The Incarnation and the Trinity: Two Doctrines Rooted in the Offices of Christ

Dr. Christopher B. Kaiser

The doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation have always been regarded as the two chief pillars of the Christian faith. Together they provide the framework for the entire Christian understanding of creation and salvation, as it pertains to both faith and life. The foundational character of the two doctrines is seen from the fact that the first six ecumenical councils were largely devoted to them—the Trinity being the primary focus at Nicea (325 A.D.), and the Incarnation and the hypostatic union of the two natures in Christ being the focus at Ephesus (431), Chalcedon (451), and the Second and Third Councils of Constantinople (553 and 680). The pivotal First Council of Constantinople (381) was equally concerned with both the Trinity and the Incarnation: it stipulated the eternal rule and eternal hypostasis of Christ against the modalism of Marcellus of Ancyra;¹ it confessed the deity of the Spirit against the Macedonians;² and it stressed the Virgin Birth and the crucifixion and burial of Jesus against the Apollinarians.³

At the previous meeting of our theological consultation in Minsk (1990), we discussed the relationship between the teachings of Scripture and the patristic doctrine of the Trinity. We concluded that the teachings of the early Fathers and the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed were well grounded in the teachings of the Apostles and the New Testament. The question before us today is how we should approach the doctrine of the Incarnation. In particular, what is the relationship between the two foundational doctrines? Is the doctrine of the Trinity a theological antecedent to the doctrine of the Incarna-
tion—the latter being a kind of corollary of the Trinity? Or is the Incarnation the basis of belief in the Trinity?

This question of the ordering of doctrines is important partly for purposes of orderly teaching. But it is also important for explaining the meaning of a doctrine. Our understanding of the Trinity, for instance, would be somewhat different if we derived it from an examination of the Incarnation than if we began with it as the presupposition of the Incarnation. We shall return to this question of meaning later when we treat the offices of Christ.

Many traditional presentations of theology have treated the Trinity before the Incarnation. Ontologically speaking, this procedure is correct: the Trinity is eternal and therefore takes precedence over the Incarnation, which began at a particular point of time. However, it would be wrong to conclude that our belief in the Incarnation is derived from the doctrine of the Trinity as a logical inference or that it originated in this way historically.

Modern presentations often prefer to follow historical lines. Historically speaking, it makes more sense to argue that belief in the Incarnation anteceded belief in the Trinity. It is very unlikely that Christians would have found the Trinity in the Hebrew Bible if they had not been convinced of it already on the basis of their knowledge of Jesus Christ. So it can be argued that Christians first came to the conclusion that Jesus was God in the flesh and only later realized that there was a Trinity of divine persons.

The problem with this second approach is that a strictly monothestic faith would more likely view Jesus as a man through whom God’s Spirit worked and in whom God was revealed (dynamic monarchianism) or else as the incarnation of God the Father (modalism). It seems unlikely that early Christians would have concluded that there was a Trinity of divine persons unless the relationship between Jesus and the Spirit and that between Jesus and the Father had already been recognized as transcending time.

I shall argue that it is best to treat the Trinity and the Incarnation as being two distinct doctrines, neither of which is derived from the other epistemologically or historically. Rather both doctrines are firmly rooted (epistemologically) in the person and work of Jesus Christ as they were apprehended (historically) in terms of the types or offices of the Hebrew Bible.

To anticipate our results and put the matter succinctly: The doc-
trine of the Trinity stems from the realization that in Jesus’ relationship to God (being sent from God, praying to God, returning to God) we have an eternal relationship in the divine being. In the terms of Nicea (and, later, Chalcedon), Christ is homousios with God the Father. The doctrine of the Incarnation derives from the realization that in Jesus’ relationship to us as his people, we have the Word or Wisdom of God among us in human form. In the terms of Chalcedon, Christ is homousios with us. The doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation are the twin pillars of Christian faith and life, but they can not be either derived or properly understood other than on the foundation of the relationships, and hence of the offices, of Christ.

First I shall review the meaning of the idea of the Incarnation in the New Testament and the Nicene Creed. On this basis, I shall show that belief in the Incarnation is not a deduction from the doctrine of the Trinity. This will lead me to a discussion of the foundational role of the traditional three offices of Christ (the triplex munus) in the definition of the two doctrines.

THE INCARNATION AND THE TRINITY

In the New Testament, the idea of the Word assuming flesh is stated explicitly in two texts. The best known of these if John 1:14, “And the Word became flesh [sarx egeneto; Latin, caro factum est] and lived among us.” The same basic idea is found in an early hymn quoted in 1 Timothy 3:16, “He was revealed in the flesh [phanerōthē en sarki; Latin, manifestatum est in carne], vindicated in spirit....” On the basis of these texts, the idea of the “Incarnation” takes its primary meaning from the initial event whereby the Word became (or was revealed in) flesh.

Presumably this initial event was the Virgin Birth although some scholars deny that either John or Paul ever had this in mind. However, the Incarnation, in the proper sense of the term, includes more than just an initial event. It is also the state of affairs established by that event—the hypostatic union of divine and human natures in the person of Jesus Christ. As John 1:14 goes on to say, “...and we have seen his glory, the glory as of a father’s only son, full of grace and truth.”

The dwelling of God in human flesh was something quite new—unprecedented in all the history of Israel. And it was something
permanent. The Incarnation included the entire life of the historical Jesus—the state of humiliation; it includes the present state of the exalted Christ—seated at the right hand of the Father; and it will include the future state of Christ’s eternal rule. Hence, this state of affairs is quite unlike the temporary human appearances of Hellenistic Egyptian gods or the avatars of Vishnu. It is unprecedented in all human history.

In the context of the Nicene Creed, the idea of the Incarnation is based on the Greek term sarkôthenta (an aorist passive participle in the accusative) meaning “was made flesh” or “became incarnate” and translated into Latin as incarnatus est, from which we get the Latin incarnatio and the English word, “incarnation.” In the Creed, there is a parallel Greek term, enanthrôpêsanta, meaning “was made man” or “became human” (Latin, homo factus est). Like the Johannine sarx egeneto, these terms define the initial event in which the eternal Word was united with human flesh: Christ “came down from heaven, and became incarnate by the Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary, and became human.’

However, in the Creed as in the Gospel, the Incarnation includes more than just an initial event—the Virgin Birth. It is also the state of affairs established by that event. The Creed, in fact, describes four distinct stages in the life of Christ:

1. eternal sonship with the Father (prior to the Incarnation), for which there was no beginning;
2. the state of humiliation (from the Virgin Birth to the Cross);
3. the present state of exaltation (from the Resurrection to the Parousia)
4. the future reign of Christ, for which there will be no end. The Incarnation includes the second, third, and fourth of these stages:

For us and for our salvation, he came down from heaven, and became incarnate by the Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary, and became human. He was crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate, and suffered and was buried, and rose from the dead on the third day... and ascended into heaven, and was seated at the right hand of the Father, and will come again with glory to judge both the living and the dead. Of his kingdom there shall be no end.

All of these stages are accomplished in human flesh and are included in the Incarnation.
The primary focus of the second article of the Creed then is the Incarnation in the broad sense of the term. Still the Incarnation is prefaced by the first stage listed above, in which Christ is clearly identified as the second person of the Trinity, “of one substance with the Father.” Does this mean that the Incarnation is a corollary of the Trinity?

Unlike the Latin *Quicunque vult*, traditionally referred to as the “Athanasiastic Creed,” the Nicene Creed does not begin with a formal statement of the Trinity. Rather the doctrine of the Trinity is assumed as the framework for all three articles, a framework that had already been established in the New Testament as we agreed at our meeting in Minsk (1 Cor. 8:6; 12:4-6; Eph. 4:4-6).¹²

In the Creed, the trinitarian framework is portrayed, in an appropriately biblical manner, by means of parallelisms rather than by formal statement (as in the *Quicunque vult*). We may exhibit these parallels between the three persons of the Trinity as follows:

We believe...

in one God

the Father Almighty

Maker of heaven and earth

in one Lord

begotten of the Father

by whom all things were made

in the Holy Spirit

who proceeds from the Father

Lord and Giver of life.¹³

According to the Creed, then, all three persons are the recipients of our faith; all three persons are Creator; and the second and third persons are derived from the Father (or, in the words of the Creed of the 318 Fathers of Nicea, “from the *ousia* of the Father’). But these truths are not stated in so many words; they are expressed by the overall trinitarian framework. That does not mean that the content of the articles can be deduced from the doctrine of the Trinity. Instead it fills out the doctrine and substantiates it.

In other words, the Nicene Creed exists as an organic whole, not as a series of logical deductions. The Creed should not be read as if the second article followed from the first and the third from the second. The second article focusses on the Son, but clearly the presence
and operation of the Spirit are already included (he “became incarnate by the Holy Spirit”).

Similarly, the first article focusses on the Father, but it describes the Father in such a way that the eternal presence of the Son is already assumed. When God is described as “Father” in the first article, it is understood that this is not just another title, like “Almighty” or “Creator of Heaven and Earth,” that relates God to creation, but a reference to the eternal presence of the Son. In patristic thought, God can not truly be Father without a consubstantial Son.14

And, when God is said to be the “Creator of heaven and earth and of all things visible and invisible,” the “things invisible” are understood to include heaven and all the angels and archangels, but neither the Son, who is “begotten, not made,” nor the Spirit, who “proceeds from the Father.”

The same organic character that characterizes the Creed as a whole applies to the second article of the Creed taken by itself. It too must be interpreted holistically. Just as there is no Father other than the one who is Father of the Son, so there is no Jesus Christ other than the one who,

...for us and for our salvation, came down from heaven, and became incarnate by the Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary, and became human. He was crucified for us under Pontius Pilate, and suffered and was buried, and rose from the dead on the third day....

