed to the disciples during the last discourse, speaks of the relation between Christ and Christians: "No longer do I call you servants, because the servant does not know what his master does. But I have called you friends, because all things that I have heard from my Father I have made known to you." Christians are not to be called "servants" because of their knowledge of the Father. Neither is "servant" an appropriate title for Christ, then, on the basis of His union with and perfect knowledge of the Father, which the whole gospel has been careful to demonstrate: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." (1:1) "All things that the Father has are mine..." (16:14) Finally, and perhaps more importantly, "servant" could not adequately express John's most characteristic Christology, at least in the sense which that term "servant" possessed in the early Church.

---

[1] See above, pp. 61-64.

Nevertheless, the servant theme does provide a valid understanding of the work of Christ among men. Even though John avoids it as a specific Christological designation, he must have been conscious of its peculiar relevance for his hearers. For a Church in persecution, an understanding of Christ as suffering servant was particularly appropriate. For a Church which was only beginning to grasp the meaning and reality of its position in the world, the servant theme was uniquely valuable in providing a pattern for Christian life in the world. For a Church which was beginning to form a more definite hierarchical structure, an insight into the nature of the authority exercised by the servant-Christ was an invaluable guide. And finally, for a Church in which an explicit sacramental theology was emerging, particularly a Eucharistic and a baptismal theology, an adequate understanding of the service which constituted Christ's redeeming activity was essential. Therefore, the Johannine Christology did not reject the servant theme, but gave it a more valid understanding by situating it in the more comprehensive Son of God Christology. In this larger context, service is seen as an essential factor in the incarnation and the redemptive work of the Son of God, and as a service which is performed precisely by that Son of God.

## CHAPTER IV

## COMPARISON AND CONCLUSION

At the outset of this study, reference was made to the belief that Peter and John possessed the same background stemming from their position in Judaism, their alleged connection with John the Baptist, and their relationship with Christ and the early Church. Yet the study has revealed two radically different Christologies in their writings. Here we shall briefly compare these Christologies in order to determine the cause of the divergence.

It is not possible to make a summary statement about the Petrine servant Christology since two stages of its development are evident. Acts presents an extremely primitive servant Christology, in which the service in question is viewed as the earthly work of Jesus of Nazareth. It is in this capacity that He is given the explicit title of "servant." The sufferings through which He executed this service are viewed as being planned by God, but they are not explicitly presented as possessing positive redemptive value. Repentance and remission of sins can be made available to men by this Jesus only after His resurrection has established Him as risen Lord and Christ, constituting Him as judge of men.

The later Petrine thought is seen in I Peter and in Mark. (The thought is more clearly evident in Mark; the lack of explicit Christological presentation in I Peter is undoubtedly due to the purpose which

governed the writing of the epistle.) According to this later Petrine thought, the service of Christ is not limited to His actual passion and death; rather it is seen as beginning with His baptism in the Jordan, continuing through His entire life, and reaching a climax in His suffering and crucifixion. The sufferings are no longer seen as simply in accord with God's plan, but as actually necessary, since they constitute the purpose for which the Son of Man had come. The one who thus suffers is not simply the man Jesus, but the divine Person, one for whom the title "servant" is not adequate. Moreover, because of the nature of this divine Person, the service He performs bears redemptive power; it is this service, and not simply the glory following this service, which brings redemption and remission of sins to man.

The Johannine thought, on the other hand, reveals a much more developed servant Christology. Here the service of Christ is seen as extending from His incarnation through the lifting up which is both His suffering and His exaltation. The sufferings are essential to His service of men, as necessary as is the death of the grain of wheat for its fecundity. Moreover, the sufferings bear the full redemptive power within them; they are actually one with the glorification. This identification of suffering and glory is indicated by the use of the single term "lifting up." The one who performs this service is the divine Son, the incarnate Word, whose service is an integral part of His nature and His mission. He is not defined primarily in terms of His service, and hence the title "servant" is avoided. On the contrary, His service is defined in terms of His person, that is, His service is shown as integrally bound up with his Sonship, His incarnation and His redemption of men. Finally, the effects of this Son's service are more explicitly stated: the Father and the Son are

glorified, the true nature and work of the Son are revealed, evil is overcome and judgment rendered, and life is conferred on men as they are drawn into unity in the Son.

