LITURGICAL PATTERNS AND STRUCTURE IN THE JOHANNINE APOCALYPSE AGAINST THE BACKGROUND OF JEWISH AND EARLY CHRISTIAN WORSHIP

Charles W. Fishburne

Doctor of Philosophy
University of Edinburgh
1976
ABSTRACT

The Apocalypse of St. John belongs to the class of literature generally known as "apocalyptic", though with significant differences arising primarily out of its Christian orientation. Although the author is not primarily concerned with worship, the Apocalypse is nevertheless profoundly liturgical, and stands within the stream of early Christian Worship. Thus the first two chapters of the thesis are devoted to a study of the literary and liturgical backgrounds of the Apocalypse, as are the four main appendices.

A detailed study of all possible references to worship in the Apocalypse is outwith the scope of this thesis, and the subject of research has been narrowed down to liturgical "patterns" and "structure". Certain scholars claim to have detected a liturgical pattern in the Apocalypse, and these are analysed in Chapter III. All of the suggested patterns are rejected, with varying degrees of improbability, although certain concepts are found to be valuable in an historical study of the Apocalypse and early liturgy, and it is admitted that the Apocalypse does reflect the liturgical theory and practice of its age.

An understanding of the Seer's use of Christian worship is found most clearly in his use of the image of the Temple. In common with the early Church he views the Church as the new Temple, the dwelling place of God on earth, and further develops the concept of the heavenly Temple, which forms the scenic background for the primary
drama of the Apocalypse. The language, forms and images of the Jewish Temple are used to represent both the new and heavenly Temple, and similarly such images are drawn from the new Temple, the Church. Certain hermeneutical guidelines for analysing liturgical images emerge from this study of the Temple in Chapter IV, and these are subsequently applied in a study of the structure of early Christian worship as reflected in the Apocalypse, particularly as revealed in the scene of the heavenly worship.
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It has often been suggested that the Johannine Apocalypse is a potentially rich source of information for the study of early Christian worship. This was stated with categorical clarity in 1951 by Cullmann:

A further important mine of information is the Book of the Revelation of St. John.... He sees the whole drama of the last days in the context of the early Christian service of worship.... Hence the whole Book of Revelation...is full of allusions to the liturgical usages of the early community.

Although a few articles have appeared in this connection, as well as a few books with a certain relation to liturgy in the Apocalypse, to our knowledge no detailed and thorough study has yet been made of this interesting subject.

It was our original purpose to undertake such a study. As is frequently the case, the sheer magnitude of the subject required a narrowing of the scope of the thesis. Consequently this study is limited to liturgical "patterns" and "structure" in the Apocalypse. These are defined in more detail within, but essentially refer to outlines of (for) worship services, and the organisational arrangements for worship.

Notwithstanding the limited scope of the thesis, it will be necessary on frequent occasion to refer to other aspects of Christian and Jewish worship as they touch upon


2. These are referred to and discussed in Chapters III and IV.
our discussion: baptism, the Eucharist, synagogue and Temple services, and the liturgical "forms" to be found in church, synagogue and Temple.

Since modern discussion is still taking place on the nature of the "liturgical background" of the Apocalypse, it was necessary to prepare a chapter on "Early Christian Worship." This in turn necessitated similar studies of Temple worship, synagogue worship, and worship among the Qumran sectarians. The chapter on early Christian worship is included in the main body of the thesis as the "Liturgical Background" of the Apocalypse, but the studies of Jewish worship have been appended at the end, in order to achieve more rapid continuity in approaching the main subject.

Frequent reference is made in the thesis, however, to the appendices, which are crucial to the thesis as a whole.

Nor can the Apocalypse be considered apart from its literary context. Consequently the opening chapter deals with "The Literary Background: Jewish Apocalyptic." It is not our purpose, however, to study "apocalyptic" as such. So much modern scholarship having been devoted to this subject, we have merely included a summary of the work of modern scholarship on the nature of apocalyptic, and devoted most of the chapter to questions of direct concern for our study: whether or not the Apocalypse stands in the tradition of Jewish apocalyptic, and the use of worship in Jewish apocalyptic. We have also added a brief appendix summarising the literature from Qumran and evaluating its relationship to apocalyptic generally.
Thus the thesis is divided into four parts: a study of the background of the Apocalypse, literary and liturgical (Chapters I and II); an examination of those modern theories which claim to have detected liturgical patterns in the Apocalypse (Chapter III); a detailed investigation of the Seer's use of liturgy in the Apocalypse, as exemplified in his use of liturgical structure (Chapter IV); and several studies of the Jewish background of considerable importance to the thesis (Appendices I-IV). The main thesis of this work is reached in Chapter IV.

An article arising out of my study of Jewish apocalyptic, which was published in New Testament Studies (17) during my period of candidacy, is included as per regulations, as Appendix V.

Finally, I should like to express my appreciation to Professor Hugh Anderson and Dr. Ian A. Moir of the University of Edinburgh for their encouragement and helpful comments in the preparation of this thesis, and to Professor George E. Ladd of Fuller Theological Seminary for his thorough and interested guidance in the acquisition of skills necessary for research in the study of New Testament history.
CHAPTER I

THE LITERARY BACKGROUND: APOCALYPTIC

The Johannine Apocalypse belongs to a class of literature which was widely circulated among the Jews (and later Christians) from the 2nd century B.C. until several centuries later. This literature has come to be termed "apocalyptic," deriving from the title of the book of Revelation, found in chapter 1.1, "the ἀποκάλυψις of Jesus Christ, given to him by God," and further transmitted through a certain "John." ἀποκάλυψις is derived from the verb ἀποκάλύπτω, meaning "to reveal." All the literature of this period, therefore, which is of a "revelatory" nature and purports to answer questions concerning the history of this world and the nature of the "heavenly world" has come to be classified as "apocalyptic."

In order to study liturgical patterns and structure in the Johannine Apocalypse it is necessary first to understand something of its literary background, particularly the use of worship in that background and the liturgical "theology" reflected therein. It is also necessary to establish the Johannine Apocalypse as truly belonging to the class of literature known as "apocalyptic." Consequently this chapter is divided into three sections:

1. The Nature of Jewish Apocalyptic

A brief summary of the vast amount of research carried out in the last several decades, with a view towards establishing the relationship of apocalyptic
literature to the Jewish community of the times.

2. Is the Apocalypse an "Apocalypse"?

A comparison of the Johannine Apocalypse with the characteristics of apocalyptic literature discussed in Section I, with a view towards establishing its relationship to that literary background.

3. Jewish Worship and Apocalyptic

An analysis of the use of worship in apocalyptic literature with a view towards establishing the extent and nature of the use of Jewish worship in apocalyptic literature.

The results of this study should provide useful tools with which to approach an analysis of liturgical patterns and structure in the Johannine Apocalypse.

A. THE NATURE OF JEWISH APOCALYPTIC

Although certain apocalypses, mostly Christian, were composed later, the literature which is of importance for Christian origins and which concerns us is that which was composed up to the end of the 1st century A.D. General consensus acknowledges the following as belonging to that category:

2nd Century B.C.
Daniel (c. 165 B.C.)
I Enoch (c. 164 B.C. onwards)
Jubilees (c. 150 B.C.)
Third Book of the Sibylline Oracles (c. 150 B.C. onwards)
Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs (c. 110 B.C.)

1st Century B.C.
Psalms of Solomon (c. 48 B.C.)

1st Century A.D.
Assumption of Moses (c. 6-30 A.D.)
Life of Adam and Eve (c. 65-70 A.D.)
Ascension of Isaiah (c. 65-80 A.D.)
Apocalypse of Abraham (c. 70-100 A.D.)
II Enoch, or The Secrets of Enoch (late 1st century?)
Fourth Book of the Sibylline Oracles (c. 80 A.D.)
IV Ezra (II Esdras) (c. 90 A.D.)
Testament of Abraham (late 1st century A.D.?)
II Baruch, or The Apocalypse of Baruch (late 1st century A.D.?)

In addition to these must be added the Apocalypse of Mark 13 and the Revelation of John itself. The dates of these books are by no means settled with exactitude.¹ For instance, II Enoch is thought by some to date from no earlier than the 7th century A.D.² Most scholars, however, favour the approximate dates given above. In any case, these writings are those which give us a picture of apocalyptic literature in circulation during the period of the early church.

Many parts of these writings have been interpolated by Christian redactors, or even composed by Christian authors. Nevertheless they all reflect a strong Jewish character, and although they probably represent only a small fraction of the literature in circulation in the first century,³ they should nevertheless afford us insight into the literary background and religious temper of the Johannine Apocalypse.

³. Russell, op.cit., p. 29.
The Rise of Apocalyptic

The basic problem of the apocalyptists was the suffering of Israel under the oppressive rule of wicked foreign powers, in spite of her obedience to the Torah and faithfulness to Yahweh.

And now, O Lord, behold these nations which are reputed as nothing lord it over us and crush us. But we, thy people, whom thou hast called thy first-born, thy only-begotten, thy beloved, are given up into their hands. If the world has indeed been created for our sakes why do we not enter into possession of our world? How long shall this endure?

The prophets of the Old Testament proclaimed the Assyrian and Babylonian captivities as the judgment of Yahweh upon his people for their idolatrous and unrighteous ways. Having learned their lesson, the Jews built a new Temple and established the synagogue in order to maintain the true worship of Yahweh and ensure faithful obedience to his Law. Thus from the time of the Exile onwards there was no more idolatry and gross unrighteousness as in pre-Exilic days. But after a period of limited independence under the benign rule of the Persians, Palestine fell into the hands of the Greeks. After the death of Alexander the Great the Jews were ruled for a century by the Greek Ptolemies of Egypt. In 198 B.C. rule was transferred to the Greek Seleucids of Syria. This brought on very troublous times. The Ptolemies and Seleucids vied with one another for possession of Palestine. Hellenization was intensified, leading to

bitter inner divisions among the Jews. The policies and practices of Antiochus Epiphanes led to the Maccabean revolt in 166 B.C. The whole period from 197 B.C. until the Maccabean revolt was marked by foreign domination, increased taxation, Hellenization, intrigues surrounding the High Priesthood, religious persecution, defilement of the Temple, and finally religious and political revolt. In this milieu the first truly apocalyptic work extant appeared, the canonical book of Daniel. Its purpose was to mediate a divine message of courage and hope to the faithful in troublous times by asserting the sovereignty of God and the certainty of the ultimate triumph of his Kingdom. Its success made it a model for works to follow; its failure (in exact prediction) led to its re-interpretation and adaptation.¹

The Maccabean successors soon degenerated into rival factions, and the next hundred years witnessed a series of murders and intrigues surrounding the throne and High Priesthood that shocked the pious. Finally, in 63 B.C., Jerusalem fell to Rome and the Jews were again under the heel of foreign domination. Thus the evil times persisted.

The faithful felt almost abandoned by God. If God was righteous, and if he was sovereign, why did he continue to allow his faithful people to suffer?

For the pious Jew the problem was confounded by the fact that God's voice was no longer heard in Israel. It was

everywhere acknowledged that prophecy had ceased; the Lord no longer spoke in a living voice.

We do not see our signs; there is no longer any prophet, and there is none among us who knows how long.¹

Russell lists four factors contributing to this cessation of prophecy: (1) the increasing influence exercised by the Torah; (2) the absorption of charismatic prophecy by the "cultic prophecy" of the Temple guilds; (3) reaction against abuses of prophecy as practiced among encroaching foreign cultures; and (4) the fear of the ruling classes that prophecy was dangerous to the peace.²

Another factor would be that the conditions in Israel itself were different. The prophets were men of revolutionary temperament; they were protesters; they were reformers. But there was no idolatry now, except that imposed from outside. Although there was still a deep sense of sin, the conviction prevailed that the Jews alone were obedient to the Law of Yahweh. Thus the internal conditions were different, and the flaming call to repentance of the Old Testament prophets seemed unnecessary.

But there was one tradition in Old Testament prophecy that was particularly relevant. This was the eschatological message that

In that day the Lord shall punish the hosts of the high ones,
the kings of the earth upon the earth.
And the Lord of hosts shall reign in Mount Zion,
and in Jerusalem,
and before his ancients gloriously.³

¹ Ps. 74.9. Cf. Josephus, Contra Apion, I, 8.
² Russell, op. cit., pp. 75-82.
³ Isaiah 24.21; 23:7.
The germ of apocalyptic was found in the predictive element of Old Testament prophecy, especially Isaiah 24-27, Ezekiel 37-48, Zechariah 9-14, and Joel. This element was developed in apocalyptic, and was further influenced by the emphasis in the wisdom literature on cosmological gnosia, skill in understanding divine mysteries, and interpretation of dreams (cf. Dan. 1.17).

The answer to the problem of Israel's suffering was to be found in the ultimate triumph of God in history. This gave rise to the development of those eschatological conceptions which are characteristic of apocalyptic. On the other hand, prophecy had ceased. The apocalypticists, however, had a relevant message. Thus they spoke through the lips of honoured persons of ancient times. Their pattern was the first apocalypse, Daniel. This gave rise to the development of those literary methods which are characteristic of apocalyptic.

1. Gerhard Von Rad has rightly called attention to this Wisdom element in apocalyptic in his Old Testament Theology, Vol. I (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1965), pp. 305-308. Von Rad goes too far, however, in completely divorcing apocalyptic from Old Testament prophecy and finding its origin solely in Wisdom, pp. 301-306. A clear development towards apocalyptic can be seen in the later prophets, especially Ezekiel, Zechariah and Joel, and Daniel is obviously dependent upon Ezekiel. Von Rad's discussion of the divergent views of history in prophecy and apocalyptic does not justify his thesis that we must look solely to Wisdom for the "real matrix from which apocalyptic originates," p. 306. Cf. further our discussion on the apocalyptic non-prophetic view of history, infra, pp. 14-15 and on the relation between prophecy and apocalyptic, infra, p. 21.
Characteristics of Apocalyptic

Several scholars have rightly distinguished between apocalyptic as a literary genre and apocalyptic as a particular kind of eschatology. There is by no means a consistent eschatology among the various apocalyptic works. On the other hand, several of the works listed above do not fully share in the literary marks of apocalyptic (e.g., the Psalms of Solomon, the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs) but nevertheless contain apocalyptic ideas. We will first discuss those eschatological conceptions which are characteristic of apocalyptic, then its literary characteristics. No attempt will be made at extensive discussion, since this has been done elsewhere. Our purpose will be best served by a summary presentation of the results of modern scholarship.


Eschatological Conceptions. It must be re-emphasized that a variety of "eschatologies" occurs amongst the apocalyptists. I Enoch, a composite work, reflects three divergent eschatologies: (1) an earthly Kingdom with no Messiah (1-36; cf. also Jubilees); (2) a final resurrection and judgment, followed by a transformed earth, all brought about by a heavenly figure called the Son of Man (37-71, the so-called Similitudes); and (3) new heavens enjoyed by the souls of the righteous (92-105). Add to these the concept of an earthly Kingdom with a Davidic Messiah (Psalms of Solomon), or an earthly Kingdom followed by a new creation (IV Ezra 7, II Baruch 29-30) and the picture of proliferation becomes apparent.

Bousset¹ and Frey² have pointed out that there are two basic types of eschatology in apocalyptic: a nationalistic, which looks for a future earthly victory of Israel, with a Messianic King; and a transcendental, which looks towards the future destiny of the whole cosmos in which the old will perish and the whole creation become new. These two types are brought together in certain later apocalypses, with a Messianic Kingdom as a sort of interregnum or prelude to the final triumph of the Kingdom of God in a new creation.³

In general, apocalyptic was concerned with such subjects as the nature and unity of history, the cosmic dimensions of history, the primordial creation and fall of angels and men, the source and powers of evil, the conflict of God versus Satan, light versus darkness, good versus evil, Messianic concepts and the development of the transcendental Son of Man figure, eternal life, Hell and Heaven, the resurrection of the dead, the final judgment, the doctrine of this age and the age to come, the coming Kingdom of God.  

It is important also to note that the apocalyptists were not only concerned with "the end," but with the whole scope of history, its beginning, its development, and its conclusion. Thus the book of Jubilees is almost entirely devoted to the beginning and development of history, with only a short passage at the end treating its consummation. Apocalyptic also reflects a deep interest in the structure of the physical universe, the phenomena of nature, and the movements of celestial bodies. Another feature to which sufficient attention has not been given is the development of the concept of the divine throne and heavenly worship.

G.E. Ladd has suggested that underlying the proliferation of eschatological ideas is "a distinct philosophy of history." This philosophy may be described as consisting

---

1. See the further discussions in Russell, op. cit., pp. 205-390; Beckwith, op. cit., pp. 64-82; and Ringgren, op. cit., cols. 455-458.
of five basic tenets, which together comprise the apocalyptic "mood," or "temper."\(^1\) The first of these is dualism, which Ladd defines as cosmological (light versus darkness, God versus Satan) and eschatological (this age versus the age to come.) This undoubtedly reflects the influence of Persian dualism,\(^2\) but an influence that served primarily as an accelerating catalyst of ideas already contained in seed form in the Hebrew Prophets.\(^3\) It is distinctive, however, in that the dualism is not between two equal powers. God is always viewed as the sovereign King and Creator, in control of the whole conflict. There is no doubt about the outcome of history.

A second basic tenet is the non-prophetic view of history. The historical situation of suffering could not be reconciled with the apocalyptists' view of God. Therefore it was concluded that God no longer acts in history, and his redemptive acts have no bearing upon the present. Thus the prophetic tension between eschatology and history was lost. God was no longer the God of history; he was only the God of the consummation. Perhaps Ladd slightly overstates the point. Such books as Daniel and Jubilees

---


2. Ladd holds that Persian influence is "unlikely," since the source of our knowledge of its eschatology is found in the Bundahishn, a post-Mohammed work, op.cit., p. 84. But as Beckwith has pointed out, op.cit., p. 80, the fundamental ideas of Zoroastrian eschatology extend back well into pre-Christian times, as shown by the testimony of Theopompus (c. 380 B.C.) as recorded in Plutarch, De Iside et Osiride 47.

3. So Beckwith, op.cit., pp. 81-82. Ladd agrees that if there was Persian influence, it was as a force sharpening Jewish concepts, op.cit., p. 84.
seem to conceive of God as working right down to the present and about to bring in the consummation. Nevertheless, it seems valid as a general rule to say that the apocalyptists conceived of God ultimately and primarily as the God of the future.

The third tenet, which naturally follows from the first two, is a basic pessimism concerning this age, which is abandoned to evil and suffering. The righteous must simply resign themselves to suffering in this age (cf. II Tim. 3.12!). It is hopelessly corrupt, and under the control of Satan. Nevertheless, the apocalyptists were ultimately optimistic; they looked for the glorious age to come soon. For them, God was still the King, but was allowing evil to run its course in this age.

A fourth tenet is an historical determinism. God has decreed the course of this age, and no matter whether Israel obeys God's Law or not, it must come to pass. The time of the end is fixed. But the apocalyptic message is usually one of hope, for the end is at hand. Some mode of computation is often introduced, dividing world history into periods. The apocalyptist usually stands in the last.

Finally, Ladd asserts a characteristic which he calls "ethical passivity." The apocalyptists, like the rabbis, understood righteousness as obedience to the Law. They

1. Ladd acknowledges this of Daniel, p. 91.
2. So Daniel introduces seventy weeks of years "from the going forth of the word to restore and build Jerusalem," 9.25. I Enoch introduces seventy periods; the Fourth Book of the Sibyllines ten; II Baruch twelve; the Third Book of the Sibyllines, I Enoch 91, and the Testament of Levi seven.
were convinced that Israel alone was attempting to keep the Law. The problem was not that of Israel's disobedience but the lack of God's blessings. Thus there is very little of ethical urgency. Russell contradicts this view, however, and asserts that the apocalyptists were indeed motivated by ethical concern, and cites Daniel as evidence.\(^1\) Ladd acknowledges this of Daniel, as well as I Enoch 92-105, the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and Revelation.\(^2\) But, he argues, it is precisely this feature which sets these works apart from the other apocalypses. Furthermore, he points out that I Enoch 92-105 and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs are non-apocalyptic in form. This may be begging the question to a certain extent, but we agree with Ladd that a certain ethical passivity, as compared with the Old Testament Prophets, is indeed characteristic of apocalyptic.