Or—to put the same point in the words of the Gospel of John—there is no divine Word other than the one who “became flesh and lived among us, and we have seen his glory...” (John 1:14). The Gospel was written, and the Creed was composed, for people who already knew Jesus as their Lord and Savior.

Therefore, the Incarnation is not a deduction from the pre-existence of the second person of the Trinity any more than the second person is a deduction from what the first article has to say about the Father. Rather, the description of the eternal nature of the second person presupposes our knowing that this is the one whose life, death, and resurrection are the basis of our salvation. This leads us to consider the subject of the Atonement and the roles that Jesus filled “for us and for our salvation” in the events of his life.

THE FOUNDATIONAL ROLE OF THE OFFICES OF CHRIST

In recent Western theology, there has been much discussion of the
proper starting point for Christology: do we start “from above” with the eternal Son of God and work our way downward to the human life of Jesus? Or do we begin “from below,” start with the historical Jesus, and work our way upward (if possible) to the triune God?

Often the alternatives are understood in terms of the “two natures” of Christ. Starting “from above” is equivalent to starting with the existence of a second person in the Trinity (the divine Word) and trying to understand how this divine nature is united with the man Jesus. Starting “from below” is equivalent to starting with the human nature (the “historical Jesus”) and trying to discern the divine.

We will probably never know just how the early disciples arrived at their faith in Jesus as Lord and Christ. According to Matthew 16, it was revealed directly by God the Father: “For flesh and blood has not revealed this to you, but my Father in heaven” (Matt. 16:17; cf. Matt. 3:17; 17:5). So the disciples might not be able to reconstruct the steps they went through on the way to faith even if we could speak to them and ask them in person. In fact, the very idea of distinct steps of a sequential process—dear as it is to the hearts of modern, industrial folk—may not be an appropriate category in dealing with Scripture.

Even though we can not reconstruct a sequence of steps for the faith of the early disciples, it is important for us to ask about the meaning of Jesus in the context of the disciples’ setting and experience. Our investigation must be historical in the sense that it takes seriously the “historical Jesus,” even if it does not assume an evolutionary development.

What we do know is that, even in the earliest texts of the New Testament, Jesus was confessed as “Christ,” “Lord,” and “Son of God.” “Jesus is the Christ,” “Jesus is Lord,” and “Jesus is the Son of God” were among the very earliest credal statements of the Church. Other early biblical confessions state that Christ died for our sins, was raised for our justification, and ascended into heaven to intercede for us in the presence of God.

What we find, then, is that, even in the earliest stages of theological development which we can discern, Jesus was known and confessed in terms of the concepts or types of the Old Testament. Apparently, the Christian faith began neither “from above” nor “from below,” but rather from the collective memory of the divine presence and promises and from the collective expectation of their fulfillment
in first-century Palestine.\textsuperscript{17} The promises and types were believed to have been fulfilled in Jesus, and Jesus was viewed in terms of them.

This conclusion is born out by what we know of the historical Jesus. For example, the narratives describing the calling of the disciples are generally accepted as authentic memories of the ministry of Jesus.\textsuperscript{18} The sparseness of Jesus’ command, “Follow me!” and the immediacy of the disciples’ responses\textsuperscript{19} indicate that Jesus was perceived, even at the earliest stages of his ministry, as a prophet like Elijah, or possibly the Messiah himself.\textsuperscript{20} In other words, there never was an “historical Jesus” in isolation from the offices or types that Jesus was believed to fulfill.

Another point scholars are agreed on is that Jesus was a religious and social reformer.\textsuperscript{21} His teaching in public and his training of the disciples were both aimed at restoring the people of Israel in their relationship to God and to each other.

We know that there was widespread dissatisfaction with the temple-based administration in Jerusalem and its alliance with the Roman state.\textsuperscript{22} In response to this dissatisfaction, there arose a variety of movements and leaders, ranging from the new priesthood of Qumran to the popular prophets and messiahs of Judea. What these figures had in common was the revival of ancient promises and types. They hearkened back to the administration of the Zadokite priesthood, or to era of the canonical prophets, or to the time of David, or even to the exodus under Moses and Joshua.\textsuperscript{23} Jesus, too, must have understood his ministry and others must have perceived his actions in terms of the same promises and types of the Hebrew Bible.

Sociological and anthropological considerations also play a role in our investigation. There are significant differences between the understanding of human nature in traditional (e.g., traditional Jewish) societies and that in modern, Western ones. As Peter Berger, Bruce Malina, and others have shown, members of traditional communities identify themselves with public social roles in a way that modern, secularized people do not. Their sense of personal identity and personal worth is based on the fulfillment of socially assigned responsibilities like upholding family honor or adhering to tribal mores, allowing for a certain latitude of personal interpretation.\textsuperscript{24} These standards of behavior are often communicated through stories about guild founders or family ancestors, whose aspirations and ex-
periences community members relive in everyday life. The attention people pay to such stories may even be heightened in times of social or economic stress as in first-century Palestine.²⁵

The modern Western biblical scholar is at a distinct disadvantage in belonging to a culture that differentiates the individual from all the roles it takes on in public life. In constructing the “naked self,” we often abstract ourselves from all societal relations and even from family ties. We speak of “wearing hats” and “filling job descriptions” as something incidental to our inner natures.

In contrast, people in traditional societies were what they did in public. They owned their family names, their trades, and their inheritances as integral to themselves. To cite an historical example: If you were to write a biography of Charles I of Great Britain, you could not separate him from his being a Stuart or from being king of Scotland and England (by right) and try to think of him as an individual in the modern sense. In the same way, you can not reconstruct an “historical Jesus” by separating Jesus from the roles of Jewish prophet, messiah, and martyr that he filled. In theological terms, the “offices of Christ” are integral to an understanding of the “person of Christ.”

For this reason I believe we should regard the notion of a purely “functional” Christology as a modern idea that is unsuited to people of scriptural times. A functional Christology views Jesus as speaking for God in the role of prophet, or acting in the place of God in the role of messiah. It assumes that Jesus can be isolated from these roles as if they told us nothing about his inner character and nature. The loss of Jesus’ divine identity in many functional christologies is really a reflection of modern humanity’s loss of its own sense of identity. Difficult as it may be for us to extricate ourselves from the cult of the “naked self” in our own times, we have no reason to project this malaise back into the New Testament.²⁶

If we take the offices of Christ rather than the two natures as our starting point, we may find that the doctrines of the two natures and the three persons—the Incarnation and the Trinity—flow naturally (epistemologically, not as an historical sequence) from the witness of the New Testament—each in its own way. From a consideration of the traditional offices of Christ, we can show that Christ was the Word, Wisdom, and only Son of God (the basis of the doctrine of the Trinity). From the same offices, we can see that the Word of God has
become flesh, suffered, and died for us (the Incarnation and Atone-
ment).

SOME METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES

A great many Hebrew Bible types were utilized to describe the
person and work of Christ in the New Testament. For various rea-
sons, we shall consider only three. Happily, these three correspond in
part to the classical *triplex munus* of prophet, king, and priest, 27 but
they are selected on the basis of certain other criteria as well.

1. The three types we consider here are ones that were derived
from well known promises associated with distinct heroes of the past
(Moses, David, and Isaac) and that are known to have sustained a
variety of expectations in the time of Jesus. 28 As such they provide a
firmer basis for the investigation of early Christology than many other
Hebrew Bible types that are not associated with such promises. 29

2. The three types chosen are ones embedded in social roles that
were actually practiced in biblical Israel (prophet, sage-ruler, and
sacrificial martyr). They were remembered as having been practiced
even if they were widely believed to have ceased in their ancient
forms. In other words they are not just ideal types of future expecta-
tion, but ones which had a concrete socio-historical meaning.

3. The three types we consider are ones that can be substantiated
from the earliest strata of the Synoptic Gospels—Mark and Q 30 —
strata that derived most directly from the historical life of Jesus and
the first (pre-Resurrection) understanding of that life by Jesus’ asso-
ciates. 31 The three types of prophet, messiah, and martyr are
commonly (though not universally) viewed by New Testament schol-
ars as playing a role in the ministry of Jesus. 32

4. The three types chosen are ones that were adapted and de-
veloped by the early church in an effort to interpret the life, death, and
resurrection of Jesus. In other words, each of them had the potential
of making sense of a wide range of the events of Jesus personal his-
tory including his humiliation and exaltation. 33

This fact might be taken as grounds for doubting the pre-Resur-
rection origin of the typologies (argued in 3 above). However, most
would agree that Jesus experienced rejection and the possibility of
martyrdom for some time before his actual trial and execution. Some
of the most intense probings of Scripture promises must have oc-
curred during the final days of his life. Therefore, a realistic approach
to the life and ministry of Jesus must give some account of his own
thoughts on the subject. It makes sense to view the later theologizing of the church as developing themes already explored during the lifetime of Jesus.

5. The three types we consider are ones that could be seen to provide a role for the divine protagonist as well as the human. In the Hebrew Bible, the divine was quite distinct from the human, yet the two were closely related. The prophet was not personally the same as God’s Word, but the Word was the foundation of all true prophecy: the prophet had access to the heavenly council and functioned on earth as the instrument of the Word. The king was not personally the same as God’s Wisdom, but Wisdom was the foundation of all godly rule: the king too shared in the council of God and functioned on earth as the embodiment of divine Wisdom. And though the sacrificial martyr was not literally God’s own Son, Jewish martyrs regarded themselves as children of God by adoption (cf. Wis. 2:12-20).