Several reasons for this divergence can be offered. The most obvious reason is the individuality of the writers. Personality, temperament, interests, and depth of personal faith all bear heavily on the type of writing produced and on the manner in which the truth is expressed.

Secondly, the historical, cultural, political, and religious situation of the world to which each writer addressed himself also exercised some influence on the Scriptural presentation. In the earliest stages of the Petrine tradition, Peter addressed a world which needed a simple but convincing explanation of the great events which had just occurred in Jerusalem, particularly an explanation of the crucifixion, for which an OT apologetic was valuable. In his later writings, Peter addressed a Church which was faced with the problem of persecution and suffering, a Church which was forced to interpret Christian principles in terms of involvement in the contemporary world, and a gentile world which had to see the timeless truth of Christianity as relevant to itself. The world John addressed was rather different. It was a world which needed the initial or strengthening gift of faith, Christian truth to correct error, hope and guidance in time of persecution and defection, and an understanding of its own age as the age of the Church. Differing purposes and needs should have governed somewhat the manner in which each writer presented the truth of Christ.

Thirdly, and most importantly, the difference between the Petrine and the Johannine servant Christologies stems from the difference in the Church's understanding of the total Christian mystery, particularly the

mystery of the person of Christ Himself, since this was the framework within which servant Christology was presented. The early Petrine thought in Acts was a very primitive and undeveloped view of the person and work of Christ. He was seen primarily as the risen Lord who was established in glory by His resurrection. In a separate glance, as it were, the Church looked back to His earthly life, and saw there the man Jesus of Nazareth exercising a work of service for the benefit of man. In the later Petrine writings, I Peter and Mark, the Church had reached a deeper and more total grasp of the nature of Christ: He was a divine Person, and had been such even during His earthly life. This understanding carried over into the Church's grasp of the work of this divine Person. Since He was divine when He performed His mission, then this service bore His divine Power. Together with the glorification which was its result, His service was the cause of man's redemption.

By the time the Johannine tradition was formulated, the Church's understanding, both of the nature and the work of Christ, was much more profound. Christ is the Son of God; He was this in His pre-existence as the divine Word, in His incarnation, through His earthly life, at His "lifting up" on the cross and in glory, and through the whole time of His being lifted up. Not only His nature, but His work too, was seen in a broader dimension: its character and its effects were clarified. Finally, these two deepened understandings--of Christ's nature as Son and of His work--were inter-related and identified. His work was seen as an integral part of His very nature. Consequently, the Christological view here is much more total and more unified, viewing the servant theme only within the context of the over-all Son of God theme.

Therefore, the Church's growth in Christological insight is proposed here as the essential reason for the divergent use of servant Christology in the Petrine and the Johannine traditions. Initially in the Petrine tradition, servant Christology stood parallel to a risen Lord Christology; later in that tradition, it began to relate to a Son of God Christology; finally, in the Johannine tradition, it was completely subsumed into that larger and more comprehensive Son of God Christology.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

## Scripture and Commentaries


The Bible: An American Translation. Translated by J.M. Powis Smith and Edgar J. Goodspeed. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1948.

The Holy Bible: Confraternity Edition. New York: Benziger Brothers, Inc., 1961.

Barnett, Albert E. "The Second Epistle of Peter," The Interpreter's Bible. Edited by George Arthur Buttrick et al. Vol. XII. New York: Abingdon Press, 1957. Pp. 163-206.

Barrett, C.K. The Gospel According to St. John. London: SPCK, 1955.

_____. "John," Peake's Commentary on the Bible. Edited by Matthew Black and H.H. Rowley. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, Ltd., 1962. Pp. 844-869.

Beare, Francis Wright. The First Epistle of Peter. (Oxford: B. Blackwell, 1947.)

Bernard, J. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel of St. John: The International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1928.

Bigg, Charles. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude: The International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1901.

Brown, Raymond E., S.S. The Gospel of St. John and the Johannine Epistles. The New Testament Reading Guide. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1960.

Bruce, F.F. The Acts of the Apostles. London: The Tyndale Press, 1951.

Cantinat, J. "La Première Epitre de Saint Pierre," Introduction à la Bible. Vol. II. Edited by A. Robert and A. Feuillet. Tournai: Desclée and Co., 1959. Pp. 577-589.