**Literary Characteristics.** The cessation of prophecy and troublous times led these men with a divine message to adopt and develop a distinct method, which we have distinguished from apocalyptic conceptions.\(^3\) We would also suggest that the characteristics of this literary genre may be further divided into literary forms and literary devices.

The acknowledged decline in prophecy rendered it difficult for these men to communicate their message of

---

hope and encouragement in prophetic, verbal terms. Consequently they were led to adopt certain literary forms.

Indeed, the first and most obvious characteristic of these forms was that they were literary. The apocalypticists were writers, not preachers. Compare Jeremiah 13.12,

You shall speak to them this word: "Thus says the Lord, the God of Israel, etc."

with Revelation 1.11,

Write what you see in a book, and send it to the seven churches.

Furthermore, these were not wholly original compositions. The apocalypticist drew on a wealth of material, adapting, transforming and re-interpreting it in accordance with his own ideas and contributions. Ideas found in the Old Testament Prophets, especially in such passages as Isa. 13-14, 24-27, Ezekiel 1, 28-48, Daniel, Joel 2-3, and Zech. 9-14 were fertile ground. Popular traditions, folklore, myths, and oriental conceptions also contributed in no small way. The book of Daniel established the pattern which others followed. There is evidence that some works are the result of editing and compilation of several traditions and already existing written materials.

Resort to the written word was not sufficient in itself, however, to overcome the barrier of the cessation of prophecy. Thus the apocalypticists wrote in the name of

1. Cf. also Isa. 7.7 with Ass. Moses 1.16.
some honoured figure of the ancient past. This technique facilitated popular hearing and acceptance. Rowley has argued that pseudonymity was not so much to gain acceptance as it was the slavish following of the pattern set by Daniel. That book assumed its name in an attempt by the author of the visions (7-12) to identify himself as the author of the stories (1-6) which he had previously composed about a figure named Daniel, and which had proved so popular. Thus, maintains Rowley, pseudonymity was only an accident, which was followed slavishly by Daniel's apocalyptic successors. While this may be true as an historical account of the development of pseudonymity, the fact remains that most of the works are pseudonymous, and that their very pseudonymity did gain them a popularity which they might not otherwise have enjoyed. Thus it may still be argued that pseudonymity was an integral form of apocalyptic literature. This is not to say, however, that pseudonymity was a mere form. Russell has cogently argued, on the basis of the Hebrew views of time and personality, that behind the pseudonymity lay a sense of inspiration by which the apocalyptists regarded themselves as the true inheritors and interpreters of the men in whose names they spoke as contemporary representatives.

3. The canonical Apocalypse and the Qumran literature are notable exceptions to this rule, as there are exceptions to almost every characteristic of apocalyptic. This fact should warn us against holding too closed a view of apocalyptic as a literary genre.
Pseudonymity led the authors to assume the historical standpoint of their namesakes. Thus, when they represented the broad scope of history from beginning to end, they portrayed all history from the time of the ancient seer to the time of the author in futuristic terms. This third literary form, which is of great value for determining the dates of the books, may be called "pseudo-prophecy." 

Rowley is undoubtedly correct in arguing that the apocalyptists followed Daniel as their pattern, no doubt due to the popular success of that book. The characteristic literary devices of the author of Daniel were then assumed and developed by his successors.

The first of these is obviously that they were apocalyptic, or revelatory. God's message came in visions, ecstasies, dreams, heavenly voices and bodily transport. The rationale was that the subject matter was such that it could only be made known by means of special, divine revelations, for man is otherwise incapable of knowing it. In many cases these were undoubtedly literary and artistic devices. On the other hand, Russell has pointed out that the frequency with which these revelations come at night in connection with sleep, or after fasts and the eating of certain foods suggests the possibility of real parapsychological experiences.

1. See the discussion above, p. 13.
4. There are also exceptions to this rule, notably the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and the Psalms of Solomon.
Another problem was how to express heavenly realities, perceived in special revelations, in earthly and mundane terms. Inscrutable truths required metaphor; inexpres-sible scenes required symbol. Thus the apocalyptists utilized the device of imprecise language and fantastic imagery. We encounter such images as the four beasts of Daniel 7-8; the bullock, sheep and seventy shepherds of I Enoch 85-90; the forest and the vine of II Baruch 36-38; the lightning-crowned cloud pouring forth showers of black and bright waters of II Baruch 53-74; the mourning woman transformed into the new Jerusalem of IV Ezra 9-10; and the rapture through the seven heavens of II Enoch and the Apocalypse of Abraham. We also encounter such terms of comparison as "like," "as," "like unto," etc. This gives the reader the impression that the author must be content with describing as best he can the indescribable wonders which it has been his privilege to observe.

In connection with this use of symbol, time-imagery also played a role. Thus computations of time are introduced symbolically; the numbers 3, 4, 7, 10, 12 and 70 seem to have been especially significant.

All of this gave a mysterious quality to the writings, which thus required an interpreter. He is usually an angel, but sometimes even God himself. This mysteriousness renders much of the material very vague, especially with regard to the future.

1. Cf. e.g., I Enoch 14.10-13, 46.1ff., 71.5; Dan. 7.13; II Enoch 12.1.
2. See supra, p. 15, fn. 2.
The Place of Apocalyptic in Judaism

Apocalyptic has sometimes been sharply distinguished from prophecy. Notwithstanding their differences, however, it is important to bear in mind both the predictive element in prophecy and the spiritual element in apocalyptic. Russell quotes T.W. Manson and Sabatier with approval to the effect that apocalyptic is the Jewish development of Hebrew prophecy, as Rabbinicism is of the Torah. Beckwith has perhaps stated it most precisely when he asserts that the difference is not in content or ideas, but in dominance of ideas. Thus he calls such canonical apocalypses as Isaiah 24-27, Daniel, Mark 13 and Revelation "prophetic apocalyptic."

It is also dangerous to distinguish too sharply between apocalyptic and Pharisaic Judaism. W.D. Davies has pointed out that the two are really at one, in their attitude towards the Torah, their eschatology, and their concern with the people. The Eighteen Benedictions, which were recited daily both in and out of the synagogues, contain prayers for the regathering of Israel, the resurrection, and the coming Kingdom of God. Even though later

Rabbinicism rejected most of the apocalyptic literature in reaction to its use by Christians, and as a result of the dreadful effects of the Jewish uprisings of 66-70 A.D. and 132-135 A.D. which it inspired, the Rabbis still retained most of the basic eschatology. Thus it is a mistake to distinguish too sharply between "ethical Pharisaism" and "apocalyptic."¹

Nor can a sharp distinction be maintained between the priestly religion and apocalyptic. On the contrary, the apocalyptists were supremely allied with the Temple and its cultus.²

In view of the fact that the apocalyptists drew on much oral material, and enjoyed considerable popularity, it may be assumed that they thus expressed the root feelings of a broad cross-section of the people, as is the case with popular literature in every age. Russell is probably correct in asserting that the apocalyptists belonged to no one party, but were spread across the parties, as well as the Am ha-Aretz, who were of no party. While differing from one another in detail, they shared and expressed the "common hope in the ultimate triumph of God's Kingdom in which the Jewish people would play a glorious part."³

². See infra, pp. 49-50.
³. Russell, op. cit., p. 27. For a discussion of apocalyptic and the Dead Sea Scrolls see Appendix I of this thesis, pp. 236-244.
B. IS REVELATION AN APOCALYPSE?

This chapter began with the commonplace assumption that the Revelation of St. John belongs to the apocalyptic type of literature which has just been defined and discussed. Certain important differences have been pointed out, however, and one scholar even goes so far as to argue that Revelation is ill-named, and should not be considered an apocalyptic book at all. Thus we must justify our assumption.

It is easy to deny the apocalyptic character of the Revelation of John if "apocalyptic" is defined in such a way as to exclude the book. For example, if the hallmark of apocalyptic is identified as pseudonymity, then one would be justified in deducing the non-apocalyptic character of Revelation. But this is circular reasoning, and reflects too narrow and restricted an approach. Yet this narrow sort of approach is precisely that followed by J. Kallas in the article cited. He maintains that the


3. This assumes that the "John" of Revelation was not intended by the author/editor to refer to the Apostle John in order to gain credence for the book.

4. Ibid., pp. 69-80.
essence of apocalyptic is its dualistic view of suffering: all evil is inflicted on the righteous, not by God, but by semi-independent forces of wickedness, personified in and led by Satan, whom God himself will crush. "A piece of writing is truly apocalyptic only when and if it does take this...point of view."¹ Having thus defined apocalyptic, Kallas goes on to argue that Revelation does not share this view. Rather, it sees suffering as the disciplinary and corrective will of God—a good thing to which the righteous should submit; Satan, the anti-Christ, and all the forces of evil have no independent activity, but are mere pawns in the hands of an omnipotent God. Thus, Kallas concludes, Revelation is not apocalyptic.²

But surely this is too restricted an approach. It obscures the distinction between apocalyptic as a message and apocalyptic as a literary form. Furthermore, it singles out one aspect of the apocalyptic message, albeit a central one, and measures all other literature by this single criterion. It may be granted that Kallas has drawn attention to a distinction between Revelation and other apocalyptic literature; but that hardly justifies his assertion that Revelation is not an apocalyptic book.

We have attempted to define apocalyptic, as broadly as possible, as Jewish literature of the period involved "which is of a revelatory nature and purports to answer questions concerning the history of this world and the

¹. Ibid., p. 71.
². Ibid., pp. 77-80.
heavenly world. ¹ According to this broader definition
the Revelation of John is definitely apocalyptic. We have
also attempted to discuss the characteristics of
apocalyptic in some detail. A comparative analysis of
Revelation with other apocalyptic literature reveals both
parallels and differences; but it is distinguished from
Jewish apocalyptic in precisely those aspects which reflect
the deeply Christian theology embedded in the thought of
the Seer.

The first apocalypse, Daniel, appeared during a period
of suffering and troublous times to mediate a message of
courage and hope to the faithful by asserting the
sovereignty of God and the certainty of the ultimate triumph
of his kingdom. Although Revelation does not, like most
apocalyptic, assume the faithfulness of God's people, ² it
nevertheless follows the apocalyptic pattern. The
consensus of modern scholarship is that the book probably

¹ Supra, p. 4.
² As Kallas has demonstrated, op.cit., pp. 77-80. Kallas
overstates his case, however, when he maintains that the
suffering of the Church is "self-manufactured, merited,
and in distinct proportion to their failure to heed the
precepts of the gospel," p. 78. While the element of
divine chastisement is present, suffering is also
conceived as the evil infliction of the forces of wicked-
ness (cf. 12.17; 13.7; 17.6); those who withstand and
remain true to Jesus will, as in other apocalyptic,
find their vindication in the Day of Judgment. This is
especially true of the theology underlying the plagues
visited not upon the Church (which Kallas over-emphasises,
p. 80), but upon the wicked powers of this world; cf.
6.9-11; 11.17-18; 12.10-11; 16.5-7; 18.24; 19.2;
20.4.
appeared during the persecution of Domitian, c. 90-96 A.D.¹

Like Daniel, its purpose was to encourage the people of God to "conquer" and "endure" in the light of the coming vindication and consummation of the kingdom of God.²

The subject matter of Revelation is also apocalyptic. It is concerned with the nature, unity, and destiny of history. It makes use of such eschatological concepts as the Messianic woes, the Antichrist, the suffering remnant, the divine judgment upon wickedness and the ultimate triumph of righteousness, the resurrection from the dead to final judgment, the final redemption of God's people, and the age to come. Yet Revelation is


distinguished from Jewish apocalyptic in that the author has drastically elevated these and other concepts into the sphere of Christian theology. This is no mere "Christianising" of Jewish thought, but a thoroughgoing transformation of apocalyptic ideas in the light of the fulfilment of the Hebrew religion in Jesus Christ, through whom the eschatological age has already begun. To this extent Revelation may rightly be said to reflect a "realised eschatology."¹

Thus narrow nationalistic hopes of Judaism are enlarged to encompass the redemption of the whole world in Christ (1.5; 11.15); earthly Messianism and transcendental re-creation are brought together with Christ as Messianic King in an interregnal millennial kingdom (20.4–7) followed by the new heavens and new earth, in which the Jewish Temple is no longer the centre but Christ himself, with the Church Triumphant as the new dwelling-place of God (21.1–26); it is Jesus Christ who is "the faithful witness, the first-born of the dead, and the ruler of the kings on earth," who "loves us and has freed (or washed) us from our sins in his own blood, and made us a kingdom, priests to his God and Father," and to whom "be glory and dominion forever and ever" (1.5).

Like other apocalyptic Revelation is concerned with the phenomena of nature, especially the calendar and heavenly luminaries. It also makes extensive use of the idea of the divine throne and heavenly worship.

John's thought is primarily distinguished from Jewish apocalyptic in its underlying philosophy of history, which is profoundly Christian. Although sharing a basic cosmological and eschatological dualism with apocalyptic, Johannine thought greatly subordinates the activity of the forces of evil to the rule of God. It is God who is in complete control all the time; Satan and the Antichrist are more tools through which an omnipotent God accomplishes his purposes.

Characteristic of apocalyptic was a non-prophetic view of history in which the prophetic tension between eschatology and history was lost. God was no longer the God of history; he was only the God of the age to come. This led to a pessimism concerning this age. God was no longer active, and the righteous must find consolation in suffering during this present evil age by hoping for the glorious age to come. But the Seer has recovered the prophetic view: God is at work now; he has already brought redemption in Christ; the Messiah has already appeared; and God is seen as moving in contemporary history to

accomplish his purposes.  

John has also recovered the prophetic note of ethical urgency which was lost in apocalyptic. The primary message of Revelation is more than encouragement to hope in times of suffering; it is a vigorous call to repentance, endurance, and fidelity to the precepts of the gospel. This is especially evident in the letters to the seven churches and the invitation of 22.17: "Let him who is thirsty come, let him who desires take the water of life without price."  

Revelation most closely approximates the apocalyptic philosophy of history in its determinism. God has decreed the times, and these must be fulfilled before the end comes. Although it views the end as near, Revelation is free of such computations of time remaining until the end as are evident even in the canonical apocalypse of Daniel.

The literary characteristics of Revelation are definitely apocalyptic; its distinction lies in those forms and devices which are necessarily transformed by the Christian theology of the Seer. With regard to forms, the Revelation, like other apocalypses, is a written message, but it differs in two respects: (1) it is framed in the form of an epistle, the common Christian literary form of the period, addressed to specific churches in contemporary time; (2) the author calls his work a "prophecy," thus

3. Cf. 6.11; 9.15; 11.2, 3; 12.6, 14; 13.5; 20.6-7.
4. 1.3; 22.7, 10, 18, 19.
classifying himself with the Christian "prophets." \(^1\)

With the advent of Christianity the spirit of prophecy dawi1 anew; the eschatological gift of the Holy Spirit had been bestowed and a new group of prophets had arisen, equipped to proclaim the message of God with prophetic

power. \(^2\) Thus the author of the Apocalypse had no need of pseudonymity; he could write in his own name as a well-known prophet of God with wide prestige among his readers, most of whom had probably heard him orally proclaim the divine message of redemption and hope. \(^3\)

Although John had no need to assume the historical standpoint of a pseudonymous namesake, he nevertheless utilises the literary form Ladd terms "pseudoprophecy" \(^4\) in the vision of the beast with ten horns and seven heads of Chapters 13 and 17. Even so, the vision does not necessarily assume the posture of predictive prophecy, and the

---

1. 11.18; 16.6; 18.20, 24; 22.6, 9.
4. See supra, p. 19.
Seer nowhere attempts to represent himself as standing at some point of time in the ancient past, predicting history until the time of the author in futuristic terms as, for example, in the Book of Jubilees, or even Daniel.¹

Like other apocalyptists the Seer of Patmos has extensively borrowed from and re-worked existing materials. Revelation contains many Old Testament images, to several of which J. Cambier has drawn particular attention.²

Charles has compiled a lengthy list of passages based on the Old Testament.³ John has also made extensive use of the apocalyptic literature,⁴ and there is evidence that he

---

1. See the discussion in Ladd, "Revelation and Jewish Apocalyptic," p. 95.

2. Op. cit., pp. 114-115. Cf., e.g., God's dwelling among men (21.3) with Lev. 26.11-12, Ezek. 37.27-28 and Zech. 2.14-15; the angel of 1.13 with Daniel 10.5ff. and Ezek. 1.26 ff.; the fall of Rome with the fall of Babylon; the water and tree of life with Gen. 1-3; the parallel Songs of Moses (15.3-4 and Deut. 32) indicate a parallel between the eschatological liberation and the Exodus.

3. Revelation, I, pp. lxviii-lxxxii. See also the list in Niles, op. cit., pp. 32-33.

4. See the list of passages dependent on or parallel with the Pseudepigrapha in Charles, Revelation, I, pp. lxxxii-lxxxiii. To these could be added the following passages which are echoes, either in language or thought, of apocalyptic passages: 1.6 - Jub. 15.18; 1.14-16 - Apoc. Abr. 10; 1.15 - Apoc. Abr. 17; 1.16 - II En. 1.4, Vit. Ad. and Eve 29.4; 1.17 - Test. Abr. 9; 2.7 - I En. 25.4-5; 2.10 - Asc. Isa. 9.18; 2.17 - Asc. Isa. 8.7; 3.4 - Asc. Isa. 4.16; 3.5 - Asc. Isa. 4.16, 9.22; 3.11 - Asc. Isa. 9.18; 3.18 - Asc. Isa. 4.16; 3.21 - Asc. Isa. 9.18; 4.4 - Asc. Isa. 4.16, 9.18; 4.7-8 - Apoc. Abr. 18, Sib. Or. III.16; 6.10 - I En. 9.3, 10; 6.11 - Asc. Isa. 4.16; 6.12-14 - Sib. Or. III. 82-90; 7.1-2 - Asc. Isa. 4.18; 8.6-9.21 - Apoc. Abr. 30; 9.1 - II En. 42.1, Apoc. Abr. 21; 10.5-6 - II En. 65.7; 10.7 - Apoc. Abr. 30; 11.7 - Apoc. Abr. 21; 11.14-19 - Apoc. Abr. 30; 12.1-6 - IV Ezra 4.40-43; 12.6 - Asc. Isa. 4.13, Apoc. Abr. 29; 12.12 - Asc. Isa. 9.5; 12.14 - Asc. Isa. 4.13; 13.3 - Sib. Or. V. 33-34; 13.4 - Asc. Isa. 4.8; 13.8 - Asc. Isa. 4.8, 9.22; 13.12 - Asc. Isa. 4.8; 13.14 - Asc. Isa. 4.11;
knew and used several books of the New Testament. It is also argued by some that he re-worked and incorporated earlier Christian apocalyptic material, perhaps of his own composition, possibly dating from the time of Caligula, Nero, or even Vespasian.