Hence the “hypostatic union” of the two sides, human and divine, in the New Testament was an innovation to be sure, but it could be seen in retrospect, even in the Hebrew Bible types themselves. In fact, in Second Temple literature, the Wisdom of God was already said to have dwelt with Israel in the Torah and the Temple cult. So the three offices of Christ that we treat here were Hebrew Bible types (prophet, sage-ruler, and martyr) that Jesus was believed to fulfill in such a way that they were clearly seen to be grounded in the divine being (Word, Wisdom, and Son of God).

6. Finally, the types we consider are ones that illuminated the ministry of the early Church—its own prophetic witness, practical wisdom, and faithfulness under persecution—as well as the person and work of Jesus. Similarly, Question 31 of the Heidelberg Catechism, “Why is he called Christ(?)” is answered with a brief description of the triplex munus and followed immediately by Question 32, “But why are you called a Christian(?)” So the three types discussed here have relevance for the understanding of Christian vocation in the world today, and our investigation into the person and work of Jesus is one of the best ways we have to understand that vocation.

To work this out in detail would be a mammoth undertaking, but I shall try to give an outline here.
1. Jesus as Mosaic Prophet and Word of God

First we consider the prophetic office of Christ.

Clearly, Jesus was viewed as a prophet by many of his contemporaries,\textsuperscript{38} and he seems also to have understood himself as a prophet like Moses and Jonah.\textsuperscript{39} In continuity with this early understanding, Matthew, Luke, and John all depict Jesus as fulfilling the role of the Moses-type prophet, the one for whom the Jewish people had long been waiting.\textsuperscript{40}

The prophetic type we are concerned with here was based on the Deuteronomic promise of a “prophet like Moses,” whom God would raise up among the Jewish people:

The Lord your God will raise up for you a prophet like me from among your own people; you shall heed such a prophet. (Deut. 18:15)

There is sufficient evidence to indicate that this promise was the basis for widespread hopes for liberation and covenant renewal in the time of Jesus.\textsuperscript{41}

In the Deuteronomistic literature, Mosaic prophets were known by their deeds as well as by their words. For example, Moses not only proclaimed liberation to the people of Israel; he also led them out of bondage and healed and fed them in the wilderness.\textsuperscript{42} Elijah and Elisha not only spoke out against the political corruptions of their day; they also healed the sick and fed the hungry.\textsuperscript{43}

There is good evidence that Jesus presented himself as a Mosaic prophet. Like Elijah (and John the Baptist before him), Jesus recruited disciples from the ranks of the socially and economically marginal. Like Samuel, Elijah, and Elisha, he presided over this small band of disciples and taught them as a “master.”\textsuperscript{44} Like Elijah and Elisha he also healed the sick and fed the hungry.\textsuperscript{45} Like Moses, he fed his followers in the wilderness, proclaimed a new freedom, and initiated a new covenant.\textsuperscript{46} So there seems to have been several lines of continuity between the traditional models and the self-understanding of Jesus.

Even if initially there were only a few points of correspondence between Mosaic typology and the actual behavior of Jesus, the complete web of Mosaic and prophetic associations would immediately have become available for the interpretation of his life and actions. For example, the death and resurrection of Jesus could be interpreted
in this context, as we shall see below.

In spite of the continuity of prophetic office indicated by these parallels, the way in which Jesus presented himself as a prophet was unusual, to say the least. There were several “sign prophets” in the first century who patterned themselves after Moses, but none of them (to our knowledge) was ever worshipped by their followers as a divine being.47 An appropriate way to express this difference would be to say that Jesus presented himself and was perceived by others as the very embodiment of God’s lifegiving Word.48 This perception was not just a matter of later reflection on the part of the church. As far as we can tell, he was perceived in this way from the very start. The evidence for this is as follows.

First, according to the New Testament, Jesus was raised from the dead, whereas classical prophets were normally preserved by God in the midst of their troubles and, in a few cases, either martyred49 or taken up directly into heaven prior to death.50 Jesus’ prophetic ministry was thus validated in a more dramatic way, out of all proportion to the ministries of the classical prophets.51

But, secondly, even in his earthly ministry, Jesus spoke in a manner radically different from that of the prophets. The classical prophets spoke words they received from God—words normally introduced by the formula, “Thus says the Lord....” In contrast, Jesus spoke on his own authority: “You have heard it said... but I say to you...”; “Amen, amen I say to you....”52 Here divine authority is expressed in the first person (“I say’) rather than in the third person (“the Lord says’). In both Mark and in Q, the criterion for divine judgement is said to be Jesus’ own words, not some revelation he received from heaven.53 As Raymond Brown states, “The presupposition seems to be that the word did not have to come to him, but rather that he already had it—to which John gives an even further formulation: he was the Word.”54

Third, the Hebrew prophets demanded repentance and promised that the people’s sins would be pardoned.55 Following the example of Moses, they also called on the Lord for forgiveness on behalf of the people.56 Jesus also promised the Father’s forgiveness to those who asked for it,57 but he also forgave sins directly and explicitly claimed the authority to do so (Mark 2:5-11; Luke 12:8-10).58

Finally, whereas classical prophets like Moses called on the people to follow them in renewing their allegiance to the the law of Moses,59
Jesus called people to follow him even at the risk of ignoring particular precepts of the Sinai Torah. As E. P. Sanders has put it, "...Jesus was willing to say that following him superseded the requirements of piety and the Torah." We might well conclude (with Bruce Chilton and others) that Jesus was understood to be above the Torah because he was the very Word of God. The fact that following him superseded the demands of the Torah set Jesus in a category above comparable Mosaic prophets like the Qumran Teacher of Righteousness. The only alternative would have been to regard him as a false prophet.

Another way to put the contrast would be to say that Jesus spoke and acted as one who belonged, not to the age of the classical prophets, but to a future age, an age yet to come, when the Word and Spirit of God would be available to all. The pericope on the ministry of John the Baptist in Q makes this point clearly: John the Baptist was a prophet and even "more than a prophet." John was the last and the greatest of the old order ("those born of women''), but Jesus (and his followers) belonged rather to the coming kingdom of God (Luke 7:24-28 [Q]).

Jesus filled the office of prophet in such a way that the divine prototype of all prophecy, the lifegiving Word of God, was experienced speaking to people and healing people directly (Mark 13:31; Luke 6:47-9; 7:7). It was never said that the Word of God was just "with Jesus" as it was with the Old Testament prophets (2 Kgs. 3:12). It would be more accurate to say that the Word of God was Jesus. The comment of Jesus in Matthew and Luke (following Q) makes sense in this context: "something greater than Jonah [the prophet] is here!" (Matt. 12:41; Luke 11:32).

In short, Jesus was a prophet like Moses and yet more than just a prophet or even a new Moses. He was believed to fulfill the Hebrew Bible types of both human (healing) prophet and divine (lifegiving) Word. What are the implications of this office for our understanding of the church's teaching about the Trinity and the Incarnation?

On one hand, belief in Jesus as the divine Word provided a basis for the doctrine of the Trinity. In Jewish tradition, the Word was a direct emanation or extension of God and served as an instrument of creation as well as divine revelation and healing. So Jesus, who spoke and healed as the Word of God, was aptly described, in the words of the Nicene Creed, as "God of God, Light of Light, true God
of true God, being of one substance with the Father, [the one] by whom all things were made.”

What sort of Pneumatology would correspond to the prophetic office of Christ? Clearly the Spirit was one who spoke and healed the sick through Jesus and through Jesus’ disciples.69 In the words of the Nicene Creed, the Spirit was the “Giver of life” and the one “who spoke through the prophets” (and healed through the prophets) in ancient Israel.

From a pre-resurrection viewpoint, the Spirit might have been equated with the prophetic power (the Word) that was incarnate in Jesus. In fact, such an identification of Christ and the Spirit in Jesus did occur in some post-biblical texts.70 However, in prechristian Jewish literature, the Spirit was never portrayed in a concrete human form the way the Word was.71 In any case, after the Cross and Resurrection, the church generally discerned two distinct divine principles to be at work: the Spirit of prophecy and Jesus Christ the Word.72 The Spirit was the same as that known in the classical prophets and in the life of Jesus, but s/he was experienced as having been poured out by the risen Christ (or by God in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ) and as inspiring the disciples to preach Christ as Lord.73 So the two were not identical.74 Apparently, there were three divine persons in the godhead. Hence, belief in the Trinity could be understood on the basis of Jesus’ being a prophet and more than a prophet, the very Word of God.

Belief in Jesus as a prophet like Moses could also help the early church to explain the puzzling events of the Cross and Resurrection (as in Luke-Acts).75 Jesus was rejected by the leaders of the Sanhedrin as being a false prophet and turned over to the Romans for trial and execution (note that Deut. 18:20 demanded the death sentence for false prophets).76 But unlike other prophets who had met similar fates, Jesus was raised up by God in literal fulfillment of Deuteronomy 18:15: “The Lord your God will raise up [Greek, anástēsei] for you a prophet like me from among your own people.” According to the Book of Acts, Peter argued this very point in his second sermon after Pentecost:

Moses said, “The Lord your God will raise up [anástēsei kurios ho theos] for you from your own people a prophet like me. You must listen to whatever he tells you. .... When God raised up [anástēsas ho theos] his servant, he sent him first to you, to bless you by turning
each of you from your wicked ways. (Acts 3:22-26)\textsuperscript{77}

The Crucifixion could thus be viewed as the ultimate test of Jesus
as the Mosaic prophet. And the Resurrection could be seen as a vin-
dication of Jesus as a true prophet (like Moses)—and the foundation
of all true prophecy, the divine Word.\textsuperscript{78}

Hence, the Incarnation, Crucifixion, and Resurrection could be
understood on the basis of Jesus’ being a prophet and more than a
prophet, the very Word of God taking flesh, suffering, and rising again
for us. In the words of the Nicene Creed:

He came down from heaven, and became incarnate by the Holy Spirit
and the Virgin Mary, and became human. He was crucified also for us
under Pontius Pilate, and suffered and was buried, and rose [anastanta]
from the dead on the third day, according to the Scriptures....