Cerfaux, L. Les Actes des Apôtres. La Sainte Bible. Paris: Les éditions du Cerf, 1958.

Chase, F.H. "Peter, First Epistle," Dictionary of the Bible. Vol. III. Edited by James Hastings. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1907.

Cranfield, C.E.B. The Gospel According to St. Mark. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959.

Dodd, C.H. Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953.

Feuillet, A. "Le quatrième évangile," Introduction à la Bible. Vol. II Edited by A. Robert and A. Feuillet. Tournai: Desclée and Co., 1959. Pp. 614-679.

Fillion, L. "Pierre (Première Epitre de Saint)," Dictionnaire de la Bible. Vol. V. Edited by F. Vigouroux. Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1895.

Gould, Ezra P. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Mark: The International Critical Commentary. Edinbourgh: T. and T. Clark, 1896.

Grant, Frederick C. "The Gospel According to St. Mark: Introduction and Exegesis," The Interpreter's Bible. Vol. VII. Edited by George Arthur Buttrick et al. New York: Abingdon Press, 1951. Pp. 629-917.

Hoskyns, E. The Fourth Gospel. London: Faber and Faber Limited, 1947.

Howard, Wilbert F. "John," The Interpreter's Bible. Vol. VIII. Edited by George Arthur Buttrick, et al. New York: Abingdon Press, 1957. Pp. 437-462.

Huby, R.P.J., S.J. L'Evangile selon saint Marc. La Sainte Bible. Paris: Les éditions du Cerf, 1953.

Hunter, Archibald M. "I Peter," The Interpreter's Bible. Vol. XII. Edited by George Arthur Buttrick, et al. New York: Abingdon Press, 1957. Pp. 77-159.

Lagrange, P.M.-J., O.P. Evangile selon saint Jean. Paris: J. Gabalda, 1948.

Leconte, R. Les Epitres Catholiques. La Sainte Bible. Paris: Les éditions du Cerf, 1961.

Lightfoot, R.H. St. John's Gospel: A Commentary. Edited by C.F. Evans. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956.

Macgregor, G.H.C. "The Acts of the Apostles," The Interpreter's Bible. Vol. IX. Edited by George Arthur Buttrick, et al. New York: Abingdon Press, 1954. Pp. 3-352.

Maly, Eugene H. The Epistles of Saints James, Jude, Peter. New Testament Reading Guide. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1960.

Mollat, D. L'Evangile de Saint Jean. La Sainte Bible. Paris: Les éditions du Cerf, 1953.

Muilenburg, James. "The Book of Isaiah," The Interpreter's Bible. Vol. V. Edited by George Arthur Buttrick, et al. New York: Abingdon Press, 1956. Pp. 381-419.

Selwyn, Edward Gordon. The First Epistle of St. Peter. London: Macmillan and Co., 1947.

Tasker, R.V.G. The Gospel According to St. John. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Erdmans Publishing Co., 1960.

Tricot, A. "Pierre (Saint) I Epitre," Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique. Vol. XII. Edited by A. Vacant, et al. Paris: Librairie Letouzey et Ané, 1933. Pp. 1753-1775.

Van Unnik, W.C. "First Letter of Peter," The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. Vol. III. Edited by George Arthur Buttrick, et al. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962. Pp. 758-766.

Books

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

Bacon, Benjamin Wisner. The Beginnings of Gospel Story. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1909.

Carpenter, Levy L. Primitive Christian Application of the Doctrine of the Servant. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 1929.

Chapman, John, O.S.B. Matthew, Mark, and Luke. Edited by John M.T. Barton. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1937.

Chevallier, Max-Alain. L'Esprit et le messie dans le bas-Judaisme et le nouveau testament. Vol. IL of Etudes d'histoire et de philosophie réligieuses. Edited by R. Mehl. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1958.

Corell, Alf. Consummatum Est. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1958.

Cullmann, Oscar. The Christology of the New Testament. Translated by Shirley Guthrie and Charles Hull. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1963.

Dodd, C.H. The Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1935.

Dupont, Jacques, O.S.B. The Sources of the Acts. Translated by Kathleen Pond. New York: Herder and Herder, 1964.

Farrer, Austin. A Study in St. Mark. Westminster: Dacre Press, 1951.

Filson, Floyd V. A New Testament History: The Story of the Emerging Church. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1964.

Grant, Frederick, C. The Earliest Gospel. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1943.