1. See the parallels in Charles, Revelation, I, pp. lxxiii-1xxxvi.

2. Cf. supra, p. 26, fn. 1. E.F. Scott suggests that the Seer used five sources: his own visions, the writings and messages of Christian prophets, the Old Testament, Jewish apocalyptic, and pagan mythology, op.cit., pp. 22-25. Carrington suggests that John worked with three sets of Christian material: the Old Jerusalem (directed against the great city), written under Caligula; the Neronic; and the Domitianic, op.cit., pp. 343ff. See the full discussion in Kümmel, op.cit., pp. 324-326. See also the more recent discussion in B. Reicke, "Die jüdische Apokalyptik und die johannische Tiervision," Rech. de sci. rel., 60 (1972), pp. 173-192.
He observes that those scholars who maintain a close connexion between Revelation and the Qumran literature also hold to the identical authorship of Revelation and the Fourth Gospel, for the latter of which there is ample evidence of Qumran parallels. But Braun has convincingly shown that the connexion between Revelation and the Scrolls is not at all apparent, and theories of the identical authorship of Revelation and John, or even a close connexion between the two, find no support or proof in the evidence of the Scrolls. John definitely was familiar with and made use of certain apocalyptic works of which the Qumran Covenanters were fond, but if he knew the literature peculiar to the Qumran community he made sparse use of it.

The author of Revelation readily avails himself of the literary devices of apocalyptic. Almost the entire book, from 1.10 onwards, is cast in the form of a vision which John experienced "in the Spirit on the Lord's Day." The Seer makes extensive use of symbols and imagery to express inscrutable truths and inexpressible scenes. He freely employs archetypal images (dragon, beast, abyss, heavenly throne, feast, keys, war, horses, crown, blood) and "a tremendous array of colour, sound and form." He

1. Herbert Braun, Qumran und das Neue Testament, Band I (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1966), pp. 307-324. Braun allows the parallels of Rev. 10.7 with IQ S 1.3, IQp Hab 2.9, and CD 6.1; and Rev. 11.7-10 with 4Q Test 21-30.
2. Ibid., pp. 324-325. See also Appendix I of this thesis, pp. 242-244.
3. Especially I Enoch and The Testaments of the XII Patriarchs; see Charles, Revelation, I, pp. lxxxii-lxxviii. Ctt also the dist in Appendix I of this thesis, p. 236.
does not indiscriminately appropriate these symbols, however, but contemporises and profoundly Christianises them. Thus, for example, the angels of Dan. 12.5 are reflected in Rev. 10.2, but the scope is enlarged from the destiny of Israel to that of the whole world;¹ the Old Testament symbol of Babylon as the city of oppression and evil is preserved, but clearly applied to Rome; the judgment scene of Dan. 7 is adapted to revolve around Christ in Rev. 20; the solid foundations of the eschatological city, a common apocalyptic theme, become the twelve apostles in Rev. 21.14; and the eschatological Temple of Ezek. 40-48 and other apocalyptic literature is transformed into the perfected and sanctified Church as the final dwelling-place of God in Rev. 21, which is of considerable importance to our study.²

As in other apocalypses number imagery plays a significant role; seven and twelve are particularly key numbers.

The effect of all this imagery is to impart a mysterious quality to the book which thus, like other apocalyptic literature, requires a heavenly interpreter.³ John himself supplies an occasional interpretation, either clearly or veiled, whenever he deems it necessary.⁴

¹ This and the following examples are taken from Cambrier, op.cit., pp. 116-117.
² See infra, pp. 168-179.
³ Rev. 1.20; 7.14 ff.; 17.7 ff.
⁴ Rev. 4.5; 5.8; 13.18.
This analysis reveals that the Revelation of John definitely belongs to the apocalyptic class of literature, and should be so understood and interpreted. Nevertheless, it must be emphasised that it is a profoundly Christian work, and to that extent differs from its Jewish forebears. While concerned with the prediction of the future, Revelation is deeply spiritual and profoundly prophetic, proclaiming the message of Christ and calling all men to repentance, thus justifying Beckwith's observation that the book may be called "prophetic-apocalyptic."¹

C. JEWISH WORSHIP AND APOCALYPTIC

Although considerable attention has been devoted by modern scholarship to the Jewish apocalyptic literature, little has been written on the role of worship in that literature.

We have made an effort to identify all the references to worship in the apocalyptic literature of the period dating from the 2nd century B.C. to the end of the 1st century A.D.² Some passages have undoubtedly been omitted,

² The following works have been included in this analysis: Daniel, I Enoch, Jubilees, the Third and Fourth Books of the Sibylline Oracles, the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, the Psalms of Solomon 11, 17, and 18, which are the apocalyptic Psalms, the Assumption of Moses, the Life of Adam and Eve, the Ascension of Isaiah, the Apocalypse of Abraham, II Enoch (The Secrets of Enoch), IV Ezra (II Esdras), the Testament of Abraham, II Baruch, and the little apocalypse of Mark 13. The canonical Apocalypse and other Christian apocalyptic literature of later origin have been omitted.
due to oversight and ignorance, whereas some have probably been included into which, out of zeal for the subject, we have read too much. The results obtained by the analysis of these passages tend to bear out the conclusions one would expect, while also suggesting further conclusions of some importance to our understanding of the apocalyptic literature.

An attempt has been made to classify all of these references, of which there are 187, according to their literary context, liturgical reference, and locational setting.

The classification designated literary context is divided into three categories: apocalyptic, historical-apocalyptic; and non-apocalyptic. Defining the last first, by "non-apocalyptic" is meant a passage set in a context which, although occurring in an apocalyptic work, is devoid of apocalyptic characteristics. Such, for example, is the doxology in Darius' decree in Dan 6.26-27. Another example is Baruch's lament over the ruins of the Holy Place, in which he refers to the offering of sacrifices and incense by the High Priest, in II Baruch 35.4.

Under "historical-apocalyptic" are classified all those references which occur in a context that does bear apocalyptic characteristics, but which is clearly set in past history (i.e., past with respect to the real author's time and not the pseudonymous author's). Examples are the prophecy of the defilement of the Temple and its sacrifice by the Levites in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, Test. Lev 14.5-16.1, and the reference to the First and...
Second Temples in the Life of Adam and Eve 29.5-7.

Certain references are historical in character, such as II Baruch 35.4 mentioned above, but are classified as "non-apocalyptic" because they lack apocalyptic characteristics.

The third category, "apocalyptic," includes all those references which occur in a context bearing apocalyptic characteristics, and which deal with the eschatological future, heavenly visions, and the like. Examples are the blessing of God by all the hosts of Heaven on the eschatological "Day" in I Enoch 61.10-13, and the reference to the eschatological Temple in III Sib Or 772-776.

The passages are further classified according to their liturgical reference as bearing on the Temple, synagogue, or private worship. Where the references are clearly to the Temple, as is the mention of the daily burnt-offerings in Jubilees 6.14, or to the synagogue, as is the exhortation in II Baruch 86.1-2 to read the epistle "in your congregations, especially on fast days," they are classified accordingly. In some cases, however, it is impossible to distinguish the liturgical reference, since it is common to both Temple and synagogue. These passages are classified under another category which we have termed "Temple/synagogue." An example of this is the angelic singing of the Kedushah in Test Abr 20. An example of private worship is the fasting of Ezra in IV Ezra 5.21, 6.35.

It must be emphasized that these passages do not always specifically refer to the Temple or synagogue, but rather reflect the worship of those institutions... For example,
Daniel's confession in Dan 9.4 is a private act of worship, but it reflects the Day of Atonement confession of the Temple and the synagogue. Thus its liturgical reference is Temple/synagogue, and not private; although it may indeed tell us something about the relationship of private to public worship.

It should also be pointed out that although several passages reflect both Temple and synagogue, the synagogue worship took over and was patterned after the worship of the Temple. Therefore the Temple forms the original reference. Furthermore, the apocalyptists, as shall be demonstrated, were definitely Temple-oriented. This would seem to indicate that the bulk of these references to the Temple/synagogue are influenced by the Temple rather than the synagogue, although it is impossible at times to determine precisely the specific reference of a particular passage. Thus the Temple/synagogue references are considered as basically reflecting the Temple.

Finally, an endeavour has been made to classify these passages according to their locational setting. The two categories in this classification are termed "heavenly" and "earthly." Under "earthly" are listed all those passages which seem to occur in a setting on this earth in this age, such as the mention of the burning of incense in the sanctuary in Jubilees 4.25. All those passages which seem to occur in a setting in Heaven, such as the heavenly Temple with the divine throne of Test Levi 5.1, or in the eschatological age, whether on Earth (as in Jubilees 1.28-29), or Heaven (as in I Enoch 51:10-13), or in one instance;
Hell (I Enoch 22.14) are listed, for want of a better term, under "heavenly."

In many cases it is very difficult to draw an artificial distinction between the categories imposed upon the material, and a certain amount of subjectivity is inevitably involved. We are concerned, however, with broad patterns and indications of liturgical theology, which clearly emerge despite the subjectivity and error involved. We turn, then, to an analysis of our findings as recorded in the following tables (pp. 40-43).

**Literary Context.** Of the 187 liturgical references, 75 are apocalyptic, 70 are historical-apocalyptic, and 42 are non-apocalyptic.

Of the 75 references in an apocalyptic setting, 44% (33) reflect the worship of the Temple. The Temple/synagogue references, which basically reflect the Temple, add another 23 passages (31%) bringing the total of apocalyptic passages referring to the Temple to 56, or 75%. This emphasis on the Temple is also characteristic of the historical-apocalyptic references, of which 86% (60) reflect the Temple. The Temple figure drops off sharply to 48% (20) in a non-apocalyptic context.

With regard to location, 67% (50) of the apocalyptic references are heavenly. This is sharply reversed in the historical-apocalyptic category, in which only 7% (5) are heavenly, and the non-apocalyptic, in which only 5% (2) are.

Thus the basic pattern with regard to literary context emerges as follows: apocalyptic references tend strongly toward the Temple and heavenly categories; historical-
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
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<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N A T/S E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N A S H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N A S E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N A P H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N A P E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 A T/S H</td>
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II Baruch:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Company/Version</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.4-7</td>
<td>ATH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>NATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>NATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>NAPE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.10</td>
<td>NATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.18</td>
<td>NATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>NAPE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>ASE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.1-2</td>
<td>NAPE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.4-26</td>
<td>NASE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>NATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>NATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>NAPE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.1-24</td>
<td>NATESE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.7-8</td>
<td>APE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>HATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.2-5</td>
<td>HATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.2-3</td>
<td>HATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.2-4</td>
<td>HATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.4-5</td>
<td>HATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>NATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.8</td>
<td>NASE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.1-2</td>
<td>NASE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mark 13:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Company/Version</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>ASE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
apocalyptic references tend very strongly toward the Temple and earthly categories; and non-apocalyptic references are almost all earthly, with even distribution among the liturgical reference categories.

Further analysis reveals that those references which fall under the apocalyptic-Temple categories are primarily set in a heavenly location (40 out of 57, or 70%), whereas 5 out of 6 apocalyptic-synagogue references are on earth. Understandably, most of the apocalyptic-private worship references are in heaven (9 out of 13), and consist mostly of private praises, blessings and prayers to God offered by the Apocalyptists themselves, as in I Enoch 81.3.

The historical-apocalyptic references, most of which also reflect the Temple, are almost all located on Earth (55 out of 60) and thus refer to the earthly Temple. The historical-apocalyptic references to the synagogue (5) and private worship (5) are all located on earth.

The non-apocalyptic references to the Temple include only one in Heaven, the remainder (19, or 95%) being on Earth. All of the non-apocalyptic references to the synagogue (7) are on earth, as are 93% (14 out of 15) of the references to private worship.

Thus the following conclusions may be drawn with respect to the literary context of these references: in an apocalyptic context the dominant emphasis is on the Temple in a heavenly or eschatological setting; in a historical-apocalyptic context the dominant emphasis is on the earthly Temple in this age; and in a non-apocalyptic context the
references are almost all earthly, but distributed more or less evenly among the liturgical categories.

**Liturgical Reference.** Of the 187 references, 90 reflect the Temple, 46 the Temple/synagogue, 18 the synagogue, and 33 private worship.

Again including the Temple/synagogue references as basically reflecting the Temple, we find that in an apocalyptic context the Temple references are mostly heavenly or eschatological (70%, or 40). In a historical-apocalyptic context they are mostly earthly, as in a non-apocalyptic context.

The synagogue, in an apocalyptic context, is still usually earthly (5 out of 6); in a historical-apocalyptic context it is always earthly (5), as in a non-apocalyptic context (7).

Private worship in an apocalyptic context tends to occur in a heavenly setting (9 out of 13), whereas the setting is almost always earthly in a historical-apocalyptic context (5) or a non-apocalyptic one (14 out of 15).

Thus the following **conclusions** emerge with regard to the liturgical reference of our material: the Temple is the most common, and tends to be heavenly in an apocalyptic context and earthly in other contexts; the synagogue is referred to equally in all three literary contexts, but is almost always earthly. Private worship is usually found in an apocalyptic context, where it is usually heavenly, or a non-apocalyptic context, where it is definitely earthly.

**Locational Setting.** Of the total of 1874/13050 references (70%) occur in scenes located on Earth, and
57 (30%) in Heaven or the eschatological age. 88% (50) of the heavenly references are in an apocalyptic context, whereas only 19% (25) of the earthly ones are. Conversely, only 9% (5) of the heavenly references are in a historical-apocalyptic context, whereas 50% (65) of the earthly ones are. Similarly, 3% (2) of the heavenly references are in a non-apocalyptic context, whereas 31% (40) of the earthly ones are.

With respect to liturgical reference, 81% (46) of the heavenly references reflect the Temple; all but one of the remaining references are to private worship. Of the earthly references, 70% (90) reflect the Temple; 18% (23) are private, and 12% (17) reflect the synagogue.

Thus the basic pattern with respect to locational setting emerges as follows: heavenly references tend very strongly to be found in an apocalyptic context and to reflect the Temple; earthly references are more evenly distributed, but tend to be found in historical-apocalyptic and non-apocalyptic contexts, and to reflect the Temple.

Further analysis reveals that the heavenly references in an apocalyptic context are dominated by the Temple (80%), most of the remainder being private in character. The earthly references in an apocalyptic context are distributed more or less evenly among the liturgical categories: Temple (9), Temple/synagogue (7), synagogue (5), and private worship (4).

Heavenly-Temple references occur 46 times; of these fully 87% are in an apocalyptic context. On the other hand, the earthly-Temple references, of which there are 90,
definitely tend to be found in a historical-apocalyptic or non-apocalyptic context, some 84% (76) being so classified. There is only one reference to the synagogue in a heavenly setting, and it is in an apocalyptic context. Earthly-synagogue references are distributed evenly among the literary categories. Heavenly-private worship is almost always found in an apocalyptic context (90%), whereas earthly-private worship tends to be in a non-apocalyptic (61%, or 14) or historical-apocalyptic one (22%, or 5).

Thus we reach the following conclusions with regard to locational setting: in a heavenly setting the markedly dominant emphasis is on the Temple in an apocalyptic context; in an earthly setting the liturgical emphasis is more balanced, although still tending towards the Temple; the literary context shifts, however, with most references occurring in a historical-apocalyptic or non-apocalyptic context.

**Summary of Conclusions**

Four distinct patterns emerge from this analysis, which would seem to reflect basic emphases of the apocalyptists, and which should provide scholarship with a further tool for analyzing apocalyptic theology, the historical milieu in which it arose, and literary and historical characteristics of the various books.

Perhaps the most significant pattern theologically is that which is also the most consistent in occurrence, that of the apocalyptic-heavenly-Temple.
recurrence, and most significant historically, is that of the historical-apocalyptic-earthly-Temple. Two other patterns, of considerably lower frequency and thus less important, are the earthly-synagogue, evenly distributed among the literary contexts, and private worship, which seems definitely to fall into either a heavenly-apocalyptic category or earthly-non-apocalyptic. While the latter patterns may be of less importance for the study of apocalyptic and its theology, they nevertheless provide us with additional information for the historical study of the synagogue and private worship.

It may be objected that not only is there a subjective factor in this analysis, but also that the statistics do not take into consideration the degrees of significance and importance of the various passages. There is a vast difference, for example, between the brief reference to the Temple oblations in IV Ezra 3.24 and Baruch's prayer in II Baruch 21.4-26, in which private worship in a non-apocalyptic context is clearly illustrated. It may further be objected that this analysis does not take into consideration the differences between the various works. There is a great difference, for example, between the Book of Jubilees, in which all the references are historical-apocalyptic, and II Enoch, in which none are.

All of these objections are valid to a certain extent. This analysis has only dealt with frequency of occurrence; a complete exegetical and historical analysis would...
constitute a full thesis on its own. Nevertheless, we would maintain that such a statistical analysis, despite its shortcomings, does reveal patterns which are significant for our understanding of the liturgical orientation and theology of apocalyptic, and consequently for our study in the Johannine apocalypse. It is clear, for example, that the apocalyptists, even after the Fall of Jerusalem in 70 A.D., were definitely oriented toward the Temple as the centre of worship, and were strongly influenced by it. They reflect intimate knowledge of its worship, and conceive of the worship of Heaven in terms of the worship of the Temple (as, e.g., in II Enoch 20.3-4, 21.1, 22.3). They look forward to the age to come, in which the worshipping community of the elect is centred round the eschatological sanctuary (as in III Sib Or 702-718). The synagogue is always confined to this age, and in no way is it considered as anything other than a temporary supplement to the worship of the Temple. Thus we could perhaps be justified in suggesting that the basic orientation of apocalyptic literature was priestly, and reflects a priestly theology of the period. As many scholars feel that the apocalyptic literature represents the deep hope and common tradition of a broad cross-section of the Jewish people and the various parties.

within Judaism, the priestly orientation of that literature would seem to call for a re-evaluation of the role of the Temple, its cultus and theology, in the Judaism of the 1st century A.D. The emphasis laid upon the synagogue in such traditional works as Moore's Judaism ought perhaps to be balanced by a stronger emphasis on the importance of the Temple. This is true also with respect to Christian origins.

Thus we conclude that the apocalyptic literature reflects a priestly theology of the period involved. It also reflects the worship of the period, laying a heavy emphasis on the Temple, which, for the apocalyptists, was very important as the centre of Jewish worship. The Temple played a significant part in the development of apocalyptic eschatology, the heavenly worship being patterned after its own, and the new creation revolving around the eschatological sanctuary. As we shall attempt to show in this thesis, this factor is crucial in understanding the liturgical orientation of the Johannine apocalypse.

D. SUMMARY

In this chapter we have sought to analyse the literary background of the Johannine Apocalypse, particularly the liturgical orientation of that background. We have argued

that apocalyptic enjoyed considerable popularity in the Jewish community (from which the author/editor of Revelation came), expressing the root feelings of a broad cross-section of the people and the various parties of the time.

We have argued that the Johannine Apocalypse is firmly rooted in the apocalyptic tradition, and should be so understood. Nevertheless, it is a profoundly Christian work, and many of the elements of Jewish apocalyptic contained therein have been re-moulded into the framework of early Christian theology. This crucial factor must be borne in mind in our study.

Finally, we have briefly analysed the liturgical orientation of Jewish apocalyptic, and concluded that it reflects a priestly theology of the period involved. In particular, we noted the significant part played by the Temple in apocalyptic eschatology, with the new heavenly creation revolving around the eschatological sanctuary, whose worship is patterned after the familiar Temple on earth. We shall attempt to show in this thesis that the Johannine Apocalypse stands firmly within this liturgical tradition, but in a profoundly Christian sense.