So the prophetic office of Christ is one theme in accordance with
which the doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation could emerge
(epistemologically) from the witness of the New Testament. With
respect to this theme, there is significant continuity from a category
in terms of which Jesus understood himself, through that in terms of
which the early church interpreted his life, death, and resurrection, to
that in which classical Christian theology has understood him. But
the Church needs to recover the full meaning of the prophetic life of
Jesus in its ministry. Words about the Resurrection or the deity of
Christ will seem empty if they are not accompanied by deeds of heal-
ing, feeding, and liberating in the tradition of the classical, Mosaic
prophets.

2. Jesus as Son of David and Wisdom of God

The second major office in terms of which Jesus was perceived
and portrayed was that of a sage-ruler like David and Solomon. The
traditional offices of sage and king were distinct, but they also over-
lapped in many ways. Both figures were guided by divine Wisdom
and could be viewed as embodiments of Wisdom.\textsuperscript{79} Great Israelite
kings like David and Solomon were known as sages, and the Jewish
sages were also portrayed as “kings.”\textsuperscript{80} This overlap allows us to
combine the two offices for the purposes of this essay.\textsuperscript{81}

Early strata of the New Testament present Jesus as the “son of
David” and “son of God” like the son promised to David in 2 Samuel
7:
...I will raise up your offspring after you, who shall come forth from your body, and I will establish his kingdom. He shall build a house for my name, and I will establish the throne of his kingdom forever. I will be a father to him, and he shall be a son to me. (2 Sam. 7:12-14a)\textsuperscript{82}

There is ample evidence that this promise was cherished in a variety of Jewish circles of Jesus’ time.\textsuperscript{83} In fact there was a variety of such expectations.\textsuperscript{84} There is also evidence that the political risks such expectations could raise were appreciated and that messianic fervor was discouraged in some quarters.\textsuperscript{85} Jesus and his followers were apparently aware of both expectations and risks and thought seriously about his own ministry in this context.\textsuperscript{86}

Although Jesus undoubtedly distanced himself from popular, nationalistic expectations of a Jewish king\textsuperscript{87} and may have avoided using the title of “Messiah” in public discourse,\textsuperscript{88} he seems to have modelled his ministry on the Davidic/Solomonic type in other ways. Among the more likely historical features of his life are the following: like Solomon and the sages, Jesus taught in proverbs and parables;\textsuperscript{89} he contested the power of Satan in order to establish (or re-establish) the rule of God;\textsuperscript{90} he promised his disciples a place in the coming kingdom;\textsuperscript{91} he rode into Jerusalem on a donkey (as Solomon had done and as the eschatological ruler or Messiah was expected to do);\textsuperscript{92} he referred to himself as God’s son and the heir of God’s kingdom;\textsuperscript{93} he apparently claimed he would build a new temple (as Solomon, Zerubbabel, and the Herods had done);\textsuperscript{94} and he was crucified as one who pretended to be “The King of the Jews.”\textsuperscript{95}

As in the case of the prophetic office, there was some degree of continuity between the Jewish expectations and the ministry of Jesus. His selective appropriation of messianic roles seems to have focussed on sage teachings, conflict with satanic forces on earth, personal intimacy with God as his “Father,” challenges to the Herodian dynasty in Jerusalem, and dramatic anticipations of a new order to be realized in the future.\textsuperscript{96} But, even if initially there were only a few, tentative points of correspondence between Davidic/Solomonic typology and the actual behavior of Jesus, the complex web of messianic associations immediately became available for the interpretation of all of his life and actions. The baptism, death, and resurrection of Jesus could be interpreted in this context, as we shall see below.

But, unlike Solomon, who was remembered as having to pray to
God in order to receive wisdom,97 Jesus is portrayed in his teaching ministry, even in the earliest strata of the New Testament, as the very embodiment of God's enlightening wisdom. See, for example, the Q saying in Luke 10:22: "...no one knows who the Son is except the Father, or who the Father is except the Son and anyone to whom the Son chooses to reveal him." Here the mutual knowledge of Father and Son appears to be modelled on that of God and his Wisdom/child in the Old Testament.98 At any rate, it is clear that Jesus, "the Son," unlike the known sages of Israel, spoke to his contemporaries from God's side of the revealer-receptor relationship, not just on the basis of Jewish tradition.99 In fact, Jesus could be highly critical of the sages of his time who were the recognized leaders of his people.100

Furthermore, unlike the ancient kings of Israel, who were anointed by the Lord, the very earliest strata of the New Testament describe Jesus as Yahweh, the Lord himself, in human form.101 Whereas, the anointed king of Israel was expected to restore the political independence of Israel,102 Jesus announced the end of the Jerusalem-based state and pointed toward the universal kingdom of God.103 And, whereas, the anointed king was expected to defeat the Gentile nations that oppressed Israel, Jesus assumed the task of doing battle with Satan himself, a task generally assigned either to supernatural agents of God or to Yahweh himself.104 To use one of the traditional phrases adopted by Luke, he was the "anointed Lord" or "lordly Messiah."105

Apparently, Jesus filled the role of "king" in such a way that the very ground of divine rule, the wisdom and power of God,106 spoke to the people and ordered their lives directly. According to Mark, Jesus argued that even David called the Messiah "my Lord" (Mark 12:35-37, referring to Ps. 110:1).107 The comment attributed to Jesus by Matthew and Luke (following Q) makes sense in this context: "something greater than [King] Solomon is here!" (Matt. 12:42; Luke 11:31).

In short, Jesus was a sage-ruler like David and Solomon and yet more than a sage or a king. Jesus was believed to have fulfilled the types of both ruler (ordering) and Wisdom (enlightening). What are the implications of this office for our understanding of the church's teaching about the Trinity and the Incarnation?

On one hand, belief in Jesus as divine Wisdom provides another approach to the doctrine of the Trinity. In Jewish tradition, Wisdom
(like the Word) was an emanation or extension of God and served as an instrument of creation as well as divine guidance.\textsuperscript{108} So Jesus, who ordered life and taught as the Wisdom of God, was aptly described, in the words of the Nicene Creed, as “God of God, Light of Light, true God of true God, being of one substance with the Father, [the one] by whom all things were made.” The phrase, “Light of Light,” in fact, comes directly from one of the attributes of Wisdom found in the Wisdom of Solomon (“she is a reflection of eternal light,” Wis. 7:26) and Hebrews (“He is the reflection of God’s glory,” Heb. 1:3).\textsuperscript{109}

What sort of Pneumatology would correspond to the royal office of Christ? The Spirit was the one who anointed Jesus sage and ruler at his baptism,\textsuperscript{110} and who empowered him to perform exorcisms like those attributed to David and Solomon.\textsuperscript{111} In the economy of modern logic, such dependence on the Spirit might seem to cast Jesus as merely a human sage-ruler. In the thinking of the first century, however, such dependence was not incompatible with a heavenly origin.\textsuperscript{112} The Messiah and the Spirit, the Anointed One and the Anointing One, could be paired as divine persons.\textsuperscript{113} In the words of the Creed, the Spirit is “Lord” (\textit{to kurion}), like Jesus, and “Giver of life,” like divine Wisdom (cf. Prov. 3:16, 18; 8:35; 9:11).\textsuperscript{114} Evidently, there were three divine persons in the godhead. Hence, the Trinity could be understood on the basis of Jesus’ being a sage-ruler and more than a sage-ruler, the very Wisdom of God.

On the other hand, belief in Jesus as sage-ruler further helped the early church to explain the puzzling events of the Cross and Resurrection. Jesus’ being executed as a false messiah,\textsuperscript{115} would naturally be viewed as a scandal for many Jews.\textsuperscript{116} However, within the scope of Jewish typology, Jesus could be seen as fulfilling the tragic role of the Israelite king, the role of “servant” who suffered on behalf (and sometimes at the hands) of the people.\textsuperscript{117} In fact, the divine promise in 2 Samuel 7 actually stated that God would punish the descendant of David “with blows [\textit{nig’ey}] of human beings” (2 Sam. 7:14). The punishment could also be understood as a vicarious one—one administered by God for the sins of the people as in Isa. 53:4 (“we accounted him stricken [\textit{nagüa’}]”). Given the messianic gestures of Jesus’ life described above, the death of Jesus could also be understood in messianic terms.

In being raised from the dead and seated at the right hand of God,
Jesus was exalted and glorified as God’s true servant and declared to be “Son of God” and Davidic messiah in literal fulfillment of 2 Samuel 7:12: “I will raise up [Greek, anastésō] your offspring after you... and I will establish his kingdom [tên basileian autou].” More than that the risen Christ filled all things as divine Wisdom and Lord, the foundation of all just order.

Hence the Incarnation, Crucifixion, and Resurrection could also be understood on the basis of Jesus’ being Davidic messiah and more than a messiah, on the basis of his being the very Wisdom of God taking flesh, suffering, and rising again for us. In fact, the royal office nicely ties together the titles of Christ with the works of Christ as described in the second article of the Creed:

And [I believe] in one Lord, Jesus Christ, the only Son of God... who for us and our salvation came down from heaven and became incarnate by the Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary and became human. He was crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate, and suffered and was buried, and rose [anastanta] from the dead on the third day, according to the Scriptures, and ascended into heaven, and was seated at the right hand of the Father, and will come again with glory to judge both the living and the dead. Of his kingdom [hou tês basileias] there shall be no end.