Grossouw, William. Revelation and Redemption. Translated by Martin W. Schoenberg, O.S.C. Westminster, Maryland: Newman Press, 1955.

Hooker, Morna D. Jesus and the Servant. London: SPCK, 1959.

Howard, W.F. Christianity According to St. John. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1946.

Manson, T.W. The Servant-Messiah. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1956.

Manson, William. Jesus the Messiah. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1946.

Menoud, Philippe-H. L'Evangile de Jean: D'apres les recherches recentes. Paris: Neuchatel, Delachaux, et Niestle, 1947.

North, Christopher, R. The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah. London: Oxford University Press, 1956.

Nunn, H.P.V. The Authorship of the Fourth Gospel. London: Alden & Blackwell, 1952.

Pirot, Jean. Paraboles et allegories evangeliques. Paris: P. Lethielleux, 1949.

Ringgren, Helmer. The Messiah in the Old Testament. Vol. XVIII of Studies in Biblical Theology. Chicago: A.R. Allenson, 1956.

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

_____. The Unity of the Bible. London: The Carey Kingsgate Press Limited, 1953.

van der Ploeg, J.S., O.P. Les chants du Serviteur de Jahve. Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1936.

Zimmerli, W. and Jeremias, J. The Servant of God. Vol. XX of Studies in Biblical Theology. Translated by Harold Knight from "Pais Theou" in Kittel's Theologisches Worterbuch Zum NT. Naperville, Illinois: A.R. Allenson, 1957.

Articles and Periodicals

Augrain, Charles and Lacon, Marc-François. "Serviteur de Dieu," Vocabulaire de théologie Biblique. Edited by Xavier Léon-Dufour. Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1962. Col. 1012-1015.

Barrett, C.K. "Lamb of God," New Testament Studies, I (1955), 210-218.

_____. "The Background of Mark 10:45," New Testament Essays. Edited by A.J.B. Higgins. Manchester, England: Manchester University Press, 1959. Pp. 1-18.

Black, Matthew. "Servant of the Lord and Son of Man," Scottish Journal of Theology, VI (1953), 1-11.

Boismard, M.-E., O.P. "La typologie baptismale dans la première Epitre de saint Pierre," La Vie Spirituelle, XCIV (April, 1956), 339-352.

_____. "Une Liturgie baptismale dans la prima Petri," Révue Biblique, LXIII (1956), 182-208, and LXIV (1957), 161-183.

Braun, F.M., O.P. "La vie d'en haut," Révue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques, XL (1956), 3-24.

Braun, F.M., O.P. "L'eau et L'Esprit," Révue Thomiste, IL (1949), 5-30.

Brown, Raymond E., S.S. "The Messianism of Qumran," The Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XIX (1957), 53-82.

_____. "Three Quotations from John the Baptist in the Gospel of John," The Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XXII (1960), 292-298.

Cazelles, Henri. "Les poèmes du Serviteur," Récherches de science réligieuse, XLIII (1955), 5-51.

Craig, Clarence Tucker. "The Identification of Jesus with the Suffering Servant," Journal of Religion, XXIV (1944), 240-245.

Dodd, C.H. "The Prophecy of Caiaphas (Jn 11:47-53)," Neotestamentica et Patristica. Vol. VI. Edited by W.C. Van Unnik, et al. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1962. Pp. 134-143.

Dupont, J. "L'Utilization apologetique de l'ancien testament," Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses, XXIX (1953), 289-327.

Durken, Daniel, O.S.B. "First Peter," Worship, IXXX (July, 1955), 382-384.

Feuillet, André, P.S.S. "Le baptême de Jésus d'apres l'évangile selon S.Marc," The Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XXI (1959), 468-490.

Funk, Robert. "Humiliation-Exaltation: The Structure of the New Testament Proclamation," The Drew Gateway, XXX (1960), 143-150.

Giblet, Jean. "Jésus, Serviteur de Dieu," Lumiere et Vie, VII (1958), 5-34.

Howton, Dom John. "'Son of God' in the Fourth Gospel," New Testament Studies, X (1963-1964), 227-237.

Johnston, George. "The Servant Image in the New Testament," Theology Today, XV (1958), 321-332.

Leaney, A.R.C. "I Peter and the Passover: An Interpretation," New Testa- Studies, X (1964), 238-251.