Before turning to our study of the Apocalypse itself it is necessary first to analyse its liturgical background. This is comprised of the worship of the Temple, the synagogue, and the early Christian Church.¹

¹. In order not to take up an undue proportion of the main body of this thesis with background, we have included only the section on early Christian worship in the following chapter. Sections on the worship of the Temple, the synagogue, and among the Qumran Covenanters are included at the end of the thesis as Appendices II-IV. Reference is frequently made in the body of the thesis to these appendices.
CHAPTER II

THE LITURGICAL BACKGROUND: EARLY CHRISTIAN WORSHIP

A. INTRODUCTORY

Students of the New Testament often tend to concentrate on the "theology of the New Testament," overlooking the fact that during the New Testament period Christianity was primarily a life-movement rather than a theological one. Those who followed Jesus of Nazareth were bound together and built up in their faith through common experience in worship. Early Christians "saw the worship of God as the whole purpose of life."¹ This new life-movement revolved around its corporate worship. Indeed the Johannine Apocalypse itself, which is the main object of our study, was meant to be read aloud in the context of corporate worship.²

Consequently the New Testament literature, though seldom referring explicitly to worship, reflects a liturgical atmosphere. Worship is "everywhere present behind the writers, giving form and colour to their modes of expression and thought."³ It is not without justification, therefore, that many recent writers have detected

2. As we shall attempt to demonstrate in Chapter III, pp.149-151.
numerous liturgical references in the New Testament.¹

The nature of early Christian worship is not easily analyzed. Was it spontaneous or fixed? Was it original, or simply adapted Jewish worship? The answer must be that it was both: Christianity spontaneously expressed itself in the fixed forms of Jewish worship to which its early adherents were accustomed, as well as in the original forms which spontaneously arose.

Most scholars have emphasized the Jewish origins of Christian worship. The Christian community was no sudden appearance without any background; almost all the early Christians were Jews who entered the Church with a long and developed cultic tradition.² Christianity was considered the fulfilment of Old Testament and Jewish religion; even "radicals," for such the early Christians were, were loath to overthrow the ancient customs and practices of their liturgical heritage.³ The very meagreness of data in the New Testament might argue that early Christian worship was largely the traditional form to which early Christians were accustomed.⁴


Other scholars have emphasized the distinctiveness of Christian worship. Morris correctly observes that there is no real evidence for a Christian "service of the Word," designed and patterned after that of the synagogue. The very newness of the kerygma, and the consciousness of eschatological fulfilment demanded new expression in worship.

It is clear that Jewish-Christians continued to worship in the Temple for some time, perhaps right up until its destruction. Although the Pauline epistles and Hebrews may reflect a growing antagonism toward the Temple, they also reveal a profound respect for it. After its destruction, when it no longer constituted a threat to Christianity, the Temple assumed an increasingly important place in Christian theology and worship; the pre-destruction Pauline concept of the Church as the eschatological Temple being built in


this age attained particular influence.¹

Christians continued to worship in the synagogues as well, both in Palestine and the Diaspora.² Explicit references are scanty, but certain changes in the synagogue liturgy made by the Rabbis in Jabneh toward the end of the first century are justified as necessary on account of the activities of Christians in the synagogues.³ Other evidence is the manner in which the Church adapted the synagogue liturgy to its own use. Examples abound in the New Testament of Christianized Jewish forms.⁴ Jewish worship is clearly reflected in the Didache, 10.2 ff., where Passover haggadah has been adapted for Christian use. Later examples are the Armenian Liturgy, and especially Books VII and VIII of the Apostolic Constitutions, in which Jewish prayers have been Christianized.⁵ Jewish-Christians considered their faith as the fulfilment of Judaism, and therefore compatible with it, right up until the final struggle, c. 250-380 A.D.⁶


4. Cf. e.g., Rom. 1.25, 9.5, II Cor. 11.31, Acts 4.24 ff.

5. Cf. especially VII, 33-35, in which the first three of the Eighteen Benedictions are Christianized. Werner, op.cit., has a long list of early Christian liturgical texts compared with their Jewish counterparts, pp. 31-36.

The majority of early Christians were Jewish, or if Gentile, Jewish proselytes, and it would seem reasonable to assume that they continued their regular worship in the synagogues, constituting themselves as ecclesiolaiae in ecclesia in much the same manner as the Pietistic movements in the confessional churches of Europe. The very scarcity of data concerning the earliest Christian worship tends to confirm this view: innovations in worship would certainly be the subject of considerable debate and discussion; on the other hand, if Christians continued their traditional worship in the Temple and synagogue there would be no occasion to mention the subject of worship — it would be assumed as common experience. It is significant, therefore, that sources devoting considerable discussion to organization for worship and containing liturgical rubrics only begin to appear toward the end of the first century (the Pastoral Epistles, Didache, Epistles of Ignatius), after the tension with Judaism had led to actual separation from the synagogues.¹

Thus it seems likely that in the earliest period most Christians continued to worship as Jews in the Temple and synagogue; but as the conflict increased, culminating in the expulsion of Christians from the synagogues, they turned increasingly to their own special meetings as the centre of worship, and in time dropped their connection with

¹ The evidence of Corinthians might suggest rather that the reason is that Early Worship was unorganized and unliturgical. In any case we must be very careful about generalizing. Practice may have differed a good deal in different areas, and Corinth may have been unusual.
the synagogue (and Judaism) altogether. 1 These special meetings, consisting originally of informal gatherings in private homes for prayer, instruction, and "the breaking of bread," were the seeds of later Christian worship, and will be discussed below. It is sufficient to note here that the religious nature of these meetings was also profoundly Jewish. 2

G. Delling has observed that interest in such matters as the conscious shaping of a "Christian" liturgy was unlikely to arise until the expectation of an imminent parousia had largely subsided. 3 The regular worship of the synagogue continued its normal pattern; the informal meetings of Christians were basically spontaneous and charismatic, utilizing Jewish forms, but in no way repeating the synagogue service. 4 This state of affairs could not last long, however, and evidence soon appears of an increasing concern with the conduct of these meetings. 5 "It should not be

1. A great deal has been written about the influence of the Jewish sect of the Essenes on Christian worship. At present it is sufficient to note that although there may have been certain features in common, and perhaps a modicum of inter-relation, it is impossible to specify what this was with any precision. Cf. Lucetta Mowry, The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Early Church (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1962), p. 247.


5. Cf. I Cor. 10-14; Col. 3.16-17; Jas. 2.2 ff.
assumed...that the Christianity of the first generation was formless and unorganized, merely because the surviving contemporary evidence is small in quantity."¹ Nor should it be assumed that the Church Order in the Didache and the detailed concern with church organization and worship in the letters of Clement of Rome and Ignatius² have no background in the developments of the previous half-century. It must be recognized that the worship of the Church developed from spontaneous, charismatic origins into a much more ordered and formal liturgy. This was no doubt expedited by the transfer of Old Testament sacrificial terminology to Christian life and worship, which helped to "create a liturgical phraseology."³ This does not imply a uniform development, however. In the early period of the Church we must speak of liturgies, not a liturgy; the development was from diversity toward unity, but it was a long and gradual process.⁴

Consequently we may use second and even third century sources as a guide to the development of worship in the first

2. Cf. I Clem. 34, 40-44; Ign., Smyr. 8, Magn. 7.2, Philad. 4.
century, but in a cautious manner. Cullmann has issued a timely warning against a too-iconoclastic methodology of ignoring later developments in our attempts to reconstruct early Christian worship; there is also a danger of reading later material too readily back into the first century. We therefore propose to use sources dating down into the beginning of the third century, being mindful both of the conservative tendency in regard to changes in worship and of the fact that this was a period of development and transition, within both Christianity and Judaism.

Delling has called attention to the importance of eschatology in early Christian Worship. The Church was understood as the eschatological Temple, whose eschatological function was the worship of God. This worship is directed and inspired by the Holy Spirit, which is the great eschatological gift already bestowed upon the eschatological community, the Church. Consequently the Holy Spirit played a central part in the early Church's conception of worship. Again, this is of primary importance for our study of the Apocalypse.


2. As e.g., Dom Gregory Dix, The Shape of the Liturgy (Westminster: Dacre Press, 1943).


5. Cf. Phil. 3.3. On the role of the Holy Spirit in prayer, see Rom. 8.26,27; I Cor. 14.15; Eph. 6.18; Jude 20; in praise, see I Cor. 14.2, 15; Eph. 5.19; in teaching, see Rom. 12.7, Eph. 4.11 ff; in prophecy, see I Cor. 14.3; 2.4; I Thess. 1.5, 5.20; Acts 17.24-28; I Cor. 14.25; Jn. 16.8 ff.
B. STRUCTURE

Although Christian worship was spontaneous and charismatic at first, the need for order and structure soon arose. This was due to several factors. One was the waning of the expectation of the imminent parousia, already mentioned; another was the excess to which the ecstatic enthusiasm sometimes led. The heightening tensions with official Judaism caused Christians to turn increasingly from the Jewish services to their own meetings as the centre of worship; the concept of the Church as the eschatological Temple was undoubtedly strengthened by the need of a theological rationalization for the replacement of Jewish worship with that of the Church. Consequently the need for structure increased during the last half of the 1st century, until finally there appeared early in the 2nd century the first Church Order, The Didache, and a deep concern with full-blown church organization, as reflected in the Letters of Ignatius.

It has already been observed that Christians probably continued to worship with the Jews for the first several decades, holding their own special meetings at another time.  


2. There is evidence that in certain quarters Jewish-Christians continued to observe the Sabbath, either with the Jews or in their own special services, right up until the end of the 4th century. Cf. Ap. Const. VII.23, 36; Ap. Trad. 24 (a later Ethiopic addition); Greg. of Nyssa, De. Castig. 2; Test. of Our Lord 1.22. See the discussion in C.W. Dugmore, The Influence of the Synagogue Upon the Divine Office (London: Oxford University Press, 1944), pp. 33-37. On the other hand Ignatius, Justin and Irenaeus reflect the 2nd century Catholic tradition opposed to Sabbath worship: Magn. 9.1; Dial. c. Trypho 18; Adv... Haer. IV.16.1. Cf. also Ep. Barn. 15.5.
These special meetings eventually gave rise to the regular Christian worship services held on Sunday morning during the 2nd century. But this was a later development. The evidence argues that Christian meetings were held on Saturday night for most of the 1st century. The practice of the primitive Church at Jerusalem of meeting daily could not last long and did not spread; the evidence soon reveals a weekly meeting, centering around the "breaking of bread."  

Several considerations led to a Saturday night meeting. First, it had to be in the evening: most of the Christians would have to work during daylight hours, and although most of them enjoyed a Sabbath holiday because they were Jews, the day was largely spent in attendance at the synagogue. Furthermore, a meal was involved, and the evening afforded the leisure time necessary in which to gather. Secondly, Saturday would be the most convenient night since most of them would have already gathered for Jewish worship during the day; the Christian meeting may well have been held in a private home shortly after the conclusion of the Sabbath minchah service, in much the same manner as a modern "after-service" on Sunday night. Thirdly, this time lent itself well to Christian theologizing, for their Lord was raised on Sunday, and since the early Christians followed Jewish reckoning, Sunday would begin at dusk on what we now call Saturday night. Thus the service would be a combination of

2. Cullmann, Worship, p. 29; Delling, op.cit., p. 148.
a vigil and an Easter celebration feast. It was also strengthened by the eschatological idea of the Church as representative of the new creation of God, meeting on the "eighth day of the Lord." 

This is not to imply that the early Church consciously reasoned in this manner. Rather they were naturally led to meet on Saturday nights, and the practice was strengthened by the theological considerations mentioned. The clearest New Testament evidence is found in Acts 20.7 ff. At Troas the Christians gathered on the first day of the week "to break bread." But it was obviously in the evening, that is, Saturday night, for Paul spoke until midnight. Then the supper was held, and Paul continued teaching until dawn.

The Church increasingly followed this pattern of meeting until dawn until sometime toward the beginning of the 2nd century. As the Christians were cut off from the synagogue Sunday worship replaced Sabbath worship entirely; by the time of Justin the common practice seems to have been to meet early Sunday morning. The practice of maintaining

3. Apol. I.67; cf. Acts of John 106. According to Pliny the Christians in Bithynia were forced to hold separate worship services without the meal; this they accepted, and began then (c. 117 A.D.) to hold meetings on Sunday morning without the fellowship-meal, Ep. ad Trajan, X.96.7. Hippolytus specifies the time as cockcrow on Sunday morning, Ap. Trad. 21. Substantially supporting this view of the development of Sunday as the day of worship are Scott, op.cit., pp. 74-75; Moule, Birth, p. 18, and Worship, p.16; H. Riesenfeld, "Sabbat et Jour du Seigneur," in New Testament Essays (in Memory of T.W. Manson) Ed. A.J.B. Higgins, 1959, p. 272. Willy Rordorf disputes this view, however, particularly as developed by Riesenfeld, in Sunday (London: SCMPress Ltd, 1968), pp.179-180, 200ff. His main objection to Riesenfeld's thesis, that the shift from Saturday evening to Sunday morning is unclear, and certainly not dictated by a conscious theological development, is answered by the arguments put forward in the text above.
a vigil until dawn was retained, however, in the Paschal celebration at Easter; indeed, the Paschal liturgy probably reflects a combination of the ancient weekly worship service, and the baptismal liturgy, which in time came to be celebrated over Easter.¹

The term κυριακός designating Sunday as the day of Christian worship first appears in Rev. 1.10 and Didache 14.1. It is possible that it was called "Lord's Day" in distinction from (but not opposition to) the Sabbath, which was "God's Day." Or it may simply designate the day on which Christ was risen. A possible suggestion first made by Deissmann is that it meant "Imperial Day" in opposition to Roman emperor worship,² and that this is reflected in the Latin term, dominica. Support for this theory may be found in that the Apocalypse, in which the term first appears, is vehement in its opposition to emperor worship. Furthermore, its use in Didache 14.1 is most peculiar if translated "Lord's Day of the Lord" (κυριακός κυρίου); "Imperial Day of the Lord" actually makes sense. If that was the original meaning, however, it was soon lost.

¹ Cf. Ep. Apost. 15, in which a Passover vigil and a dawn Agape are mentioned without any reference to the baptismal liturgy; this passage represents an intermediate stage in the development of the Paschal liturgy, after the Sunday morning worship had replaced the Sabbath night, but before baptism had been relegated specifically to Easter.

As early as The Didache Wednesday and Friday were observed in some quarters as days of fasting, marked by special worship; the practice is also mentioned by Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria and Origen.\(^1\) There is no evidence for its observance in the 1st century, however. It is difficult to reject the possibility that this practice is attributable to the influence of those Jewish-Christian converts, including Essenes, who observed the old Jewish calendar.\(^2\) The only 1st century evidence for the later practice of daily services, which are common by 200 A.D., is the practice of the Jerusalem Church in Acts 2.46-47, but it is not unreasonable to suppose that the practice may have been observed in some of the larger churches.\(^3\)

Just as the early Christians observed Jewish worship and subsequently replaced it with their own, using Jewish forms, so they seem to have followed the Jewish calendar, subsequently Christianizing it. Dates are reckoned in the New Testament by the Jewish calendar, familiarity with which the writers presuppose on the part of their readers.\(^4\)

---

1. Didache 8.1; Tert., De jejun. 10, 14; Clem. Alex., Strom. VII.12; Or., Hom. in Levit. 10.2. See the discussion in Dugmore, op.cit., pp. 38-42.
3. Dugmore perhaps goes too far in his assertion that it was common practice based on the synagogue, op.cit., pp. 42-58.
Christians probably observed the holy days in the Jewish manner for several decades, but undoubtedly infused them with Christian interpretations. As their connection with Jewish worship diminished, however, so did their Jewish observance of the holy days; but those which were particularly capable of Christian interpretation became the basis, along with Easter, for the Christianized Jewish calendar. A. Jaubert has conclusively established that more than one calendar was followed in Judaism, and that it

1. T.W. Manson suggests that I Corinthians is essentially a Passover haggadah roll, II Corinthians a Pentecost roll, and Romans a Day of Atonement roll; quoted in Carrington, Calendar, p. 43, no reference given. Carrington also suggests that Hebrews is a Day of Atonement roll, and emphasises the importance of the Feast of Tabernacles for the Fourth Gospel and Revelation, p. 44.

2. Of paramount importance were Passover, Pentecost, and probably the Feast of Tabernacles, which may have been transferred to Eastertide, so Danielou, op.cit., pp. 344-346. The arguments of Davies, op.cit., and Morris, op. cit., against Mark and John being based on lectionary systems in no way negate the fact that the Church followed the Jewish calendar, basing their own replacement on it. According to Justin, Dial. c. Trypho 10, 18, 23, Christians did not observe sabbaths and feasts; so Davies, op.cit., p. 134, and Morris, op.cit., p. 38. But the context reveals that Justin is polemicising against Jewish observance, and what he says cannot be held as evidence that Christians followed no calendar and observed no special Christian holy days. In fact, Justin may represent an extreme antinomian, anti-Jewish reaction which by no means reflected universal Christian practice. Cf. Hippolytus, also representing the Roman church of the late 2nd century, who assumes the Christian observance of the Paschal and Pentecostal seasons, Ap. Trad. 28-29. The Epistle to Diognetus, 4, is sometimes quoted as evidence against the observance of the Jewish calendar; closer examination, however, reveals that the author is railing against the improper observances of the Jews, and also apparently against the Jewish use of the lunar calendar; cf. infra, p. 66, fn. 2.
was a point of controversy.\(^1\) There is some evidence that the old solar calendar may have influenced the Church in a modified form.\(^2\)

Of what did these special weekly Christian worship assemblies consist? At first they could not be called "services," but rather meetings, or assemblies, for the purpose of "teaching and fellowship, the breaking of bread and the prayers."\(^3\) These early meetings centred around a table-fellowship meal, the highlight of which was the eucharistic act.\(^4\) There was no separation of the "Word-service" and the "Sacrament"; it was basically an unstructured, spontaneous and charismatic meeting including table-fellowship, Eucharist, prayers, teaching, and other

---

2. Ibid., pp. 53-66. Sutcliffe cautiously supports Jaubert, and suggests that a large number of people, perhaps Galileans, followed the old solar calendar, op.cit., pp. 122-123. James A. Walther also supports Jaubert, but suggests that the old calendar fell out of use immediately in the primitive Church because it centred in Jerusalem, "The Chronology of Passion Week," JBL, LXXVIII (1958), p. 122. The old solar calendar's use may be reflected, however, in the practice of fasting on Wednesday and Friday instead of Monday and Thursday as practiced by Jews following the lunar calendar, see infra, p. 14; and in the importance of Pentecost in the Christian calendar, as evidenced especially in Luke-Acts and the Fourth Gospel, so Mowry, op.cit., pp. 230 ff. The Quarto-deciman controversy between East and West over the date of Passover and Easter possibly reflects the ancient Jewish calendrical controversy, see Jaubert, op.cit., pp. 62-63. Ep. Diog. 4.1, 5 rails against the lunar calendar, cf. 12.9.
forms of Jewish worship. Of these early meetings we can only say with certainty that there was an abundance of variety in worship. There does not seem to be any distinctive synagogue influence on the structure of the meeting. Delling suggests that various simple structures may have soon imposed themselves naturally upon the meetings, differing from place to place, but all including an introductory formula, prayers of thanksgiving, hymns, teaching, praise and a blessing. It must be emphasised, however, that these structures varied from place to place.

By the time of Tertullian (c. 200 A.D.), however, a regular service was held on Sunday mornings, consisting of both the Synaxis and the Eucharist, which were separable. Tertullian mentions all the features of the later Synaxis (prayers, Scripture lessons, preaching, psalms), and places a great stress on the lections and homilies. Thus was Christian worship transformed between 50 A.D. and 200 A.D. Traces of this development can be seen. According to Justin (c. 140 A.D.) structured services were held on Sunday

1. Ibid., pp. 26-29. Schweizer corrects Cullmann's emphasis that the Eucharist was the culmination of every service; it was rather the highlight, in some places occurring in the middle of the meeting (Acts 20.7-11) or even the beginning (I Cor. 11.17-22), op.cit., p. 203. Moule's suggestion that "non-sacramental" services were held in New Testament times, without the Eucharist (Worship, pp. 61-63) seems to refer to occasional gatherings on days other than Saturday night, cf. supra, p. 14. But these were not the weekly gatherings which gave rise to the regular Christian worship services; the latter centred around the eucharistic meal.