The royal office of Christ is a second theme in accordance with which the doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation could emerge from the witness of the New Testament.

3. Jesus as Sacrificial Martyr and Son of God

The Mosaic/prophetic and Davidic/messianic offices are the two types in the life and times of Jesus most often discussed by scholars. The third major type Jesus was believed to fulfill is not so widely recognized—that of the aqedah, the “binding” of Isaac as described in Genesis 22:

God said, “Take your son, your only son Isaac, whom you love, and go to the land of Moriah, and offer him there as a burnt offering on one of the mountains that I shall show you.” (Gen. 22:2)

The promise associated with the aqedah was that God would provide a suitable means of atonement for Israel in every generation (Gen. 22:8, 14). Accordingly, the binding of Isaac was regarded as the foundation of the Temple cult of sacrifices offered to God: Mount Moriah was identified with Mount Zion, the location of Solomon’s
temple.  

In the Hellenistic era, the families of Jews who died as martyrs under tyrants like Antiochus Epiphanes viewed themselves (and were viewed by others) as reliving the experience of Abraham and Isaac. As Abraham had been willing to provide his son as a sacrificial victim, the parents of the martyrs encouraged their children to be faithful to their God, even at the expense of their lives. As Isaac had willingly submitted to the command of God and to his father, these Jewish martyrs were willing to give up their lives rather than forsake the teachings of the Torah. Such self-sacrifice was believed to have atoning value for the people as a whole at a time when the temple-cult and its priesthood were regarded by many as being corrupt.

In the New Testament, Jesus is portrayed as the antitype of Isaac, as a sacrificial lamb whose death would atone for the sins of the people. It may even be the case that Jesus foresaw his death in these terms. An attitude of filial obedience to God is reflected in the words of Gethsemane: “Abba, Father, ...not what I want, but what you want” (Mark 14:36), words that correspond to the words of Isaac to Abraham in Genesis 22 in Jewish tradition. Again there was some continuity between earlier Jewish models and the ministry of Jesus.

But Jesus transcended the traditional terms of this “priestly” office, just as he did those of the prophetic and royal offices. The “father” who handed Jesus over to his executioners was none other than God. The words of the baptismal declaration, “You are my Son, the Beloved” (su ei ho huios mou ho agapêtos, Mark 1:11) reflect those that God spoke to Abraham: “Take your son, the beloved one” (labe ton huion sou ton agapêton, Gen. 22:2 LXX). Whereas the alternative to death for the Jewish martyrs would have been their personal denial of the Torah, the basis of the Temple cult, the alternative to death for Jesus would have been denial of the impending kingdom of God as he understood it (Mark 14:55-65; 15:2-5). And, whereas the Jewish martyrs committed their souls to God in hope of a future, general resurrection, Jesus was raised on the third day signifying that he was one Jewish martyr whose bodily presence God could not bear be without.

Jesus was believed to fulfill the Hebrew type of the akedah, the sacrificial offering of the Jewish martyr, but he also transcended it. As Matthew put it in relation to the sacrificial cult as a whole, “some-
thing greater than the temple is here” (Matt. 12:6).  

Like the prophetic and royal offices, this priestly or sacrificial office provides grounds for both the doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation. On the one hand, Jesus is the one in whom God’s future was invested just as Abraham’s and Sarah’s future was invested in their son, Isaac (cf. Heb. 11:18). Jesus was the one true Son of the one true God.  

So the priestly office points to Jesus’ deity and the doctrine of the Trinity, albeit in a more subordinationist form that the prophetic and royal offices.

What sort of Pneumatology would correspond to the priestly office of Christ? In so far as the Spirit could be thought of as a third divine person, s/he would be the one who descended on Jesus and established him as the new temple, the new dwelling place of God (or God’s shekinah/glory) in the world.

On the other hand, the akedah motif helped the early church to make sense of the Cross and Resurrection even more readily than the prophetic and royal offices did. Jesus is portrayed in the New Testament as God’s own means of atonement for the sins of Israel. As the writer of Hebrews developed the idea, Christ was temporarily made lower than the angels and assumed a human body in order to suffer death on our behalf (Heb. 2:9; 10:5-10). Jesus’ resurrection and ascension into heaven apparently indicated God’s acceptance of the offering, the completion of the Atonement.

Hence, the Incarnation could be also understood on the basis of Jesus’ being a Jewish martyr and more than just a martyr. God’s own Son taking flesh, suffering, and rising again for us. Accordingly, the Nicene Creed states:

For us and for our salvation, he came down from heaven, and became incarnate by the Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary, and became human. He was crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate, and suffered and was buried, and rose from the dead on the third day... and ascended into heaven....

So the priestly, sacrificial office of Christ is a third theme in accordance with which the doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation could emerge from the witness of the New Testament.

**CONCLUSION**

I have argued that the most suitable starting point for both doc-
trines, the Trinity and the Incarnation, is the person and work of Christ as apprehended in terms of the types of the Hebrew Bible and recorded in the New Testament.

Belief in Jesus as the Word made flesh, the embodiment of divine Wisdom, and God’s own Son, provides the basis for our understanding of the doctrine of the Trinity. The Word and Wisdom of God had been known only as divine energies or attributes (probably not hypostatically) in the Hebrew Bible: they were one way, perhaps, of describing God’s immanence in the world. As a result of the life and death of Jesus, however, they came to be viewed as a distinct divine person, coming from the Father and returning to the Father, but equal in deity to the Father. And, as a result of the resurrection of Jesus and the outpouring of the Spirit, a distinction of three divine hypostases was recognized in the New Testament.

Conversely, belief in Jesus as the Mosaic prophet, Davidic messiah, and substitute for Isaac provides the basis for our understanding the doctrine of the Incarnation and Atonement. In New Testament times, the legitimate prophetic, royal, and priestly offices were known to Israel only as memories from a distant past. As a result of the work of Christ, however, they came to be viewed as present realities, now so implanted in the history of Israel and in human nature that they could never cease to be effective.

The connecting link between the doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation is found in the person and work of Christ. Only on the basis of the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus, do we understand that there is a Trinity of divine persons. On this basis, we also understand that the second person of this Trinity has been united with our human nature and will never forsake us. The gift of prophecy, the light of divine wisdom, and the obligation to live sacrificially are ours forever.

Notes

1The phrases, “[begotten of the Father] before all worlds” and “whose kingdom shall have no end,” were not present in the Creed of the 318 Fathers at the Council of Nicea. The inclusion of the latter at Constantinople is generally understood to be aimed against Marcellus of Ancyra. It seems to me that the former is best understood as having the same target (thus extrapolating the hypostatic existence of Christ backward as well as forward into eternity) and not as “a recession from the strict Nicene standpoint” as

The phrases, "the Lord and giver of life," "who proceeds from the Father," and "who is worshipped and glorified together with the Father and Son," were likewise added at Constantinople.

The phrases, "[became incarnate] by the Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary," "was crucified for us under Pontius," and "was buried" were likewise added at Constantinople. Again Kelly is too economical in allowing this purpose only for the first of these phrases and saying that the others have "little, if any, bearing on current theological discussion"; *Early Christian Creeds*, 303.


Or, alternatively, both doctrines are rooted in the types or offices of the Hebrew Bible as they were fulfilled and integrated by Jesus Christ. Obviously, our understanding of the Hebrew types is altered by the fact that we find their fulfillment in Jesus.

The Incarnation includes the entire life of the historical Jesus, not just his conception and birth. It also includes the present state of the exalted Christ—seated at the right hand of the Father. In fact, the purpose of the Incarnation was the effecting of atonement. In the words of the Nicene Creed: "For us and for our salvation, he came down from heaven and became incarnate...." And traditional theories of the Atonement have relied on the combination of the two natures, divine and human, in Christ.

According to a variant reading of John 1:13 (tib, Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Origen), Jesus is the one who was "born, not of bloods nor of the will of the flesh not or the will of a man, but of God." According to this reading, John would have believed in the Virgin Birth.


The order of the last two attributes of the Spirit has been reversed in order to bring out the parallelism between the three articles more clearly.

So Alexander of Alexandria: "But God is the Father, since the Son is always with him, on account of whom he is called the Father" (Ep. to Alexander of Constantinople 7; apud Theodoret, *E.H.* I.4. So also Athanasius, *De decretis* 7.31.

E.g., Matt. 16:16; Mark 15:39; John 20:31; Rom. 10:9; 1 Cor. 8:6; 12:3; 2 Cor. 4:5. Interestingly, Pauline writings tend to cite confessions of Jesus as the "image of God," rather than "Son of God"; 2 Cor. 4:4; Phil. 2:6; Col. 1:15. This probably reflects Paul's Wisdom Christology; cf. Wis. 7:26; Philo, *Leg. All.* I.43; Conf. 148. It may also reflect an understanding of Christ as the new Adam; cf. D. Steenburg, "The Worship of Adam and Christ as the Image of God," *JSNT* 39 (June 1990), 95-109; Dunn, *Partings*, 193-5.

Fragments of early confessional statements detailing the work of Christ are found
in Luke 24:46-47; Acts 4:10; Rom. 4:25; 8:34; 14:9a; 1 Cor. 15:3-4; 2 Cor. 5:14-15; Phil. 2:6-11; Col. 1:18-20; 1 Thess. 4:14; 1 Tim. 2:5-6; 3:16; 6:13; Heb. 1:3b-4; 1 Pet. 3:18-22.

17Hendrikus Berkhof refers to this option as a Christology “from behind;” Christian Faith (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979), 267. However, it might also be called a Christology “from before” or “from that which was “at hand.”” The Hebrew types, on which Jesus’ ministry was based, were also promises of God’s presence and reign in the age to come.