Legault, André, C.S.C. "Le baptême de Jésus et la doctrine du Serviteur souffrant," Sciences ecclésiastiques, XIII (1961), 147-166.

Lennox, Robert. "The Servant of Jahweh in the Old Testament," Theology Today, XV (1958-1959), 315-320.

Love, Julian Price. "The First Epistle of Peter, "Interpretation, VIII (1954), 63-87.

Mackay, John A. "The Form of a Servant," Theology Today, XV (1958-1959), 304-314.

Masson, Charles. "Serviteur de Dieu et Fils de David," Révue de théologie et de philosophie, n.s., XXXIV (1946), 175-180.

McCool, F.J., S.J. "Revival of Synoptic Source-Criticism," Theological Studies, XVII (1956), 459-493.

Menard, Jacques-E., S.S. "Pais Theou as Messianic Title in the Book of Acts," The Catholic Biblical Quarterly, IXX (1957), 83-92.

Moule, C.F.D. "The Nature and Purpose of I Peter," New Testament Studies, III (1956-1957), 1-11.

Mudge, Lewis, S. "The Servant Lord and His Servant People," Scottish Journal of Theology, XII (1959), 113-128.

Murphy, Richard T. "Second Isaias: The Servant of the Lord," The Catholic Biblical Quarterly, IX (1947), 262-274.

North, C.R. "Servant of the Lord," The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, Vol. IV. Edited by George Arthur Buttrick, et al. New York: The Abingdon Press, 1962. Pp. 292-294.

Peifer, Claude, O.S.B. "Primitive Liturgy in the Formation of the Gospels," The Bible Today, I (October, 1962), 15-21.

Preiss, Théo. "Le fils de l'homme: probleme du Serviteur de L'Eternel," Etudes théologiques et religieuses, XXVI (1951), 51-69.

Quasten, John. "The Parable of the Good Shepherd: Jn 10:1-21," The Catholic Biblical Quarterly, X (1948), 1-12, 151-169.

Robinson, John A.T. "The Baptism of John and the Qumran Community," The Harvard Theological Review, L (1957), 175-191.

_____. "The Destination and Purpose of St. John's Gospel," Twelve New Testament Studies. Naperville, Illinois: Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1962.

_____. "The Most Primitive Christology of All?" Twelve New Testament Studies. Naperville, Illinois: Alec. R. Allenson, Inc., 1962. Pp. 139-153.

_____. "The New Look on the Fourth Gospel," Twelve New Testament Studies. Naperville, Illinois: Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1962. Pp. 94-106.

_____. "The Significance of the Foot-Washing," Neotestamentica et Patristica. Vol. VI. Edited by W.C. Van Unnik, et al. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1962. Pp. 144-147.

Ryan, William, F.J., S.J. "The Church as the Servant of God in Acts," Scripture, XV (1963), 110-115.

Selwyn, E.G. "Eschatology in I Peter," The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology. Edited by W.D. Davies and D. Daube. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964. Pp. 394-401.

Stanley, David M. "The Theme of the Servant of Jahweh in Primitive Christian Soteriology and Its Transposition by St. Paul," The Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XVI (October, 1954), 385-425.

Strachan, R.H. "The Gospel in the New Testament," The Interpreter's Bible, Vol. VII. Edited by George Arthur Buttrick, et al. New York: Abingdon Press, 1951. Pp. 3-31.

Taylor, Vincent. "The Origin of the Marcan Passion Sayings," New Testament Studies, I (1954-1955), 159-167.

Thornton, T.C.G. "I Peter, a Paschal Liturgy?" Journal of Theological Studies, N.S., XII (1:1961), 14-26.

Torrey, Charles C. "The Influence of II Isaias in the Gospels and Acts," Journal of Biblical Literature, XLVIII (1929), 24-36.

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

Wand, J.W.C. "The Lessons of I Peter: A Survey of Recent Interpretations," Interpretation, IX (1955), 387-399.

Waterman, Leroy, "The Martyred Servant Motif of Isaiah 53," Journal of Biblical Literature, LVI (1937), 27-34.

Willaert, Benjamin. "Jesus as the 'Suffering Servant,'" Theology Digest X (1962), 25-30.

## Unpublished Material

Deering, Ronald F. "The Humiliation-Exaltation Motif in I Peter." Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky, 1961.