4. De anima 9; Apol. 30,39; De orat. 9.10; De corona 3.
morning, consisting of the reading of lessons, teaching, prayers, and the Eucharist; hymnody is not mentioned, but can probably be assumed. The Eucharist was still an integral part of the weekly service, but had been separated from the table-fellowship meal.\footnote{1} In 112 A.D. the Christians in Bithynia met for two separate rites "on a fixed day." The first rite was held before dawn and included "a hymn to Christ as God;" they re-assembled later to partake of food "of an ordinary and innocent kind."\footnote{2} The day was apparently Sunday; it is not clear whether "food" was just the Eucharist or the whole table-fellowship meal inclusive of the Eucharist. The Bithynian service, in any case, may have reflected a peculiar circumstance arising out of the efforts of Pliny, under the direction of Trajan, to prevent troublesome practices.

At the time of the Didache (early 2nd century?) Christians met on "the (imperial?) Lord's Day of the Lord" for the meal and the Eucharist, which were at that time still observed together. It is therefore likely that the "Lord's Day" service still began on Saturday night.\footnote{3} Nevertheless the Didache, I Clement and the Letters of Ignatius reflect the fact that at the end of the 1st century there was a marked concern over the structure and manner in which Christian worship was conducted. We may thus assume that during the period from 50–100 A.D. the churches

\footnotesize

1. \textit{Apol.} I.67.
increasingly structured their worship, borrowing basic patterns, and especially forms, from Jewish worship. After its destruction the Temple and its sacrificial cultus seem to have played a strong part in the developing liturgical thinking of the Church.

As concern with the structure of worship developed so did organisation for worship. As with its worship, the Church's organization evolved in accordance with the peculiar nature of the Church; it was not patterned after the synagogue, although Jewish models undoubtedly exercised an influence.

Apostles were essentially eye-and-ear witnesses of the life and resurrection of Jesus, chosen by Christ for the missionary task of proclaiming the kerygma to the world; as such they exercised special authority in matters of faith and practice.

The local church officers that eventually emerged were the bishop, elders, and deacons. At first the bishop and the elders seem to have been indistinguishable.

---

1. So Oesterley, op.cit., p. 100.
2. Cf. especially I Clem. 40, 41; Ep.Barn. 1; Ep. Diognetus; see supra, pp. 54-55.
4. Acts 1.22, 2.32, 10.39, 13.31; I Cor. 5.5-9; Gal. 1.16. Cf. I Cor. 7.10 with v. 12; 9.1-2; II Cor. 5.19; 8.8; 10.8; 11.5,13; 12.11-12; 13.10; Gal. 1.1; Col. 1.25. Cf. especially I Clem. 40.
elders were those men who by virtue of their charismatic ability and spiritual attainment naturally rose to leadership in the local group of Christians. They seem to have been appointed by the apostles and their successors. Their functions were primarily teaching, leading in worship, and generally overseeing the activities of the church.

It was natural that one of the elders should emerge as leader of the others, especially in the larger churches. This seems to be the case with the Jerusalem church, James having assumed the leading role. By the time of Ignatius the episcopacy had emerged as a near monarchical institution, at least in Antioch and the churches to which Ignatius wrote. This development is reflected in the Pastoral Epistles, where the bishop seems to hold a separate office from that of the elder. I Clement 40-41 speaks of the functions of the "High Priest, priests, and Levites" in worship. This passage seems to be symbolic of a three-fold Christian

1. Acts 14.23; I Tim. 3.2; Tit. 1.5-7; cf. I Clem. 40.4-5. The Didache is unclear, 15.1, when it says "Appoint for yourselves, therefore, bishops and deacons;" is the rubric directed to the churches or the church leaders? The latter seems more likely, in the context of the whole book; indeed, the lack of mention of elders here may indicate that the work is addressed to the elders of the churches, who at that time appointed deacons and selected the bishop.

2. Acts 20.28; I Thess. 5.12; I Tim. 5.17; Jas. 5.14; I Pet. 5.1-4.


4. Daniélou maintains that this pattern first arose in Jerusalem and was continued and strengthened after 70 A.D. in Antioch, op.cit., pp. 355-356. G. Koridanis contends that the church in Antioch first drew a sharp distinction between the two offices between 70-100 A.D.; München Theologische Zeitschrift, 12, (1961), pp. 269 ff. See the discussion in Schweizer, Church Order, pp. 198-200.
organisation, reflecting a monarchical episcopate at the end of the 1st century.\(^1\)

Thus during the 1st century the "bishop" came to be more or less the ruling elder, with overall responsibility for the life of the church.\(^2\) The elders were primarily concerned with assisting the bishop in his function as ruler; they were charged with the care and oversight of the church, and the needs of its individual members, under the bishop's direction.\(^3\) By the time of Hippolytus the elders played a small role in assisting the bishop in the worship; this may also be reflected in the letter of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians in which he refers to their sacerdotal position as priests,\(^4\) and it is reasonable to assume that they exercised some liturgical function, though in a small way, right from the time of the emergence of the bishop. This actual liturgical function is unclear; the earliest explicit evidence is Hippolytus, who indicates that they assisted with prayers, laying on of hands, anointing with oil, responses, and the like.\(^5\)

---


4. Ap. Trad. 21, 23; I Clem. 40, 41. Clement indicates that most of the liturgical duties are carried out by the bishop and deacons, 41.2. Ignatius frequently refers to the elders along with the bishop as the rulers of the church. Liturgically they seem to occupy the "place of the Council of the Apostles," while the bishop sits in the "place of the Father," Magn. 6.1; cf. Trall. 3.1.

In addition to his responsibility for general oversight, the bishop was particularly charged with the function of the teacher of the church; this emphasis continued right through the 2nd century, and seems to have been his primary role. The bishop's throne was not so much a seat of government as his symbol of doctrinal authority; "for the cathedra is the symbol of teaching." Connected with his role as teacher was the bishop's liturgical responsibility as leader of the worship of the church. According to Ignatius the bishop sat in "the place of the Father;" without the bishop there could be no valid baptism or eucharist. Clement of Rome likewise stresses the bishop's sacerdotal function, referring to him as the "High Priest of God." As late as Hippolytus the bishop was necessary for all worship services; elders could only assist. It is reasonable to assume, therefore, that the bishop exercised this liturgical function right from the time of his emergence, and by the time of Ignatius it was solidifying into a required practice.

2. Irenaeus, Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching, 2. Cf. the discussion in Dix, op.cit., pp. 31 ff.
3. Magn. 6.1; Smyrn. 8.1.
4. I Clem. 40, 41; see supra, pp. 70-71.
5. The bishop was to "serve as High Priest," Ap. Trad. 3; appoint the lection reader during the service, 12; preside over baptism, 21, and the Eucharist, 23. The first mention of an elder celebrating the Eucharist without the bishop is mid-3rd century (Cyprian, Ep. V.2); so Dix, op.cit., pp. 33-34.
The deacons constituted an office from the very early days of the Church. As the title indicates, their function was to serve the church by assisting the bishop in oversight and worship. Hippolytus says that they are to "serve and carry out the bishop's commands" and "offer in (God's) holy sanctuary the gifts," thus illustrating their administrative and liturgical functions. Their duties in worship were not so much liturgical as assisting with technical aspects, such as bringing forth gifts and offerings to the altar, providing and holding the anointing oil at baptism, and serving the elements at the Eucharist. Earlier traces of these functions can be seen. According to the Shepherd of Hermas they are to minister to the widows and orphans blamelessly. Ignatius insists that their conveyance of the eucharistic elements not be considered mere table-service, but a spiritual ministry to the church. Their liturgical function is also reflected in I Clement 40-41, and their administrative function in Acts 6.1-6. Although no evidence is explicit, it is reasonable to assume that they carried out such other

1. Acts 6.1-6; Phil. 1.1; I Tim. 3.8, 12; I Clem. 42.4-5; Didache 15.1; Ignatius mentions the deacons sixteen times.
3. Ap. Trad. 9, 21, 23; Justin also describes their duties as such, Apol. I. 65.
4. Sim. IX. 26.2.
5. Trall. 2.3. Ignatius calls them "ministers of Jesus Christ," Magn. 6.1, Trall. 3.1. They were also sent as emissaries to other churches, Philad. 10.1.
6. Assuming that the "seven men of good repute" are an early example of deacons.
technical liturgical duties as seating the people, keeping order, bringing forth the rolls for reading, and announcing each stage of the progress of worship, in much the same manner as the synagogue attendant.¹

Another office mentioned in the early literature is that of the prophet. Judas and Silas were prophets; on their conciliar mission from Jerusalem to Antioch they exhorted the Christians there.² Paul encourages the practice of prophesying at Corinth.³ The author of Ephesians considers them almost in a class with the Apostles.⁴ By the end of the 1st century the office seems to be widely established and respected; it is mentioned often in the Didache and the Shepherd of Hermas.⁵ The prophets seem to have comprised a sort of missionary priesthood, whose primary task was evangelistic and catechetical. They were apparently ordained, ranking as high as elders, and perhaps even as bishops, since they were allowed to perform the Eucharist.⁶

Although it is unlikely that the Church consciously patterned their organisation after the synagogue, the tradition of the latter must have exercised considerable

2. Acts 15.32.
3. 1 Cor. 14.
4. Eph. 2.20, 4.11.
5. Didache 13.4, 15.2, 11.3; Shep. Hermas, Sim. IX. 15. 4, IX. 25. 2; Vis. III. 5. 1; Mand. XI. 7, 12, 15, 16.
6. Didache 15.1. See the discussion in Daniélou, op. cit., p. 351. It is possible that the prophetic mission is the Sitz im Leben of Mt. 9.35-10.23, Lk. 10.1-16, and Mk. 6.7-13.
influence. This is evident in the similarities between the bishop and the ruler of the synagogue, the elders and the synagogue elders, and the deacons and the synagogue attendant. But Cross's assertion that the "Church appropriated and modified offices and institutions belonging to older apocalyptic communities," particularly the Qumran Covenanter, is difficult to accept, though some slight influence may have crept in through Essene converts.

For the first two centuries the churches assembled for the most part in private dwelling-places. The erection of buildings for worship came into practice toward the beginning of the 3rd century. Only when the synagogue no longer constituted the regular service of worship for Christians, and the larger churches had grown too large to meet in the homes even of their wealthier members, and the Church had grown wealthy enough to afford them, did the erection of sanctuaries commence.

The emphasis placed on the importance of the whole church assembling together rendered it necessary to meet in homes spacious enough to accommodate the growing numbers of Christians, especially in the great cities. The large homes of the wealthier Graeco-Roman believers in the


3. Acts 2.46, 5.42, 12.12, 20.6-9; Rom. 16.5; I Cor. 16.19; Philem. 2; Col. 4.15.

4. Heb. 10.25; Eph. 5.2; Magn. 7.1; Tráll. 7.2; Phil. 4.
Empire were admirably suited to this purpose, and consider­able evidence remains that many well-to-do Christians offered their homes as gathering places for the worship of the churches.¹

C. BAPTISM

Tradition ascribes the origin of the Christian rite of entry to Jesus' own commandment.² Even if this is correct, baptism did not arise in a vacuum; but its antecedents as well as its origins are obscure.³ There is some doubt as to the extent of Jewish proselyte baptism in the first half of the first century A.D.; all of the sources are of a later date. The Qumran Covenanters practised ritual lustrations, but these differed significantly from Christian baptism, and offer little more than an instructive example of the widespread use of ritual

1. Philem. 2; Rom. 16.5; I Cor. 16.19. Excavations at the basilica of St. Clement in Rome have uncovered part of the 1st century palace of Titus Flavius Clemens, who with his wife Domitilla was martyred in 96 A.D. His palace served as a church until the erection of another building on the same site, of which sanctuary Jerome writes; see Dix, op.cit., p. 27. The earliest Christian church so far uncovered, that of Dura-Europos in Syria (c. 232 A.D.) is a converted private house of the prevalent Syrian pattern; C. Hopkins, "The Christian Church," in The Excavations at Dura-Europos, Fifth Season, ed. M.I. Rostovtzeff (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1934), p. 238. Hopkins quotes further evidence of large homes being donated for Christian use in the first two centuries, pp. 245-247.


Illustrations at the time. The most obvious antecedent is the baptism of John; and even its antecedents and origins are obscure.

Whatever its origins, it is clear that baptism was practiced as the rite of entry into the Church from the beginning; Paul assumes it as a familiar experience on the part of his readers. It was distinguished from both Jewish lustrations and pagan initiation rites in that it was performed into the name of Jesus, an historical person, and involved the reception of the Holy Spirit. It seems to have borne many nuances of meaning, reflecting the diversity of the early Church; common to all the sources, however, are the forgiveness of sins and the gift of the Holy Spirit resulting in new life.

In the very beginning the hearing of the Gospel, believing and being baptized seem to have comprised one event. In time, as baptism came to be a separate service requiring preparation, it gradually attained sacramental efficacy. This is seen in its development in Pauline

3. Rom. 6.3; Col. 2.1. Cf. also Acts 2.37-28; 8.16; 10.48; 19.5; 22.16; I Cor. 1.13-15.
4. See the discussions in Delling, op. cit., pp. 128-129; and Moule, Worship, pp. 48-49.
theology as a type of the transition from the old life to the new (Rom. 6), and finally in the Fourth Gospel it is the instrument of new birth.¹

The basic pattern of the baptismal preparation and rites seems to have been present from the beginning, and was expanded and developed into the later practices reflected in sources at the end of the first century A.D. and later. First there was pre-baptismal instruction. This is reflected in Acts 8.35-36, and perhaps Heb. 6.2.² This instruction developed into a detectable pattern consisting primarily of teaching concerning the Two Ways, the Two Great (Love) Commandments, and the Golden Rule.³ It also contained specifically Christian elements, in Jewish form.⁴ A period of fasting for one or two days before baptism seems to have been a common requirement as well.⁵

The actual ritual of baptism in the 1st century is difficult to define with precision, but certain features

² So Delling, op. cit., p. 135.
³ Didache 1.1, 2; Ep. Barn. 17.1, 19.2, 5; Clem. of Alex., Paed. 3.12; Clem. Homilies 7.3, 7.
⁴ So Danielou, op. cit., pp. 316-319. I Pet. 1.3-4,1 may also contain baptismal instruction; so Beasley-Murray, op. cit., pp. 254-258.
⁵ Didache 7.4; Justin, Apol. I.61. Danielou suggests that this was probably in connection with the exorcism of evil, op. cit., pp. 320-321.
are evident. The baptizand, according to Hippolytus, removed his clothes and entered the water naked; he was re-clothed in garments of white after baptism, signifying purity and new life. This practice seems to be reflected in the New Testament. According to Didache 7, baptism was to be administered in cold running water "into the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit;" but if it was not available warm, still water could be used. If neither were available then water could be poured on the head three times "into the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit."

According to Tertullian baptizands renounced Satan and evil and took an oath to Christ; this practice was ancient in his day. There are also references to renouncing evil in Justin and the Shepherd of Hermas. This later practice of baptismal confession seems to have had its roots right in the beginning of the Church. Cullmann has argued persuasively that Acts 8.37 is original, and reflects a fragment of a very early baptismal confessional formula. Although that passage may remain in

1. F.L. Cross is the most recent scholar to express the view that I Peter is a baptismal eucharist, I Peter, A Paschal Liturgy (London: 1954). The view has gained little acceptance among modern scholars, however. Cf. the arguments against it in Moule, Birth of the New Testament, p. 27, and Worship in the New Testament, pp. 58 ff.; Beasley-Murray, op.cit., pp. 254 ff.

2. Hippolytus, Ap. Trad. 21. Cf. Gal. 3.27, 6.15; Rom. 13.12, 14; II Cor. 5.17; Col. 2.11, 12, 3.9-14; Eph. 4.22, 24; Jas. 1.21; I Pet. 2.11. Test. Levi 8.4-5 and Odes of Solomon 11.9-10, 15.8 and 21.2 are so interpreted by Daniélou, op.cit., pp. 325-327.

3. De spect. 4.


doubt, many scholars recognize other excerpts of baptismal confessions in the New Testament.\(^1\) The Apostle's Creed seems to have been formed in connection with baptismal confession; its earliest appearance is in the baptismal rite of Hippolytus.\(^2\)

No doubt prayers were offered, and perhaps a homily delivered; but of this no evidence has survived.\(^3\) Several New Testament passages seem to reflect hymns connected with baptism, which would indicate that hymnody formed a part of the service.\(^4\)

Other acts accompanying baptism may have been anointing with oil, the laying on of hands, "sealing," and the part-taking of the first Eucharist. The anointing with oil is clearly prescribed along with the laying on of hands in Hippolytus.\(^5\) At that time (c. 200 A.D.) the bishop blessed the oil; then a deacon held it while an elder extracted the renunciation of evil from the baptizand. When this was done the elder anointed him with the "oil of exorcism" and laid his hands upon him, exorcising the evil spirits.

\(^1\) Rom. 10.9, I Cor. 11.12, Phil. 2.11, Mt. 16.16, and Jn. 11.27 are so understood by Carrington, The Early Christian Church, Vol. II, p. 331. Ralph P. Martin sees a reference to baptismal confession in I Pet. 3.22, Worship in the Early Church (London: Marshall, Morgan and Scott, 1964), p. 108; and C.F.D. Moule suggests that I Tim. 3.16 may be a baptismal creed, Worship, p. 58. I Tim. 6.12 may also refer to baptismal confession.


\(^3\) Unless I Peter 1.3-4.11 is accepted as a possible baptismal homily.

\(^4\) Eph. 5.14; II Tim. 2.11-13. Delling suggests that Eph. 5.14 may be a call to the baptizand in the liturgy, op. cit., p. 134.

Then the baptizand entered the water, confessed Christ, and was baptized. After baptism the elder anointed him with the "oil of thanksgiving;" then he dried himself, was newly clothed and brought into the church to partake of his first Eucharist. Daniélou argues that a pre-baptismal anointing among Jewish Christians is reflected in Test. Levi 8.4-5. The imposition of hands in connection with receiving the Holy Spirit is attested in the New Testament; the accompanying anointing with oil is less clearly attested, although it may be reflected in I Jn. 2.20. Several passages speak of Christians as "sealed" with the Holy Spirit. Martin understands these as references to the anointing with oil; but other scholars argue that they refer to the practice of making a sign of the cross on the baptizand's forehead. Neither view is capable of proof, however; the passages may be speaking metaphorically.

4. II Cor. 1.21-22; Eph. 1.13; 4.30; II Tim. 2.19.
Hippolytus also prescribes a breaking of the fast by the celebration of the Eucharist. This practice may be reflected in Acts 9.19, Heb. 6.4, and I Pet. 2.3. Baptism seems to have comprised a separate service in the early Church. The earliest indication is in Hippolytus, where it is clearly stated that baptism is held at dawn on Sunday. This may have been the practice in New Testament times as well, after the original practice of baptizing immediately upon conversion had waned. Baptism had something to do with coming from darkness into the light; this may reflect a dawn baptismal service, a practice which would have been necessitated by the circumstances of daily life in any case (see supra, pp. 61-62).

There is some evidence that post-baptismal lustrations persisted in some quarters right up until Hippolytus. This may also be reflected in the New Testament; but very soon baptism was "the unrepeatable rite of entry."