22See, e.g., Horsley, Jesus, 279-92.

23The issue is complex, but, generally speaking, legitimate claims to kingship were believed to have ceased with the death of Jehoiachin (mid-sixth century?) and/or the disappearance of Zerubbabel (soon after 520 BCE). True prophecy was believed to have ceased sometime after the Babylonian Exile (by the reign of Artaxerxes I [465-425 BCE], according to Josephus, Against Apion 1.8.40-42, which is about the time of Malachi). In many circles, the legitimate (Zadokite) priesthood was believed to have ceased with the deposition of Onias III in 175 BCE. However, the authority of the reigning priesthood is affirmed in Mark 1:44; Acts 23:1-5; Heb. 8:4.


26For an impressive defense of an ontological, as well as a strictly functional, interpretation of Paul’s Christology, see L. Joseph Kreitzer, Jesus and God in Paul’s Eschatology (Sheffield: JSNT, 1987), 116, 169-70.


28The appeal to Hebrew Bible texts does not mean that the Jews of Jesus’ time were all biblical scholars. As Richard Horsley has argued, some of the same ideals were

29Two types associated with such promises that we shall not consider are the eschatological high priest and the Son of Man. The former does not meet criteria 3 or 5. The latter is a variation of the Davidic messiah, but by itself does not meet criteria 2, 3, 4 or 6.

30For a convenient listing of the passages in Q, taken from Matthew and Luke, and also the parallels in Mark which give added depth to the tradition, see Ivan Havener, Q: The Sayings of Jesus, With a Reconstruction of Q by Athanasius Polag (Collegeville: Liturgical Press/Michael Glazier, 1979), 123-61.

31In general the simplest way to discern material mostly directly related to the historical Jesus is to look for themes that occur in both Mark and Q. Supporting material can sometimes be found in the early letters of Paul, the Gospel of Thomas, and the speeches of Peter in Acts (assuming this material to have Petrine sources even if modified by Luke). Such material, common to several early traditions, is not likely to be the invention of any particular author or community even if it has similarities to teachings of the synagogue or the early church. In some cases, the "criterion of embarrassment" can also be used. Notions that might be awkward or embarrassing for the early church are not likely to have been invented by the church and so probably derive from the historical Jesus.


33Jesus' life, death, and resurrection could be viewed in terms of the humiliation and exaltation associated with several Jewish types. The prophetic pattern of humiliation and exaltation is exemplified in texts describing the persecution of the prophets by ruling authorities (1 Kgs. 22:24-28; 2 Chron. 16:10; Jer. 38:4-6; cf. Mark 12:2-5; Luke 11:49-51; 13:34 [both Q]); the Servant songs (Isa. 52-53); the Martyrdom of Isaiah; and (with regard to martyrdom) the Lives of the Prophets (first cent. CE). The royal pattern is exemplified in Saul's persecution of David and various Psalms (e.g., Ps. 18). The martyrrological pattern (akedah) is found in 4 Macc. 8-18 (first cent. CE); As. Mos. 9-10 (first cent. CE); and possibly the tradition behind Josephus, Ant. XIV.iv.5 (429-30). All three of these patterns are attested in early strata of the NT (criterion 3) as we shall explain below.

34On the prophet's access to the council of God, see 1 Kgs. 22:19-22 (Micaiah); Isa. 6:1-9; 40:3-11; Jer. 23:18-22. Compare the role of the Word an agent of the divine council in Ps. 147:15-19; Isa. 55:10-22.

35E.g., 1 Sam. 3:21-4:1; 2 Kgs. 3:11-12.

36On the access of temporal rulers in the council of God, see 2 Sam. 14:20; Pss. 2:7-9; 82:1-7 (cf. Ezek. 28:1-10); 110:1-7; Lam. 2:1 (cf. Isa. 14:12-15; Ezek. 28:16-17);
Ezek. 28:11-14; Dan. 7:9-14; Zech. 3:7 (Joshua assumes royal functions in 6:11-13); 1 Enoch 46:1-3; 48:2-7; 51:3. Compare the role of Wisdom as a member of the council in Ps. 43:3; Prov. 8:22-30; Wis. 9:9-11; Sir. 24:1-8. Texts that identify the king directly with (or as the embodiment of) Wisdom include Job 15:7-8; Pss. 2:5-6 (cf. Prov. 8:22-25); 89:25-27; 1 Enoch 49:3; 51:3.

37Job 28:28; Sir. 24:4, 7-12, 23-25; Bar. 3:36-4:1; 1 Enoch 42:2. Yahweh was believed to have dwelt in the Tabernacle according to the Priestly strata of the Pentateuch (Exod. 25:8; 40:34-38, where the Hebrew verb “dwell” is shakan, and the term for tabernacle is mishkan, “dwelling” or “abode,” from which we get the rabbinic term shekinah); cf. Roland de Vaux, Ancient Israel (London: DLT, 1961), 295.


40Matt. 4:1-2 (Q); 5:1-8:1 (following Q); 17:1-8 (following Mark); Luke 4:1-2 (Q); 6:17-49 (Q); 7:18-23 (Q); 9:28-36 (following Mark); 11:29-32 (Q); John 1:14-17; 4:25-6; 6:14, 30-34; 7:40; Acts 3:22-26; 7:35-37; 2 Cor. 3:7-18; cf. Aune, Prophecy, 155-6; A. D. A. Moses, Matthew's Transfiguration Story and Jewish-Christian Controversy (Sheffield: JSNT, 1996), chs. 4-7. The interpretations of the Moses typology in these traditions differ sharply. But the very existence of the typology in such different NT traditions indicates very early roots.

41Elsewhere in the NT, the promise of a prophet like Moses is alluded to in Luke 7:16, 19 (Q); 9:35; John 1:21; 4:25; 6:14; 7:40; Acts 3:22-26. Evidence of the pre-Christian expectation of such a prophet is found in T. Benj. 9:2; 1QS 9:11; 4QTest. 5-8; and possibly 1 Macc. 4:46; 14:41. Extrabiblical evidence from the first century includes the expectations surrounding the “sign prophets” or “action-oriented prophets” described by Josephus (B.J. II.13.4.259-5.262; Ant. XX.5.1.97; 8.6.168-70; 8.10.188); cf. Horsley, “Like One of the Prophets of Old: Two Types of Popular Prophets at the Time of Jesus,” CBQ 47 (July 1985), 455-60. Even if expectation of a Mosaic prophet was not universal, it was available to first-century Jews and could easily have spread as the result of early speculations about Jesus.
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1 Kgs. 17:8-24; 2 Kgs. 5:1-14; Luke 4:25-27; cf. Lester L. Grabbe, Priests, Prophets, Diviners, Sages (Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press, 1995), 70-72, 95 (on Neuer prophets), 117. The vitality of these traditions about Elijah and Elisha in the first century CE is confirmed by the accounts of their exploits in the "Lives of the Prophets" (Vitae Prophetarum) 10:6; 21:4-7; 22:4-16.

Cf. 1 Sam. 10:12; 19:20; 2 Kgs. 2:12; 4:38; 6:1; 13:14; Isa. 8:16. The social role of such bands in economically depressed situations is discussed by Joseph Blenkinsopp, Sage, Priest, Prophet (Louisville: WJKP, 1995), 133-8.


The inner connection between the Word and the prophet is based on the OT formula, "The word of the Lord came to the prophet... saying..." (e.g., Isa. 51:16). The "divine word" might be nothing more than a verbal message from God, but it could also be conceived as a messenger or angel of the Lord, as in Philo; see Ronald Williamson, Jews in the Hellenistic World: Philo (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1989), ch. 2. In Wis. 18:15-16, the divine Word is portrayed as a warrior carrying a sword, very much like the angel of the Lord in Num. 22:23; Josh. 5:13-14 (cf. Rev. 19:13; Ignatius, Magn. 8:2).


Enoch and Moses were translated into heaven in the Hebrew Bible. Other traditions celebrated the ascension before death of Phinehas, Elijah, and Ezra (Pseudo-Philo, LAB 48:1; 4 Ezra 14:4-9, 49 Syn/Eth/Arm).

It follows that belief in the death and resurrection of Jesus had to be independently established. It could not simply have been derived from the promises of Deut. 18 (prophet), 2 Sam. 7 (king), and Gen. 22 (martyr).


Raymond E. Brown, “Did Jesus Know He Was God?”, *BTB* 15 (April 1985), 77b. The quote alludes to John 1, where Christ is described as the divine Word. Cf. Athanasius, *Or. con. Arianos* III,30, for the same idea.

Isa 33:24; 40:2; 43:25; 55:7; Jer. 31:34; 33:8; 36:3; 50:20; Mic. 7:19.

Exod. 32:32; 34:9; Num. 14:19; Amos 7:2; cf. Dan. 9:19.


In the Qumran Prayer of Nabonidus, a Jewish exorcist (probably Daniel) is said to have forgiven the sins of the king of Babylon who had appealed to God for healing (4Q242 frags. 1-3). The connection between healing and forgiveness is similar to that in Mark 2:3-12, but, in the Gospel, the appeal of the sick is directly to Jesus and forgiveness and healing come directly from Jesus.

E.g., Deut. 17:19; 27:26; 28:58; 31:12; 32:46; Isa. 42:24; Jer. 9:12-13; 16:10-11; 26:4-6; Ezek. 44:24; Dan. 9:11; Hos. 8:1; Amos. 2:4; Zech. 7:12; Mal. 4:4.


“Only God Incarnate can have proposed not only to affirm but also to revise, not only to intensify but also to excise, the ancient teachings”; Bruce Chilton and Jacob Neusner, *Judaism in the New Testament* (London: Routledge, 1995), 135 (Chilton discusses the basis for this conclusion in Jesus’ own ministry on p. 115).