4. Cf. I Pet. 2.11, Heb. 6.4, 10.32 with Justin, Apol. I. 61, in which "enlightenment" is the technical term for baptism. Eph. 5.14, if it be a baptismal hymn, brings out the darkness-into-light theme with special clarity.
D. THE EUCHARIST

The nature of the early eucharistic worship of the Church is one of the most vexing subjects of New Testament studies. The problem is that discussions often hinge upon its origins, which in turn are often confused with the question of the nature of the Last Supper. Most arguments presuppose an essential unity of observance and tradition in the early Church. But the very diversity of modern interpretations as well as the varying evidence of the New Testament and early sources all point to considerable diversity of observance and tradition concerning the Eucharist. 1

It is clear that the origin of the Eucharist in the Last Supper cannot be simply assumed. 2 The divergent accounts in the New Testament argue that they are not so much historical records as the reflections of various eucharistic rites practiced in the churches known to the authors. 3

What then, are the origins of the Eucharist? Our view is as follows: it is clear that from the beginning the Church assembled for "prayers, fellowship and teaching


2. For a detailed discussion see Excursus I at the end of this chapter, pp. 113-117.

3. So also Richardson, op.cit., p. 275. Significantly, even Jungmann makes a similar suggestion, op.cit., p. 37.
of the apostles, and the breaking of bread.\textsuperscript{1} The meal, referred to frequently as "the breaking of bread," constituted the highlight of these religious gatherings.\textsuperscript{2} This was the natural outgrowth of the ministry of Jesus. Although Jesus and his disciples did not form a haburah as such, they did constitute an intensely religious, yet liberal, fellowship. Most of their meals were eaten together, often including others; Jesus invested these occasions with deep eschatological meaning.

It was only natural that after the rise of Easter faith (the tradition records several appearances in the context of table-fellowship: Lk. 24.30-35, 41-42; Jn. 21.9-14) the disciples should continue to gather together for meals. The Last Supper was literally that: the last of many religious meals. Consequently the disciples, as they gathered together in continuation of table-fellowship even more fraught with eschatological overtones after the events of Easter and Pentecost, would be reminded especially of that last supper when Jesus spoke of the fulfilment of the Kingdom of God.

The evidence argues strongly in favour of the Last Supper as a Passover meal; but its paschal nature was only a climax to a series of common meals rich in eschatological meaning. Thus the early Christian meals were not primarily paschal, much less sacramental remembrances of the death of Christ. Rather they were infused with a

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{1} Acts 2.42.
  \item \textsuperscript{2} See the discussion supra, p. 66.
\end{itemize}
multitude of joyous, exciting notions: daily, then weekly Easter celebrations; memories of fellowship with the living Jesus, and present fellowship with the risen Christ in the Church; the present realization of the Kingdom of God; and its expected consummation in the parousia and the ensuing Messianic banquet.

The concept of fellowship with Christ was fused with the remembrance of Jesus' words over the cup and the bread, so that the prevailing idea soon came to be the infusion of life: the Eucharist was the bread of life, representing spiritual union with Christ and the Church.¹ Thus in these informal gatherings for "prayers, fellowship and teaching, and the breaking of bread," did the Eucharist originate, looking back to the table-fellowship of Jesus with his followers. Only as time went on did the controlling ideas of the death of Jesus (in the West) and the Resurrection of Christ (in the East) develop into sacramental importance.²

To trace the subsequent development of the Eucharist is equally difficult. Several notable details emerge

1. Cf. I Cor. 10.16-17.
2. This view is substantially supported by Manson, op.cit., pp. 46-49; Richardson, op.cit., pp. 273 ff.; Cullmann, Worship, pp. 14 ff.; Moule, Worship, pp. 20-24. Moule asserts that there was a sacramental aspect from the beginning, pp. 21-22, though his arguments are slender. The question of the relationship of the Qumran Covenanters' meal to the Lord's Supper has been discussed by several scholars, all of whom affirm certain similarities, but cautiously avoid asserting any direct relationship: Kuhn, op.cit., pp. 84-85; Black, op.cit., p. 115; Milik, op.cit., pp. 105-107; Mowry, op.cit., p. 246. See Appendix IV, "Worship at Qumran," pp. 339-344.
from a summary of the evidence from Acts to Hippolytus.\(^1\)

With regard to the meal itself, there is no explicit evidence for a eucharistic celebration apart from the common meal before the time of Justin. Pliny's letter to Trajan possibly reflects the rise of the practice among the Christians in Bithynia.\(^2\) It is likely that as the Christian meeting gradually replaced the synagogue as the regular worship service of believers, and was moved from Saturday night to Sunday morning, the meal had to be dropped; some such official pressure as that recorded in Pliny may have been operative in regions other than Bithynia as well. But the Eucharist itself had attained sacramental significance and was retained without the meal. Even so, the practice of holding religious table-fellowship meals continued at least up until the time of Hippolytus.

In every source except the Didache the bread is explicitly identified with the body of Christ. This near universal agreement would seem to attest the centrality of the bread from the very beginning, as reflected in the Lucan expression, "the breaking of bread." But it is not so with the cup. In the Pauline words of institution (Mark (=Matthew), and the Longer Version of Luke it is the new covenant in Christ's blood. In the other Pauline passages, John, Ignatius, Justin, and Hippolytus it is

---

1. For a detailed discussion of the evidence, see Excursus II at the end of this chapter, pp. 118-126.

2. So Srawley, op.cit., p. 33. Dix claims that a distinction is drawn by Jude 12, II Pet. 2.13, Ign. ad Smyrn. 6.8, Phil. 4, op.cit., pp. 90-100; but the sources are by no means explicit, and do not support Dix's contention.
simply Christ's blood. In the shorter text of Luke, and the Didache, both of which have the cup first, it is an insignificant prelude to the bread, which constitutes the highlight of the Eucharist.

The Eucharist as a memorial of the death of Christ is reflected in the Pauline words of institution, the Longer version of Luke, Justin, and Hippolytus. This emphasis is missing in the Synoptic traditions, and in the remainder of the Pauline material, Hebrews, John, the Didache, and Ignatius the emphasis is solely on the Eucharist as spiritual nourishment, the means of communicating the life of Christ. Even Justin, who speaks of the Eucharist as a memorial of Christ's death, places primary emphasis on the sacramental communion of life.¹ Thus the "Pauline rite" of I Cor. 11.23-26 is not seen again until the time of Hippolytus.

The eschatological emphasis is found in all the Pauline material, Mark (= Matthew), both versions of Luke, and the Didache. It is essentially realized in John, and absent from the sources thereafter.

What conclusions regarding the development of the Eucharist can be drawn from this evidence? Lietzmann has proposed a controversial solution based on the strong distinction drawn by the religionsgeschichtliche Schule between Jewish and Hellenistic Christianity.² According to Lietzmann the primitive Jewish form of the Eucharist,

¹. This emphasis continued in some quarters as the primary one, cf. Ap. Const. VII. 25-26.
based on the ḫaburah meals of Jesus and his disciples, consisted of a table-fellowship meal preceded and highlighted by a bread-rite only (whence the term "breaking of Bread"), which emphasized the continuation of fellowship with the risen Christ. The Didache reflects this type, and is a stage in its development the culmination of which is seen in the 4th century Liturgy of Serapion.

Lietzmann attributes to Paul the later, Hellenistic form which finally gained universal ascendancy. The Pauline Eucharist was also based on Jesus' table-fellowship, but specifically on traditions concerning the last of these meals; the command to remembrance was, of course, a Pauline innovation. This Eucharist consisted of a bread-rite and a cup-rite in connection with a supper, but was influenced by several Hellenistic notions: the Pauline view of a substitutionary atonement; the mystical memorial-meals held in honour of the founders of mystery-religions; the idea of a sacrifice being indwelt by the "Name" or power of the deity to whom it was offered. Thus the Pauline rite embodied the symbolic, mystical, and sacrificial remembrance of the death of Christ.

The two rites developed side by side. In time the cup was incorporated in the primitive rite, as reflected in the Didache. Then the Eucharist was separated from the common supper as the service was transferred to Sunday morning. With the rise of sacerdotal terminology (I Clement, Ignatius) the Eucharist gradually became the morning sacrifice; this concept was more amenable to the Pauline emphasis than the primitive one, and as Pauline
thëology gained widespread influence so did his eucharistic rite. It was stereotyped in the Liturgy of Hippolytus, which became the model for all subsequent eucharistic liturgies. The primitive rite continued to develop only in Egypt, and even there was influenced by Pauline conceptions, as reflected in the Liturgy of Serapion.¹

Other scholars have rejected or greatly modified Lietzmann's theory. Cullmann stresses that both types originate in the Last Supper, and that the direct origin of the "primitive" type is not in the daily meals of the "historical Jesus with his disciples" but "in the meal-scenes of Christ's post-Resurrection appearances." Paul was reminding the Corinthians of the meaning of Christ's death and its connexion with the Eucharist, but had no intention of dispensing with the eschatological aspect.² Higgins supports Cullmann, adding the admission that Paul took the first step toward separating the Eucharist proper from the common meal in reaction to Corinthian excesses.³

R. Martin explicitly rejects any innovation on Paul's part and asserts that the Corinthians' one-sided, excessive emphasis on the ecstatic joy of the post-Resurrection meals led Paul to recall the Corinthian church to traditional eucharistic teaching. This dominical teaching was characterized by three features: (1) the common meal, emphasizing the unity of the believer with Christ and the

---

¹ Lietzmann is followed in substance by Mowry, op.cit., pp. 240-242; to a lesser degree by Kuhn, op.cit., pp. 87-89.
² Cullmann, Worship, pp. 14 ff.
³ Higgins, op.cit., pppp 575-583.
Church; (2) the taking of bread and wine, emphasizing the presence of the crucified and resurrected Christ by the memorial proclamation of his death; and (3) the eschatological note pointing to a yet future hope.¹

Moule also rejects Lietzmann's distinction between the two rites, and claims that both elements were used from the first. The Pauline tradition is primitive. It is impossible in the early period to draw a hard and fast distinction between "mere eating and sacramental participation." The cup-word may have arisen later in juxtaposition to the bread-word after the Eucharist had been separated from the Agape, but in any case both bread and wine were used from the first with reference to the death of Christ.²

Dix argues that the Pauline tradition was derived from the Jerusalem church itself, and thus any theories assigning Hellenistic origins to the Pauline rite should be dismissed. He defends the Pauline tradition as the most historically reliable account of the Last Supper, but observes that every known eucharistic rite from ancient times (except Didache 9-10, which he thus rejects as eucharistic) has a "four-action shape" differing from the "seven-action shape" of the New Testament accounts of the Last Supper. Thus Dix allows that early liturgical developments were not bound by New Testament traditions concerning the Last Supper, and suggests that the developing liturgical pattern

¹ Martin, Worship, pp. 121-129.
² Moule, Worship, pp. 24-27, 34, 45.
arose independently of New Testament literary tradition out of widespread practice.¹

Delling rejects Lietzmann's theory as well, arguing that the Pauline rite had no background in or relationship to the pagan cultic meals. The bread and wine were related by the Church to the death of Jesus, but also pointed past his death to his resurrection, his presence in the Church, and the Parousia.²

Most scholars, however, are concerned with refuting Lietzmann's theory of eucharistic origins and validating the primitiveness of the Pauline tradition. The diversity of the evidence, as we have summarized it, and its relative dearth, are not sufficiently recognized nor adequately accounted for. One attempt that has been made in that direction is the theory of the disciplina arcani, the discipline of secrecy, argued most cogently by Jeremias.³ According to this theory a veil of secrecy was wrapped around the celebration of the Eucharist so that pagans might not guess at things which were only for the initiated. The strongest evidence for the theory, it is argued, is the very dearth of sources concerning the central act of Christian worship; its absence in the Epistle to the Hebrews is supposed to be the most convincing proof.

This theory is, of course, incapable of being disproved. But its very circular reasoning renders it

2. Delling, op.cit., pp. 139-143.
suspect. It presupposes the existence of a universal rite from early times, and rests upon the primitiveness of the Pauline account and the authenticity of the Longer Version of Luke. But Richardson has shown that it leaves unexplained why Paul (and Luke) should have contravened the disciplina arcani, especially by including the rite in a letter to the church least likely to preserve the secret. If it is argued that the custom of secrecy arose gradually only after the time of Paul, then the Longer Version of Luke must be surrendered as inauthentic, since it would have been recorded by Luke during the period of the disciplina arcani, thus removing one of the pillars of the theory. The door is then opened, argues Richardson, to Lietzmann's theory that Paul's rite was confined to those churches founded by him until his writings gained widespread influence. The theory ends up in a cul-de-sac.

A more fruitful approach has been taken by Richardson in his essay. He accepts Lietzmann's assertion that there were two divergent emphases, but maintains that they were derived in the 2nd century from a 1st century unity of spirit and diversity of shape. The evidence points to a rite akin to Justin's in Gaul, Rome, Asia Minor, Antioch, and Egypt. There are two variations: toward bread-rites (Didache, Ebionite and Gnostic Acts), and toward memorial sacrifices (Hippolytus). But all have a common link in the bread identified as the body of Christ; thus all have a common foundation in a supper in which the blessing and

distribution of bread was the central action.\textsuperscript{1}

It is pointless to try to discover the original words of institution, since all accounts reflect developing liturgical traditions; this is revealed even in the manuscript history of the texts themselves. Justin's evidence warns against assuming the Pauline formula to be anything like a primitive, universal rite. On the contrary, there is no 1st or 2nd century rite which follows Paul's account except the Longer Version of Luke, which Richardson argues persuasively to be a later addition. Although Clement of Rome, Ignatius, and Polycarp know Paul's teaching on the Lord's Supper they give no indication of acquaintance with the rite of I Cor. 11.23-26. Furthermore, the latter passage is at variance with the rest of the Pauline teaching: in the passage mentioned the order is bread-cup, with an emphasis on the new covenant in Christ's blood and the memorial proclamation of his death; elsewhere the order is cup-bread, with an emphasis on the bread and spiritual communion in the life of Christ. The first mention of a rite akin to Paul's is in Justin, nearly a century later, and there the primary emphasis is still on the sacramental communication of life. Dodd correctly relates I Cor. 11.24 to John 6.48, 51,\textsuperscript{2} says Richardson, but the former presupposes the latter to supply it with intelligible meaning.\textsuperscript{3} Thus Richardson concludes that

\begin{itemize}
  \item[1.] Ibid., pp. 269-273.
  \item[2.] Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, p. 338.
  \item[3.] Richardson, op.cit., pp. 275-289.
\end{itemize}
the Pauline formula reflects a later stage in the developing liturgy, and was inserted into the text sometime during the 2nd century, a practice which he demonstrates to have been acceptable during that period.¹

The development is then reconstructed as follows. The Lord's Supper was originally the result of the table-fellowship of Jesus with his disciples, endued with its deepest meaning at the last of these suppers; thus there was a sense of remembrance from the first. But the meal was infused with a variety of notions.² A unity of spirit prevailed, but the rite itself developed along a variety of lines; the variant accounts of the Last Supper are reflections of this.

Richardson accounts for the sources as follows. In Mark there is no command to remembrance, nor is there any external evidence for a Markan rite for another century. Thus Mark is essentially an interpretation of the Last Supper that gradually gained ascendancy, thereby modifying the Eucharist itself. Luke-Acts is a development of Mark, but deviates significantly. If his re-working of the Markan material is a result of his repugnance to sacrificial theology, this only shows that Mark's tradition was not universally recognized. In fact, argues Richardson, Luke revised the account under compulsion of his knowledge of a rite actually practiced in the churches of his acquaintance in which the bread-rite as a communion

¹ Ibid., p. 285.
² Supra, p. 84ff.
of the life of Christ was central. This was essentially the same rite reflected in the genuine Pauline material (excluding the later liturgical formula). John is a further theological development of Luke-Acts and Paul, in which the Eucharist is elevated to sacramental heights, with the bread still central; but the cup was not long to follow in importance, being identified as the blood of Christ. This elevation of the cup, along with the rise of sacerdotal terminology and sacrificial theology (Clement, Ignatius, Ep. Barnabas) tended toward the Markan interpretation, and led many churches to follow the Markan order (bread-cup) as the Eucharist was separated from the Agape. This was hastened by the fact that bread-wine is a more natural order, especially to the Greeks, than wine-bread. The Markan order finally prevailed. The "Pauline" formula of I Cor. 11.23-26 represents a stage in the tradition perhaps between Justin and Hippolytus. In the latter the eucharistic liturgy takes on definitive form, with the Markan order and (pseudo-)Pauline emphasis prevailing.¹

Richardson's argument is well-reasoned, cogent, and convincing. Its greatest weakness lies in the total lack of textual evidence for his theory of the Pauline formula as a later addition. Against this objection he argues that all the Pauline manuscripts are descended from one edited collection of his epistles, a "Church Book" to the

¹ Richardson, op.cit., pp. 296-306, 332-333.
making of the text of which liturgical concern has contributed.\textsuperscript{1} The theory is still weakened by this lack of textual support, however.

Barring that exception Richardson's is a strong case, and a serious attempt is made to handle all the data. The evidence would seem to support diversity in the developing tradition, a diversity of which Paul may have formed a part, not as innovator but as developer of existing tradition. The 2nd century trend toward unity was culminated in Hippolytus. Lietzmann and Richardson have conclusively demonstrated that during the period under discussion the bread-rite was central, with primary emphasis on the spiritual communion of life in Christ. These conclusions must be kept in the forefront with regard to the development of the Eucharist during the 1st and 2nd centuries.

E. LITURGICAL FORMS

Although the Church made no conscious attempt at modelling its worship on Jewish patterns until the 3rd century,\textsuperscript{2} it nevertheless expressed itself in those forms of worship to which it was accustomed, \textit{viz.}, those of the Temple and especially the synagogue. Even so the Church filled those forms with new content, thus breaking with the Jewish worship of the past.\textsuperscript{3} Moule rightly asserts that

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1} Ibid., pp. 284-286.
\item \textsuperscript{2} Ibid., p. 268. \textit{Cf.} especially Ap. Const. VII-VIII.
\item \textsuperscript{3} Delling, \textit{op.cit.}, pp. 3-14.
\end{itemize}
although many New Testament references called "liturgical" may not be actual liturgical pieces, they are certainly liturgical in form, thus reflecting the worship of the period.\(^1\)

As the Christian meeting gradually replaced the synagogue as the normal centre of worship, and with the destruction of the Temple, the idea of the Church as the new Temple of God attained increasing prominence. In this the Church was undoubtedly influenced by the apocalyptic idea of the eschatological Temple as the centre of worship in the Age to Come,\(^2\) and the rise of sacrificial theology as reflected in Hebrews.\(^3\) It was only a short step to the transfer of sacerdotal terminology to Christian life and worship.\(^4\) Such language rapidly helped to create a liturgical phraseology; this is evidenced in I Clem. 34, 59-61, which indicate that certain phrases, ideas, and a defined type of prayer had become current.\(^5\) To the use of these Jewish forms by the Church and their development we shall now direct our study.

3. For a thorough discussion of the Church as the Temple of God and its possible parallels with Qumran see Gärtner, *op.cit.*
4. Cf. Rom. 12.1, 15.6; Phil. 2.17; I Pet. 2.5; Heb. 13.10, 15, 16. Clement refers to the bishop, elders and deacons as "High Priest, priests, and Levites," I Clem. 40-41. Ignatius refers to the gathering place of Christians as a "sanctuary," or "place of sacrifice," (\(\pi\)\(\alpha\)\(\iota\)\(n\)\(t\)\(h\)\(a\)\(m\)\(e\)\(\delta\)\(m\)\(i\)\(a\)\(h\)\(\alpha\)\(i\)\(s\)) Eph. 5, Trall. 7, Philad. 4, Magn. 7. Cf. Ep. Barn. 16.
1. Public Reading and Teaching. Although there are several New Testament references to the public reading of the Old Testament in the synagogue\(^1\) there is no explicit evidence that the Church followed the practice in its meetings.\(^2\) The liturgical reading of scripture was a function of worship fulfilled at the synagogue service which most of the early Christians attended. Nevertheless it is highly unlikely that certain Old Testament passages capable of Christological interpretation were not read in these meetings from the beginning as constituting the basis for the "teaching of the Apostles."\(^3\) But these passages were most probably included in the kerygmatic and/or didactic address, in the form of a Christian midrash.\(^4\) Actual readings proper of any length were most commonly taken from Christian writings, as these began to appear; the Gospels were probably meant to be read aloud, and the epistles certainly were.\(^5\) The first explicit source is Justin, who states that the "records of the Apostles, or the writings of the Prophets, are read as long as we have time."\(^6\) The public reading of scripture, including

---

1. Lk. 4.16-30; Acts 13.14-15, 15.21; II Cor. 3.14.
2. I Tim. 4.13 instructs Timothy to concern himself with "(public) reading, exhortation, and teaching," but there is no indication that the reference is to Old Testament readings after the pattern of the synagogue.
5. Col. 4.16; I Thess. 5.27; Philem. 2. Cf. Delling, op.cit., pp. 92-95.
passages from the Old Testament, is also attested by Melito, c. 170 A.D.¹ By the end of the 2nd century the office of Reader is established; like his Jewish parallel he is not a permanent officer, but one appointed to the task by the bishop on a given occasion.² Thus it is highly probable that as the Christian meeting was increasingly structured so was the practice of the public reading of both Jewish and Christian writings.

Although various lectionary systems were probably in use in the 1st century synagogues³ there is no evidence that there was any corresponding practice in the early Church. The first concrete evidence of such is in the 4th century Apostolic Constitutions. Justin, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, and Tertullian all speak of the public reading but show no awareness of a lectionary.⁴

1. Homily on the Passion, 1, 11.
4. Apol. I. 67; Adv. Haer. IV. 23. 8; Strom. 7.7; De Praescript. 36. Carrington and Guilding, in different but related theses, have most forcefully raised the question of the use of lectionaries in the early Church. Carrington, The Primitive Christian Calendar, rightly maintains that the Church continued to follow the Jewish calendar and participate in Jewish worship. He further argues that the Pentateuch was read in the synagogue in a lectionary cycle during the 1st century. This influenced the young Church to develop a cycle of its own at an early date, and Carrington's main thesis is that the Gospel of Mark was originally intended to be a one-year Christian lectionary. His arguments, based on the literary structure of the book and manuscript markings which must certainly be lectionary divisions, are well-reasoned and cogent.

But Davies, op. cit., has raised serious objections to Carrington's thesis. He rightly questions the probability of the Church's developing a Christian lectionary as early as Mark, and quotes Justin, Apol. I. 67, as evidence to the (Contd.)
Delling maintains that the spoken word, which eventually gave rise to the sermon, was derived neither from Jewish exposition nor from pagan aretalogical enumerations of divine attributes. Rather, it arose from the need for proclaiming the Christian message itself. This form of teaching was essentially determined by the eschatological content of the Christian message rather than any Jewish or pagan practice. Nevertheless, it is difficult to imagine the apostles and prophets not utilizing the Jewish

Contd.) contrary, pp. 128-133. In a detailed examination Davies demonstrates the implausibility of Carrington's literary arguments, and raises doubts as to the primitive-ness of the lectionary markings. Nevertheless, he allows that Carrington has drawn attention to the close ties of the early Church with Judaism, and his view cannot be dismissed outright, pp. 134-148. It may well be that Mark was used as a lectionary at a fairly early date in some quarters; cf. Werner, op.cit., pp. 70-94.

Aileen Guilding, The Fourth Gospel and Jewish Worship (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1960), makes no such claim concerning the use of a Christian lectionary, but proposes a thesis concerning the literary structure of John which presupposes widespread Christian acquaintance with (and use of) the Jewish lectionary system. According to Guilding the final arrangement of the Pentateuch and Psalter was made for continuous use in a triennial lectionary cycle: the Pentateuch was finally adapted circa the 4th century B.C.; the Psalter was arranged later, perhaps in the 2nd century B.C. There was still a certain freedom of choice in the 1st century synagogues with regard to the Prophets (26-44, 229-331). Guilding's main thesis is that the Fourth Gospel is patterned after the triennial cycle.

Morris has called Guilding's view into question. He argues that the sources do not give sufficient support to the idea of a fixed lectionary in the synagogues, nor is there any evidence forthcoming that Christians followed a lectionary, op.cit., pp. 11-29. The remainder of Morris's work is a demonstration of the implausibility of Guilding's thesis concerning the literary structure of John.

forms of instruction with which they were familiar; in any case, the evidence is abundantly clear that Christian teaching constituted an essential part of worship, so much so that the bishop was originally conceived as essentially the teacher of the church.¹

One other form of the "Word" aspect of worship was that of prophecy, which seems to have been the eschatological gift of the Holy Spirit enabling the prophet to speak the kerygma and instruct in the didache with particular power, having the spiritual mind of Christ.² The prophet seems to have been a prominent figure through most of the 2nd century.³

2. Prayer. Prayer was an essential feature of Christian worship from the beginning. Consistent with the charismatic informality of early Christian gatherings it was spontaneous and distinctively Christian. Acts 2.42 speaks of the first Christians in Jerusalem gathering daily for "the teaching and fellowship of the apostles, the breaking of bread, and the prayers." This may well indicate a daily recitation of the synagogue prayers;⁴ but

¹ For evidence of the centrality of teaching cf. Acts 2.42; 20.7-11; I Cor. 14.26 ff; I Tim. 4.6, 13; 5.17; 6.2 ff.; II Tim. 2.2; 4.2-3. On the bishop as teacher see supra, p. 72.
³ See supra, p. 74.
there is no evidence that the practice continued.

Nevertheless, Christian prayer was essentially Jewish in form, being filled with Christian content.\(^1\) As the Christian gathering replaced the synagogue as the centre of worship the use of set prayers in the Jewish fashion gained increasing acceptance. Perhaps the earliest of these was the Lord's Prayer, which the Didache instructs to be recited thrice daily as a direct counterpart to the Jewish prayers (8.2–3). The Amidah, or daily prayers of the synagogue, were themselves in development during the 1st century, and "it would be rash to expect whole passages in the early Christian prayers to be word for word parallel with those of the synagogue liturgy."\(^2\) But the synagogue had a great influence on Christian prayer. I Clement 59–61 is an early prayer containing many points of contact with the Amidah, Shema blessings, and the Alenu prayer. Didache 9.4 is a Christianization of the 10th Benediction; Didache 10.2–4 is an entirely Jewish blessing in tone and character except for the Christianizing phrase, "through Jesus thy child."

The 4th century Apostolic Constitutions contain many prayers essentially Jewish in form, including expanded and Christianized versions of the first three Amidah benedictions.\(^3\)

\(^1\) Cf. Acts 1.24–28; 4.24–30; 12.12; Eph. 1.16–22. I Cor. 14.13–16 shows that the basic procedure was Jewish: one led in prayer to which the congregations responded with an Amen; but the prayer itself is Christian in content. The practice is basically the same in the time of Justin, Apol. I. 67. The Lord's prayer bears strong resemblance to certain parts of the Alenu prayer and the Kaddish; see Appendix II, "Synagogue Worship," pp. 306–307, 315–316.

\(^2\) Dugmore, op.cit., p. 75.

\(^3\) VII. 33–35; cf. also 26–27.
The use of set prayers did not proscribe spontaneous ones, however. This is evident in Didache 10.7, in which the prophets are allowed to offer eucharistic prayers as they wish. This also seems to be the case in Justin, and is explicitly so in Hippolytus.

The evidence supports the view that the early Christians normally assumed the Jewish posture of standing in prayer, with the leader (if not all) raising his hands extended slightly upwards. By the end of the 2nd century it was common to pray toward the East. It is difficult to say how early this custom arose; it was an ancient Jewish practice, and may well have been practised from primitive times.

3. Confessions. Christianity was considered by its early adherents to be the eschatological fulfilment of the Jewish religion. The essential part of the faith was Christological, and the early Church found that Christological summaries of the faith were indispensable, especially before the fixation of the Canon. It is not surprising, therefore, to find numerous simple, succinct Christological confessions in the New Testament, as well as more detailed

4. Tertullian, Ad. Nation. I.13; Apol.16; Origen, Hom. in Num. V.1.
confessional Christological recitals.¹ 

Lietzmann maintains that Christological confessions have their material setting and origin in eucharistic prayers.² Others have pointed to the natural setting of the Apostles' Creed in the baptismal liturgy of Hippolytus³ and suggest that Acts 8.36 ff., Eph. 5.26, and I Pet. 3.21 are indications of baptismal confessions.⁴ 

Cullmann warns against the danger of ascribing confessional origins to one setting, and suggests that there were five: baptism, regular worship, exorcism, persecution, and polemic. We can do no better than follow Cullmann's outline, briefly summarizing and discussing the evidence.⁵ 

The Church had a precedent for confession in regular worship⁶ in the Jewish Shema service.⁷ There is some evidence that Christians tried to "Christianise" the Shema service in the synagogue,⁸ but none attesting to its actual

1. Rom. 1.3-4; Phil. 2.6-11; I Pet. 3.18; I Tim. 3.16. It is not always easy to distinguish between confessions and hymns, since hymns are usually confessional. See the excellent summary of criteria for ascertaining (and distinguishing between) confessions and hymns in Martin, "Aspects," pp. 16-17.
6. Baptismal confession has been discussed above, pp. 79-80.
use in Christian gatherings. It is probable, however, that the recitation of the Decalogue was soon included in the regular worship of the Church. Cullmann suggests that Phil. 2:6-11 was one of the earliest confessions of faith composed for worship, and was used as an independent liturgical piece, perhaps as a hymn; I Cor. 15:3-7, on the other hand, is a primitive confession used in preaching and instruction. Rom. 1:3-4 may well have been used in the latter context as well.

The confession of the Kingship of Christ seems to have played a role in exorcisms. This is especially clear in Justin, who in an exorcistic passage defines the title Kyrios as the "Lord of the powers." Its New Testament usage is attested as well.

1. Dugmore argues that it was used, daily, but his proof is entirely inferential, op. cit., pp. 102-104. He suggests that the Shema dropped out of use in the Church after Hadrian suppressed its recitation in the synagogue c. 135 A.D. The Jews resorted to the subterfuge of including it in the Kedushah of the Amidah (see Appendix III, "Synagogue Worship," pp. 300, 314.) A Christianised form of this subterfuge may be seen in Ap. Const. VII. 35; but the latter 4th century work is the product of a period when certain parts of the Church were consciously patterning their worship after the synagogues, and cannot be taken as evidence for practice in the early Church.

2. Cf. Didache 1-2; Ep. Barn. 19.2 ff. According to Pliny the Christians in Bithynia (c. 112 A.D.) "bind themselves on oath not to commit this or that crime, but rather to commit no theft, no murder, no adultery, not to break their word," etc. (Ep. ad Trajan X. 96. 7; the translation is Cullmann's, Worship, p. 22). So also Dugmore, op.cit., pp. 104-105.


5. Acts 3.6; 4.10; Mk. 1.24; 3.11; 5.7.
An important setting of early confession is persecution. Cullmann observes that \textit{μαρτύρειν}, "to bear witness," actually acquired the meaning "to suffer martyrdom." He suggests that the origin of the mention of Pontius Pilate in the Apostles' Creed can be traced back to I Tim. 6.13, in which Timothy is exhorted to keep before him the example of "Christ Jesus, who before Pontius Pilate witnessed a good confession," and thus "continue the good fight," for he (Timothy) had also appeared before the authorities once and had "witnessed a good confession before many witnesses." Cullmann suggests that in the creed "witness" became "suffered" due to the changing circumstances and developing theology of the Church. He also maintains that the simple formula \textit{Κύριος Χριστός} arose in contradistinction to \textit{Κύριος Κυίσαρ}, and that it was fixed in its stereotyped form by persecution.¹

A later setting of confession was the polemical need of the Church in opposition to heresies: anti-Docetic confessions may be seen in Ignatius² and I Jn. 4.2; I Cor. 8.6 is in opposition to polytheism; and I Cor. 15.3-8 opposes unbelief in the resurrection.³

Tripartite confessions are not found in the New Testament; there they are Christological. Cullmann suggests that bipartite formulas (God and Christ) arose out of the

². Trall. 9; Smyrn. 1; Magn. 11; Eph. 18.2.
³. Cullmann, Confessions, pp. 30-32. Cullmann cautions against a too rigid classification, observing that any given confession may have been used in a variety of circumstances (cf. I Cor. 15.3-8), p. 33.
struggle with heathenism and dogmatic disputes.  

The tripartite formula arose out of baptism, which was closely linked with the gift of the Holy Spirit.

4. Psalmody and Hymns. Music definitely formed a part of Christian worship in the Pauline churches. Its use in the Temple and synagogue and its character as a natural form of devotional expression render it highly probable that the Pauline churches reflect a widespread, if not universal, practice from a very early period.

The most common form of musical worship in Judaism was psalmody, and it is likely that Christians made extensive use of the Psalter, especially those Psalms capable of Christological interpretation. Hymns and spiritual songs are no doubt exemplified in the Hymn Scroll from Qumran, IQ H.

Although Greek hymnody affords certain parallels, and may even have influenced it to a limited extent, Christian hymnody in the early period is clearly Jewish in form.

1. Confessions, pp. 36-42. For examples of the heathen struggle cf. I Cor. 8.6; I Tim. 2.5; 6.13 ff.; II Tim. 4.1. Dogmatic disputes are reflected in Irenaeus, Adv. Haer. III. 1. 2; 4.1-2; 16. 6.

2. Ibid., p. 43. This is especially clear in Hipp., Ap. Trad. 21. See supra, p. 77.

3. I Cor. 14.26; Eph. 5.19; Col. 3.16.


5. Cf. the Bithynian Christians, who gathered "to sing a hymn to Christ as (to a) God," Pliny, Ep. ad Trajan X. 96. 7.

6. A hymn as a religious poem in metre was unknown to Judaism and the Apostolic Age. These hymns were what were later termed canticles, and other forms of Jewish religious poetry rendered musically, Werner, op.cit., pp. 207-208. See Appendix III, "Synagogue Worship," pp. 303-304.

R. Martin distinguishes between Jewish, Christianized-Jewish, and distinctively Christian hymns, and suggests the following passages as exemplifying each:

(1) Jewish: Lk. 1.46-55, 68-79; 2.14; 2.29-32.

(2) Christianized-Jewish: Rom. 11.33-36; I Tim. 1.17.

(3) Christian:

(a) Sacramental: Eph. 5.14; Tit. 3.4-7; Rom. 6.1-11; Eph. 2.19-22.

(b) Meditative: Eph. 1.3-4; Rom. 8.31-39; I Cor. 13.

(c) Confessional: I Tim. 6.11-16; II Tim. 2.11-13.

(d) Christological: Heb. 1.3; Col. 1.15-20; Phil. 2.6-11; I Tim. 3.16.

There is no emphasis in the New Testament on musical form, nor any evidence for musical instruments. There are traces of the use of instruments very early, however, and a controversy over their use dates back at least to the latter part of the 2nd century.

Contd.) (1) Greek hymns pile up epithets and invocations in the hope that one of the gods will hear, whereas Christian hymns approach God with confidence; (2) while both Greek and Christian hymns laud the deity's attributes, the latter emphasize God's redeeming activity in history; (3) Greek hymns tend to deify man and humanise the gods, whereas Christian hymns maintain a sharp distinction.

1. Caution must be exercised against a too rigid classification of hymns, and especially against a too ready identification of certain passages as hymns (cf. Rom. 6.1-11). Certain passages may well be hymnic poems composed by the author himself, and were never actually sung by the churches. Nevertheless they are hymnic in form, thus reflecting the musical worship of the period; cf. Moule, Birth, p. 26.


3. Ignatius favourably compares a harmonious church to a well-tuned lyre, through which harmoniousness "Jesus Christ is being sung," and urges the Christians to "join in this choir," Eph. 4.1-2; Philad. 1.2. Cf. I Cor. 14.7. Explicitly condoning the use of the lyre (or harp).
5. **Benedictions and Doxologies.** The various short liturgical formulae here classified as benedictions and doxologies constitute the most familiar parts of worship, and would be most expected to reflect their Jewish antecedents. It is somewhat surprising, therefore, to discover very little evidence of direct borrowing from Jewish worship. The only possible exception is the Ter Sanctus portion of the Kedushah, quoted in Rev. 4.8 and I Clement 34.6. This dearth of actual Jewish benedictions and doxologies can only be explained by our thesis that early Christians met regularly for worship in the synagogue, and that the Christian meeting for several decades constituted an extra-liturgical gathering of those Jews (and a few non-Jewish believers) who accepted the fulfilment of the Jewish religion in Christ. Thus new content was poured into the old forms.

Contd.) are Clement of Alexandria, Paed. II.4, and Cyril of Alexandria, Lexicon, "Psalmos." Opposing instruments are Pseudo-Cyprian, De spectaculis, 3; Chrysostom, Hom. in Ps. 150; Theodoret of Cyrrhus, in Ps. 150.


2. Dugmore maintains that the Kedushah does not form the background of the Ter Sanctus, nor is its usage in the passages cited liturgical, op.cit., p. 108. Lietzmann accepts the Kedushah as its background, but argues (as does Dugmore) that it was not used in the Church liturgically before the 3rd century, op.cit., p. 136. The first unequivocal mention of the Ter Sanctus as a liturgical piece is in Tertullian, De spectae. 25, and De orat. 3; it is quoted in full in Cyril of Jerusalem, Cat. Myst. 5.3, and in Ap. Const. VII. 35. Werner convincingly refutes this view, however, demonstrating conclusively that its context in I Clement is liturgical, and calls attention to the oblique reference to its liturgical use in Clem. Alex., Strom. VII. 12, op.cit., pp. 286 ff. So also Oesterley, op.cit., pp. 142 ff.
That the Jewish doxological form influenced Christian worship is abundantly clear. There are numerous examples of benedictions and doxologies in early Christian literature which are purely Jewish, even in content,\(^1\) as well as those which are Jewish in form but distinctively Christian in content.\(^2\)

6. **Liturgical Acclamations.** The Amen was taken over by the Church in its Jewish usage\(^3\) from the very beginning. It formed a congregational affirmation of faith in response to a prayer,\(^4\) blessing,\(^5\) or doxology.\(^6\)

The only occurrence of the Hallelujah in the New Testament is in the Apocalypse, 19.1,3,4,7. The earliest reference to it after that is an addition to Psalm verses mentioned by Tertullian.\(^7\) Its first appearance in the Eucharist is in a late Ethiopic addition to Hippolytus.\(^8\)

The Hosanna was originally both a plea for salvation and a royal acclaim in Jewish worship. Its use seems to have continued in certain Jewish quarters of the Church.\(^9\)

---

1. Rom. 11.36; II Cor. 11.3; Phil. 4.20; I Tim. 1.17; I Clem. 34.6; Did. 10.4.
2. I Clem. 61.3; Mart. Poly. 14.3; Ap. Trad. 3, 4, 6, et infra.
4. I Cor. 14.16; Did. 10.6; Justin, Apol. I. 67.
5. I Cor. 16.24; Gal. 6.18; Heb. 13.25.
6. Rom. 11.36; 16.27; II Cor. 120; Gal. 1.5; Eph. 3.21; Phil. 4.20; I Tim. 1.17; 6.16; II Tim. 4.18; Heb. 13.21; I Pet. 5.11; II Pet. 3.18; Jude 25; I Clem. 6.13.
7. De orat. 27.
9. Cf. Did. 10.6. Werner, op.cit., p. 267, claims that its supplicatory meaning was shed in Christianity, and the homage to royalty was sublimated.
Two other acclamations of distinctly Christian origin are *Abba* and *Marana tha*. Their antiquity is attested by their Aramaic form, preserved even in Greek. *Abba* seems to have been a peculiarly intimate vocative by which Christians addressed God in prayer. Marana tha was a primitive eschatological prayer, almost an ejaculation, for the Parousia; in the Didache it is affixed to the eucharistic prayer.