On the Teacher of Righteousness (second century BCE) as a prophet like Moses, based on Deut 18:15-18, see CD 1:11; 4QTest. 5. But the Teacher of Righteousness was strictly a “seeker” or “interpreter” of the Law; CD 6:7; 7:18.

On the discernment of false prophets, see m. Sanh. 11:5-6; b. Sanh. 90a. The concern about judgements on Jesus as a false prophet come only in later strata of the NT (Luke 7:39; John 3:2; 7:52; 9:16).

Deut. 18:15-19; Isa. 44:3; 61:1-2; Joel 2:28-29; Sir. 24:33.

Cf. Luke 3:16; 7:19, 35 (where Jesus’ disciples are the children of Wisdom); 10:9; 11:20, 32; 16:16, all from Q.

According to the Deuteronomist, the divine word was the basis of all prophecy (2 Kgs. 3:11-12). According to the prophet Jeremiah, the divine word presided at the divine council (Jer. 23:18). For the healing role of the Word of God, cf. 1 Kgs. 17:21-24; Ps. 107:20; Isa. 55:10-11.

For the Word as an emanation from God, see Isa. 55:11. For the role of the Word in creation, see Ps. 33:6; Sir. 43:26; Jub. 12:4; Philo, *Plant.* 8-10, *passim*; m. Ber. 6:2-3; Tg. Isa. 44:24 (memra); Tg. Jer. 27:5 (memra).


E.g., Hermas, *Sim.* 5:6.5; 9:1.1; *Gospel of the Hebrews*, frag. 2 (dated to the 1st half of the 2nd cent.); Justin, *1 Apol.* 33.6; 36:1-2; 38.1; 59.1.

The Holy Spirit is represented by an angel (like the Son of God), e.g., in Hermas, *Mand.* 11:9; *Mart. Isa.* 9:27-40. In nonchristian Jewish texts, however, the Spirit, unlike the Word and Wisdom, is never given a visible form.

Thomas G. Weinandy suggests a helpful schema that integrates the theologies of
the Old and New Testaments. As at creation the ruach of God prepared the elements to receive the divine word (Gen. 1:2-3), and as the ruach of God enabled the prophets to receive the prophetic word, so at Jesus' baptism the pneuma of God prepared the people of Israel to receive the divine declaration ("You are my Son...") and anointed Jesus as the Word incarnate (Mark 1:10-11; Luke 3:21-2); Weinandy, *The Father's Spirit of Sonship* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1995), 26-9, 48.

73Early texts attesting to the belief that we receive the Spirit from (or in the name of) Christ include Mark 1:8; Luke 3:16 (Q); 1 Cor. 6:11; Gal. 3:14; 4:6. The Spirit inspired the confession and proclamation of Christ in Luke 24:48-9; John 14:26; 15:26-7; 16:12-15; Acts 1:8; 1 Cor. 12:3; Rev. 22:17.

74The spirit that empowers the prophet Ezekiel is similarly differentiated from the glory-man he sees in his vision; Ezek. 1:28-2:2; 3:23-24; 8:2-4; 11:22-24.

75Clearly this theologizing took place after (and in light of) the Resurrection, but it must have been rooted in the types and promises in terms of which Jesus had already been understood in his earthly life.


78In terms of the related divine categories of life and lifegiving, the Crucifixion and Resurrection could be understood as the killing and revival of the divine principle of life (cf. Acts. 3:14-16).


80Jewish sages were portrayed as kings in Dan. 2:48-49; Eccl. 1:1; 12:9; Wis. 6:20; 7:1-22; 8:9-9:12; 10:1-2, 10, 13-14).

81Josephus refers to Jesus' reputation as a sage and teacher as well as Messiah (Ant. XVIII.iii.3 [63]). On the other hand, Jesus was not trained in the schools of the rabbinic sages, and he apparently criticized the sages of his time who were so trained (Luke 6:27-42; 7:9; 10:21, all Q).


83Other prechristian and first-century texts (mostly based on 2 Sam. 7) that uphold this Davidic expectation in various ways include 1 Kgs. 2:4; 8:25; 1 Chron. 17:11-14; 22:10; 28:6-7; 2 Chron. 6:9, 16; 7:18; 13:5; 21:7; 23:3; Pss. 2:6-9; 89:3-4, 19-29; 132:11; Isa. 9:6-7; 11:1-5; 16:5; 52:13-15; Jer. 23:5-6; 30:9; 33:14-26; Ezek. 34:23-24; Amos 9:11; Mic. 5:2; Zech. 3:8; 6:12-13; 9:9-10; LXX translations of Gen. 49:10 and Num. 24:7, 17; Sir. 45:25; 47:11-22; Pss. Sol. 17:4, 21-25, 42; Pseudo-Philo, *LAB* 60:3; 62:9;

The absence of a consistent picture does not invalidate the common point of reference in 2 Sam. 7 and related biblical texts. The tendency of some scholars to minimize messianic expectations in the first century CE has been adequately answered by John J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star* (New York: Doubleday Anchor, 1995), pp. 12, 49 65-67.

Ellis Rivkin discusses the avoidance of messianic expectation among the Pharisees; Rivkin, "The Meaning of Messiah in Jewish Thought," *USQR* 26 (1971), 394-5.

The probability of Jesus' own awareness of royal messianic expectations is nicely argued by J. G. D. Dunn, "Messianic Ideas," 372-4.


Mark 11:7-11; cf. 1 Kgs. 1:32-40; Ps. 118:19-26; Zech. 9:9. Regarding the promise in Zech. 9:9, S. L. Edgar states: "This was so widely understood as Messianic by the Jews that it seems almost certain that, when Jesus rode into Jerusalem on an ass, he was deliberately fulfilling prophecy as a means of announcing his messiahship"; Edgar, "New


94Mark 14:58-61; 15:29-32 seem to assume a direct relationship between the promise to build a new temple and the claim to be the Messiah; cf. Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism*, 61, 69-76, 153. The Davidic Messiah is portrayed as the one who would restore the Jerusalem Temple in *Psalms of Solomon* 17:30-31 (first century BCE); the Sibylline *Oracles* 5:422; the *Pseudo-Jonathan Targum* (on Isa. 53:5 and Zech. 6:12-13); and rabbinic writings of later date; cf. Don Jucl, *Messiah and Temple* (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977), 171-203.

95Mark 15:26; cf. Nils Alstrup Dahl, "The Crucified Messiah" (1960), reprinted in *The Crucified Messiah and Other Essays* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1974), 23-28; and *Jesus the Christ* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991), Jesus, 36-40. Dahl suggests that even if Jesus never openly claimed to be the Messiah (in so many words), he must have understood himself as such in view of his refusal to deny claims to messianic before the leader of the Sanhedrin; *idem*, Jesus, 42-44.

96We have interpreted certain aspects of Jesus’ ministry as being "messianic." We may suppose the general outline to reflect Jesus’ own interpretation of the messianic role, but should keep an open mind about the details. The availability of new texts and the reinterpretation of known texts will continue to alter the picture somewhat.

972 Kgs. 3:9; Ps. 51:6; 72:1-4; Prov. 8:15-16; Wis. 8:21-9:4; T. Sol. 1:5; 3:5.

98The parallel text, also based on Q, is Matt. 11:27. Cf. Job 28:23, 28; Prov. 8:30-31; Bar. 3:32-4:4 on the relationship between God and Wisdom.

99Elsewhere in Q, possible identifications of Jesus with Wisdom are found in Luke 7:35 (if the “children” are primarily the disciples of Jesus); Luke 9:58 (cf. Sir. 24:7-12; 71:10-11); Luke 11:31, 49 (keeping in mind that Jesus is the one who sends out prophets and apostles in Q; cf. Matt. 23:34); and Luke 13:34-35 (where Jesus speaks as the departing shekinah or Wisdom of God; cf. Prov. 1:28; Sir. 15:7; 24:4, 10-12; 1 Enoch 42:1-2). See Witherington, *Christology*, 51-53, 222-8, 248-50; *idem*, *Jesus the Sage*, 202-3, 219-22, 226-30; *idem*, *Jesus Quest*, 183-4, 187-9. As many as five other early Christian traditions appear also to have identified Jesus with Wisdom: Paul, James (the risen Christ), special Matthean material, John, and Thomas. Therefore, even if the issue of the Christology in Q itself may still be unresolved, we have good reason to agree with Charles E. Carlson and Ben Witherington that the source of Wisdom Christology was Jesus himself; Carlson, “Wisdom and Eschatology,” in *Logia: Les Paroles de Jesus*, ed. Joel Delobel (Leuven: Leuven Univ. Press, 1982), 117-18; Witherington, *Christology*, 51-53, 55, 223, 227, 248, 256, 268, 274-5.


Messiah: Pauline Exegesis and the Divine Christ," *HBT* 16 (Dec. 1994), 121-43. For Jesus as Yahweh/Lord in Mark, see Barry Blackburn, *Theios Anér and the Markan Miracle Traditions* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1991), 133-82. Jesus was differentiated from the Lord only when he was identified as the "Anointed of the Lord" in in reference to Psalm 2:3 as in Acts 4:24-30.

David had established the political independence of Judah (and Israel?), and the "son of David" was expected to do so again (2 Sam. 8: 10; 1 Chron. 18: 19; Jer. 23: 5-6; 33: 15-16; Ps. Sol. 17: 21-31; cf. Luke 1: 68-75; 24: 21; Acts 1: 6).


The task of Jesus was not just a therapeutic one of restricting the activity of demons and treating the demon-possessed, but the apocalyptic one of rooting out the hidden source of evil; cf. Mark 3: 22-27; Luke 4: 1-13 (Q); 11: 21-22 (Q); 10: 17-18; John 12: 31-32; Gos. Thom. 35. In Jewish tradition, battle against the angelic powers of evil was normally undertaken by a supernatural agent of God or even by Yahweh himself.

Luke 2: 11 (*Christos Kyrios*); cf. Lam. 4: 20 LXX (*Christos Kyrios*); Pss. Sol. 17: 32; 18: 7 (*Christos Kyrios*); Matt. 15: 22 (*Kyrie huios David*). The idea that the Messiah was also *Kyrios* is probably based on Ps. 110: 1.

There was also an association between the first human (Adam) and the royal-wisdom motifs considered here; cf. Gen. 1: 26-28; Sir. 17: 3 with Wis. 1: 6-7; 7: 26; Philo, *Opif.* 148; *Leg. All.* 1: 43; *passim.*

In Mark 12: 35-37, the point is not just that the Messiah is called "Lord" (David, too, was called "Lord," e.g., in 1 Kgs. 1: 37), but that King David called him his "Lord." Jesus is also assumed to be greater than David in Mark 2: 23-28; Daniel J. Antwi, "Did Jesus Consider His Death to be an Atoning Sacrifice?", *Int* 45 (Jan. 1991), 21-22.

For Wisdom as an emanation from God, see Wis. 7: 25-26; Sir. 24: 3. For the theme of creation through God's Wisdom, see Job 28: 20-28; 38: 36-37; Pss. 33: 6; 104: 24; Prov. 3: 19-20; Jer. 10: 12; 51: 15; Wis. 7: 17-24; 8: 1; 9: 1-2; Sir. 1: 1-10; 24: 1-12.

The images of light and glory are equivalent here; cf. Isa. 58: 8 (chiasm); 60: 1; Wis. 7: 25-6; T. Abr. 16: 8; Luke 2: 32; 2 Cor. 4: 6; Rev. 21: 11, 23; Odes Sol. 36: 3-4.

Mark 1: 11; Luke 3: 22 (Q); Acts 10: 38; cf. Ps. 2: 7. The idea of the Messiah being anointed by the Spirit is based on 1 Sam. 16: 13; Isa. 11: 2; 42: 1; 61: 1; cf. Zech. 4: 1-14.

Matt. 12: 15-32; cf. note 90 above on Jesus as exorcist.

In the Parables of Enoch, for instance, the heavenly Son of Man is anointed by the pluriform Spirit of God promised in Isa. 11: 2 (1 Enoch 49: 3; 62: 2; cf. J. C. O'Neill, "An Introduction to a Discussion with Dr Maurice Casey about his Recent Book," *Irish Biblical Studies* 14 (1992), 197-8.

Among NT texts that portray parity between the Christ and the Spirit, see Acts 9: 31; Rom. 15: 30; 1 Cor. 6: 11; Phil. 2: 1; 3: 3; Heb. 10: 29; cf. Cyril of Jerusalem, *Cat. Orat.* XXI.1; Gregory of Nazianzus, *Orat.* XXXIX.16.

From a pre-resurrection viewpoint, the Spirit might simply have been understood as the divine power (Wisdom) that was embodied in Jesus (cf. note 36). However, there may also have been a triadic model for the transcendent ground of the royal office. For example, the Similitudes of Enoch differentiated three heavenly hypostases: the Lord of Spirits, the royal Son of Man, and the Wisdom/Spirit of God (1 Enoch 42: 1-2; 48: 2-7;
49:1-4). Hence, "...it is easy to see that a reader of 1 Enoch could draw the conclusion that the heavenly Messiah, the Kabod, when he should manifest himself, would be accompanied by Sophia or the Spirit"; Jarl Fossum, "Jewish-Christian Christology and Jewish Mysticism," VC 37 (1983), 280.

115Mark 14:61; 15:2, 9, 18, 26, 32; cf. Nils Dahl, Jesus, 36-40.

116Luke 24:19-27 (prophet and Messiah); 1 Cor. 1:23; Justin, Dial. 10.3; 90.1; Origen, Contra Celsum II.9, 35, 68; VI.10, 34, 36.


119John 17:5; Acts 13:33; Rom. 1:3-4; Col. 1:18; Heb. 1:2, 5-9; Rev. 1:5.

120Matt. 28:18-20; Mark 16:19-20; Acts 2:30-36; 5:31; Eph. 1:10, 21-22; Phil. 2:10-11; Col. 1:18-20; 2:10; Rev. 3:21; 5:5-14.

121The verb anistēmi is used to refer to Jesus' resurrection as royal messiah in Acts 2:24, 32; 13:33, and the noun anastasis is used in Rom. 1:4; cf. Dennis Duling, "The Promises to David and Their Entrance into Christianity," NTS 20 (1974), 75-77.

1221 Cor. 1:30; 8:6; Eph. 1:10, 22-123; 4:10; Col. 1:17b; Heb. 1:3b; the latter two texts refer to Christ's eternal role as Wisdom in light of the Resurrection.

123Mark 14:62; 16:19; Acts 2:32-36; 5:31; Rom. 10:9-13; 14:9; 1 Cor. 1:30-31; Eph. 2:8; Phil. 2:9-11; Heb. 1:3, 13.

124E.g., Aune, Prophecy, 122-6.


126The most extensive treatment is found in 4 Macc. 8-18 (earlier than 54 CE); cf. de Jonge, Christology, 181-4. The idea of atonement being effected by the suffering and death of the righteous is also found in Isa. 53:6, 10-12; Wis. 3:6; 1 Enoch 47:4.

127Texts include Mark 1:11; 9:8; John 3:16; Rom. 8:32. See Robert Daly, "The Soteriological Significance of the Sacrifice of Isaac," CBQ 39 (Jan. 1977), 66-74. The clearest reference to the akedah in Paul's writings (Rom. 8:32a) is one he assumes to be familiar to the Roman church and, therefore, is pre-Pauline.

128John Downing ("Jesus and Martyrdom," 286, 291-2) argues that Jesus first thought of his death as that of a rejected prophet and only later came to understand it as that of a sacrificial martyr like those of Maccabean times. Luke 13:32-33 could be cited in support of this reconstruction and is probably an authentic saying of Jesus; cf. Hill, New Testament Prophecy, 61-62.

129Pseudo-Philo, LAB 32:3; Aramaic Targums to Gen. 22:7; cf. John 12:27-28. According to P. R. Davies and B. D. Chilton, the tradition that Isaac consented to the sacrifice can be traced to the late first century CE, beginning with Josephus, Pseudo-
Philo, and 4 Maccabees; Davies and Chilton, "The Aqedah: A Revised Tradition History," *CBQ* 40 (Oct. 1978), 521-9, 541. The Targums are generally believed to preserve earlier traditions.

130Strictly speaking, Jesus viewed himself as a sacrificial martyr like Isaac, not as a priest like Aaron (or a king-priest like Melchizedek). The combination of the types of priest and sacrifice in Christian theology probably dates from the book of Hebrews (possibly influenced by the tradition the martyr Eleazar in 4 Maccabees 6-7); Sam K. Williams, *Jesus’ Death as Saving Event* (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1975), 241.

131Another possible allusion in the baptismal declaration is to the royal declaration in Psalm 2:7 (*huios mou ei su*), but this does not account so well for the words, *hagapêtos*. Most Western texts of Luke 3:22 follow the LXX of Ps. 2:7 word for word, so this may have been the original reading of Q (cf. Havener, *Q*, 124). If so, Mark’s version clearly shifted the focus away from kingship to the *akedah* in Gen. 22 and the servant of Yahweh in Isa. 41:8-9; 42:1; 43:10. The shift in meaning from kingship to suffering would be in line with Paul’s emphasis on the cross of Jesus (e.g., 1 Cor. 1:22-31). However, the interpretation of Jesus’ death in terms of the *akedah* and the Isaianic servant is clearly pre-Pauline as evidenced by Rom. 8:32; 1 Cor. 15:3.

132The tradition of the Jewish martyrs’ faithfulness to the Law under penalty of death is found, e.g., in 2 Macc. 6:18-30; 7:1-38; T. Moses 9:4-6.


134Matt. 12:5-7 amplifies the pericope in Mark 2:23-26. The “something greater” (*meizon*) in Matt. 12:6 may refer to the new service of God or the new community which Jesus had established, but, for Matthew, the indwelling *shekinah/glory* would still be Jesus himself (Matt. 18:20).

135There may have been a tradition concerning a divine “Son of God” in Israel just as there were traditions concerning the divine Word and Wisdom of God. In 4 Ezra, for example, the Son of God/Messiah pre-exists in heaven much as the Son of Man or Righteous/Elect One does in the *Similitudes of Enoch* (4 Ezra 7:28-29; 12:32-34; 13:52; cf. 1 Enoch 38:2-3; *passim*).


137Cf. Judg. 13:19-23, where ascent into heaven is viewed as a sign of God’s acceptance of a sacrificial offering. In Wis. 3:6-7, future resurrection is viewed as the sign of God’s acceptance of the self-offering of martyrs. Some Jewish midrashim interpreted Gen. 22 as implying that Abraham actually sacrificed Isaac (cf. Gen. 22:19, where Abraham appears to return without his son) and that God rewarded this offering with the promise of a future resurrection; Jon D. Levenson, *The Death and Resurrection of the Beloved Son* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1993), 192-6.

138Without the hindsight of the NT perspective, it would be difficult to know whether to take the personifications of the Word and Wisdom as more than literary images; Dunn, *Christology in the Making* (London: SCM Press, 1980), 176; *idem*, *Partings*, 198-9.
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