F. SUMMARY

In this chapter we have sought to outline the immediate liturgical background to the Johannine Apocalypse, which was the worship of the early Christian church. We have seen that that worship cannot be studied in isolation from its Jewish antecedents, which are discussed in detail in the appendices to this thesis.

In particular we argued that as far as the development of the theology of worship was concerned, the early Christians increasingly saw the Church as the new eschatological temple already being built in this age, although the practices of worship were often the Christianised development of the worship of the synagogue and the family. We also argued, however, that much of the worship of the early Church was distinctive, as required by the consciousness of eschatological fulfilment. These points are of considerable

1. Rom. 8.15-17; Gal. 4.6; cf. I Pet. 1.17.
2. I Cor. 16.22; it is apparently translated in Rev. 22.20.
3. Did. 10.6.
importance for our main thesis, as developed in Chapter IV, "Liturgical Structure in the Apocalypse."

The detailed discussion of early Christian worship, as well as its Jewish antecedents as outlined in the appendices to this thesis, will be referred to frequently in our discussion of liturgical patterns and structure in the Apocalypse, to which we now turn.
EXCURSUS I
"The Last Supper"

The New Testament affords evidence for several views of the Last Supper. One is that it was a "Jewish festal meal in a narrow circle of friends" - a haburah. Thus it was the last of a series of ordinary, but highly religious and special in their context, table-fellowship meals between Jesus and his disciples. This view was forcefully argued by Lietzmann. But Jeremias has argued that a haburah was a religious association of a very particular kind, to the characteristics of which there is no evidence that Jesus and his disciples conformed.

Because of the paschal connotations in the eucharistic tradition, some scholars have modified the haburah-theory by suggesting that Jesus and his disciples formed a religious fellowship bearing a loose resemblance to a haburah, but as unique as Jesus’ own ministry was in the Jewish context; they met frequently for meals that were religious in nature. At meals on Sabbath eve and other festal occasions they would naturally have performed the kiddush. Thus, it is suggested, the Last Supper was the last of these meals, and took place on the Day of Preparation; it was not the actual

1. Ibid., pp. 172-187. Jungmann also supports this view, op.cit., p. 31.
Passover, but they celebrated the Passover kiddush, and thus the tradition was infused with paschal connotations.  

T. W. Manson and Higgins have urged against this view that there is no evidence for a Passover kiddush twenty-four hours before the Passover on the eve of the Day of Preparation; on the contrary, it was said in the first part of the Passover meal itself.  

A common solution is to accept the prima facie evidence of the Synoptics that the Last Supper was an actual Passover celebration. This has been argued most forcefully by Jeremias, and supported by others. Against this position is the evidence of the Fourth Gospel that it occurred on the eve of the Day of Preparation, and the enigmatic logion in Lk. 22.16 in which Jesus states that he shall not eat the Passover "until it is fulfilled in the Kingdom of God."  

Lietzmann listed several arguments against the Last Supper as a Passover meal, the most important of which is that it is lacking in all the paschal characteristics. Kümmel argues that it is very unlikely that the Jews would have crucified Jesus on the day of Passover. But these

2. Pesahim X, 2. T. W. Manson, "The Jewish Background," in Christian Worship, Studies in Its History and Meaning (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1936), p. 46; Higgins, op. cit., p. 15. Manson also points out that the Lucan account, which he considers to be primary, does not support this view.  
4. Richardson regards this as conclusive, op. cit., p. 308.  
objections have been refuted by Jeremias and Higgins, and further evidence adduced in support of the Passover theory. Nevertheless, some scholars remain unconvinced. Kuhn has refuted several of Jeremias' positive arguments, suggesting that the Dead Sea Scrolls reveal that many of the so-called "paschal" characteristics to which Jeremias alludes find their parallels in the religious meals at Qumran. Kuhn also adds the criticism that the Passover was a family celebration, and there is no evidence of it ever being celebrated otherwise. Against this, however, it must be argued that the evidence of the Scrolls does not allow us to assert as much as Kuhn does; furthermore, several logia reflect Jesus' attitude that his disciples constituted his family.

An effort has been made by A. Jaubert to resolve the conflicting evidence of John and the Synoptics and the timetable difficulties by suggesting that Jesus followed the old solar calendar, which was still in use among the Essenes and others (see supra, p. 65), according to which the 15th Nisan always fell on Wednesday. Jaubert suggests that 15th Nisan in the official lunar calendar fell on Saturday in the year of the Crucifixion. Thus the Last Supper was a Passover; Jesus and his disciples celebrated it on Wednesday eve (i.e., Tuesday night), and was arrested during the night.

The imprisonment and trial took place over the next two days, and Jesus was finally crucified on Friday, the official Day of Preparation. Thus the Synoptics are correct in portraying the Last Supper as a Passover, and John is correct in placing the Crucifixion on the Day of Preparation.¹

This appealing solution is almost too neat. Manson pointed out years ago in rejecting a similar theory of Billerbeck's that the Temple authorities would never have permitted paschal sacrifices on any day other than the official Day of Preparation.² Milik rejects Jaubert's argument on the grounds that the frequency of the feast falling in the same week in both calendars was only once every thirty years; furthermore Jaubert's theory could have dire consequences for the reliability of other New Testament data, especially Johannine, attesting Jesus' observance of other festivals.³ Neither objection is insurmountable, however, and the theory, while incapable of absolute proof, remains attractive.

The question of the nature of the Last Supper remains open. One problem is that it is often assumed that the Eucharist had its direct origins in the Last Supper. Thus Jungmann argues, for instance, that the Last Supper could not have been a Passover because that was an annual rite, whereas the Eucharist was weekly, and the early Christians

2. Manson, op.cit., p. 45.
strictly adhered to Jewish laws.\(^1\) Efforts are made to compare the various New Testament traditions with Jewish antecedents, and on that basis and other literary grounds one or another tradition is pronounced as the primary, definitive record of the Last Supper, in which the Eucharist supposedly originated. The result is a plethora of views and hopeless confusion.\(^2\)

Matthew, Mark and Luke represent the meal as paschal; John does not; and Paul gives no clear indication, unless I Cor. 5.7 indicates that it was paschal. Matthew and Mark have the order: supper-bread-cup. Luke (shorter text) has cup-bread, and the longer text has cup-bread-supper-cup. Paul has bread-supper-cup. Thus Paul follows the order of an ordinary Jewish meal; Matthew and Mark do not follow any Jewish precedent. Most interesting is that only Luke (longer text) and the weekly rite of Didache 9-10 follow the order of the Passover: cup-bread-supper-grace after meals. Yet it is precisely for the reason that the paschal rite is an annual one that Jungmann rejects the Last Supper as a Passover celebration.


2. Thus Dix brilliantly defends the Pauline account in I Cor. 11.23-26 as historically correct, \textit{op.cit.}, pp. 65 ff.; he is followed by Kümmel, \textit{op.cit.}, pp. 120 ff. And yet Lietzmann considers Paul a Hellenistic innovator, \textit{op.cit.}, pp. 205 ff.; and Richardson argues persuasively that the Pauline formula was not inserted until late in the 2nd century, \textit{op.cit.}, p. 285! Rudolf Otto favours the shorter version of Luke, and interprets all the other traditions accordingly, \textit{The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man} (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1943), pp. 266 ff. R.H. Fuller, \textit{The Mission and Achievement of Jesus} (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1954), pp. 64-68; Bornkamm, \textit{op.cit.}, p. 211, fn. 11; and Vincent Taylor, \textit{Jesus and His Sacrifice} (London: Macmillan and Co. Ltd., 1948), pp. 130, 133 give Mark the priority; Taylor adds that Matthew has correctly brought out Mark's implications. Manson also supports the primacy of Mark, \textit{op.cit.}, p. 46.
EXCURSUS II
"The Eucharist from Acts to Hippolytus"

For the first few months there was daily fellowship-meal in private homes. This food was apparently brought by all, and shared in common; it was distributed to those who were absent as well.¹ This meal had become the focal point of a weekly gathering by the time Paul sojourned with the church at Troas; there is still no direct evidence, however, for anything resembling an actual eucharistic sacrament.²

Paul discusses the common meal at some length in I Corinthians 10-11. In that passage he speaks of the "supernatural food and drink," (10.3-4) and refers to the "cup of the Lord" (10.21). He emphasises the unity of the Church and its mystical fellowship in the blood and body of Christ in "the cup of blessing which we bless" and the "bread which we break" (10.16-17). According to 11.20-22 the Christians ate a meal, the "Lord's Supper," when assembled, but the Corinthians were abusing Christian practice by not waiting for others and by not sharing their food in common.

The Pauline words of institution are incorporated in 11.23-26. Their characteristics are as follows: the bread is the body of Christ, which is "for you;" the cup is the new covenant in Christ's blood. The Eucharist is interpreted

as a remembrance of Christ, a command to perform which is included with both the bread-word and the cup-word. It also stresses the death of Christ as a proclamation, and his coming again.

The bread and the cup are again equated with the body and blood of the Lord (11.27), and Christians urged not to eat or drink unworthily. Finally Paul exhorts the Corinthians to wait for everyone before beginning the meal, thus indicating that at Corinth the meal was held at the beginning of the meeting (11.33-34). Paul does not speak elsewhere of the meal.

The Synoptics provide us with three variant words of institution. Mark (= Matthew), like Paul, has the order bread-cup-eschatological-word, and the bread is equated with the body of Christ. But the cup-word differs: it is not the new covenant in Christ's blood, but rather Christ's "blood of the covenant, poured out for (the) many" (14.24). Furthermore, the command to remembrance is missing, as is the reference to proclaiming the death of Christ. The eschatological-word is a primitive logion expressing Jesus' vow not to drink wine again until he drinks it "anew" in the kingdom of God (14.25). Matthew follows Mark, adding only the interpretative phrase, "for the forgiveness of sins," to the cup-word (26.28).

Luke (shorter text) differs from Mark considerably, following a variant tradition. He has the order cup-eschatological-word-bread. The bread is also "my body," (22.19). But the cup is de-emphasized, being neither the new covenant nor the blood of Christ; and serves primarily
as a means of introducing the eschatological-word (22.17-18), which seems to be a more primitive form of that found in Mark.

The Longer Version of Luke is simply the Pauline words of institution added to the Lucan account at 22.19b. According to this version the first cup is rendered insignificant, and the order becomes eschatological word-bread-cup. Nevertheless the resulting account differs from the Pauline words in that there is only one command to remembrance (after the bread), no mention of the proclamation of Jesus' death, and the eschatological-word is more primitive and more prominent, and is displaced from the end to the beginning.

There are three possible references in Hebrews and Jude. Hebrews 6.4 speaks of those who by "tasting of the heavenly gift" become "partakers of the Holy Spirit," thus perhaps emphasizing the spiritual nourishment of the Eucharist. Reference is made to a Christian "altar" in 13.10, from which those who serve the Temple altar have no right to eat. Jude 12 condemns those false Christians who, by their carousing, were abusing the "Agape," apparently a term for the common meal to which Paul refers as "the Lord's Supper."

By the time the Fourth Gospel was written, the eucharistic elements had come into prominence as the sacramental gifts imparting life to the partakers. Jesus exhorts the woman at the well to drink of the water of eternal life (4.13-14). Although it can be argued that the reference
here is to baptism,¹ later evidence of Justin and Hippolytus for the inclusion of water in the Eucharist perhaps indicates that the author could be referring to the eucharistic cup. In either case the emphasis is on the impartation of life. Jesus speaks of himself as the bread of life, the heavenly manna which gives life to the world (6.33, 35, 48, 50-51). Eternal life is acquired through eating his flesh and drinking his blood (6.51-58). The metaphor of the Vine and the Branches (ch. 15) is probably not eucharistic,² since the reference is to the vine and its branches rather than the fruit of the vine and those who consume it. The eucharistic prayer over the cup in Didache 9.2, however, in which thanks is offered for the "Holy Vine of David thy child," may argue in favour of a eucharistic interpretation. Whether eucharistic or not the idea is again the mystical communication of life. Thus John is devoid of the eucharistic concepts of remembrance and proclamation of the death of Christ; although the Eucharist has attained sacramental prominence the emphasis is on the bread and its life-giving quality.

I Clement contains no explicit eucharistic reference. It is significant to note that Clement employs sacerdotal terminology when referring to church leaders (40-41), adopts a sacrificial view of the death of Christ (16), yet nowhere

1. So Cullmann, Worship, p. 83.
PAGES MISSING IN ORIGINAL
knowledge...through Jesus thy child/servant," and includes an eschatological petition for the gathering of the Church into the Kingdom (9.3-4). Again there is no emphasis on remembrance or the death of Christ.

After the whole meal, including the Eucharist, has concluded, a final prayer is offered expressing thanks for "knowledge and faith and immortality...spiritual food and drink and eternal light through Jesus thy child"servant" (10.1-4). The prayer closes with the primitive eschatological petition, "Marana tha, Amen" (10.5).

Ignatius emphasises the unity of the Eucharist, speaking of "one flesh, one cup, one altar" (Philad. 4; Eph. 20.3; Magn. 7.2). He equates the bread with the flesh of Christ, and the cup with his blood, in strong opposition to the Docetic heresy (Smyrn. 7.1; Rom. 7.3; Trall. 7.1). The emphasis is still on the sacramental impartation of life (the bread is the "medicine of immortality," Eph. 20.3). Ignatius allegorizes the eucharistic flesh of Christ as faith (Trall. 7.1) and the eucharistic blood as "incorruptible Ἰγνάρη (the latter may be a play on words, Rom. 7.3; cf. Jude 12, Trall. 7.1). There is no mention of remembrance, nor any emphasis on the death of Christ; rather the controlling idea remains that of spiritual nourishment and mystical communion.

Pliny refers to the Christians in Bithynia who, after meeting before daybreak to "sing a hymn to Christ as God," re-assemble later to share a common meal of ordinary food (Ep. ad Trajan X. 96. 7).
Although the author of the Epistle of Barnabas takes a sacrificial view of the death of Christ (5), emphasizes the flesh of Christ against Docetism (6), and understands the Church as the spiritual Temple of God (16), he never connects any of these later eucharistic ideas with the Eucharist itself.

In Justin the primary emphasis is still on the bread as the life-nourishing body of Christ, but a definite advance is reflected toward a set liturgical format and an emphasis on the anamnesis. According to Apol. 1.65-67 the service is carried out as follows:

- Prayers, led by the "President"
- Kiss of Peace
- Bread, cup of water and wine brought forward
- Prayer of Thanksgiving, led by the "President," for illumination, truth, salvation
- Congregational Amen
- Distribution of bread and wine and water by deacons
- Food carried to the absent

Only baptized believers are allowed to participate. The food is the flesh and blood of Jesus which nourished the partakers. Justin quotes the words of institution, which correspond roughly to the Pauline formula. There are certain differences, however: there is only one command to remembrance, at the beginning of the bread-word; there is no reference to the covenant, and the cup is simply "my blood;" there is no mention of the death of Christ; and the eschatological-word is missing. In the Dialogue with Trypho, however, the eucharistic elements are said to be a commemoration of Christ's flesh and blood (70), commanded by Christ to be taken as a remembrance of his death and in thanks to God for creation and redemption (41). They are referred to as "sacrifices" in opposition to Jewish ones (117).
By the end of the 2nd century a liturgy was in use in Rome, recorded by Hippolytus, which included all the basic elements of the developed Eucharist (Ap. Trad. 4-6, 23). The deacons bring the "offering" forward, and the bishop and the elders lay hands upon it. The bishop and congregation then perform a brief litany:

The Lord be with you.
And with thy spirit.
Lift up your hearts.
We lift them up unto the Lord.
Let us give thanks to the Lord.
It is meet and right.

The bishop then recites the eucharistic prayer, which is essentially a Christological recital, including words of institution. These follow the Pauline pattern, adding the word "broken" after "my body." The cup-word omits any mention of the covenant, and the cup is simply "my blood, shed for you," in a variation of the Markan tradition. The command to remembrance occurs only after the cup-word. The earliest example of the prayer of anamnesis then follows, in which both the death and the resurrection of Jesus are remembered; the emphasis on the sacramental communication of life has now been subordinated to the thought of Christ's death and sacrificial blood. This is followed by an early form of epiclesis, in which God is entreated to send his Holy Spirit upon the offerings and the partakers.

Of significant interest is Hippolytus' provision for blessing oil, milk, cheese and olives, if anyone offers them at the Eucharist, thus indicating that even by this late date
the Eucharist had not been entirely confined to the two elements, although these are basic (5-6).

The eucharistic prayer (23) "makes" the bread into the image of Christ's body, and the cup of wine mixed with water "according to the likeness of the blood." The milk and honey represent the fulfilment of promise, namely, Christ's flesh; and the water is an offering "in a token of the laver" for the cleansing of the inner man, as an apparent eucharistic counterpart to baptism. The distribution follows the prayer. As he gives the bread the bishop says, "The heavenly bread in Christ Jesus," to which the recipient responds with an amen. Then the elders give the recipient first the cup of water, then the milk, then the wine; each is tasted three times in the name of the Trinity. A later Latin addition (32) instructs the celebrants to handle the elements with great care for they are the body and blood of Christ.

Hippolytus also lays down rubrics for a "Lord's Supper" (26-27). This is not the Eucharist, but a table-fellowship meal held in private homes, apparently a vestige of the common meal of the early Church of which the Eucharist originally constituted the focal point. The earlier practice is reflected in these meals in that bread was blessed which was then endowed with a sort of sacramental quality. Although the Eucharist could only be celebrated by a bishop, elders and deacons could bless the bread (εὐλογεῖν, not ἐυχηροτείνω) at the "Lord's Supper."
CHAPTER III

LITURGICAL PATTERNS IN THE APOCALYPSE

The Johannine Apocalypse has increasingly been recognized as a book replete with liturgical associations. There is no consensus, however, on the nature of those associations; very little work has actually been done on the subject. A few scholars claim to have detected a liturgical pattern in the book, and before undertaking our own investigation it is incumbent upon us to examine these various theories. They fall into three broad categories: (1) those which maintain that the entire book follows a liturgical or liturgically-related pattern; (2) one which suggests that the entire book is structured for liturgical usage; and (3) those which detect a liturgical pattern within a particular passage of the book.

A. THE ENTIRE APOCALYPSE AS A LITURGICAL PATTERN

In the first category is the work of Austin Farrer, who has proposed an elaborate thesis of the composition of the Apocalypse, which concerns us in that it revolves around the festal calendar. According to Farrer several schemes of imagery are interwoven by the Seer to form a "sacred diagram," around which the Apocalypse is constructed. The first of these images is the Creative Week. The Apocalypse consists of seven parts, each of which corresponds to a day of the week: the Seven Letters relate Christ to the pre-creation

light of the first day; the Seven Seals reflect the firma-
ment of the second day; the Seven Trumpets use the elements
of creation formed on the third day as instruments of
judgment, and so on. Since each section concludes with a
sabbatical pause, each day is also a whole week within
itself. Thus there are seven days of weeks.

Basing his thesis on this seven-fold structure (which
is really six for the purposes of literary construction,
with the Sabbath of 21-22 falling beyond the limits of the
"sacred diagram") Farrer suggests that the author also
incorporated the Jewish festal calendar into his scheme,
with each section of the book reflecting a season of the year.
But since there are only four seasons, that which is pre-
paratory to Passover is assigned to the first section, so
that the Seven Letters reflect the winter season which is
highlighted by the Feast of Dedication. The book then
revolves around the year, with the winter quarter of Ded-
cation and the spring quarter from Passover to Pentecost
repeated in the fifth and sixth sections, so that the final
vision of 21-22 is attained after Pentecost at the summer
solstice. Farrer observes that each section contains
references to feasts other than those which occur in the
quarter assigned to it, and concludes that as each day of
the week is a week within itself, so also each season contains
a full annual revolution, sometimes several times.1

1. See, e.g. Farrer's discussion of the fourth section
(ch. 12-14) or day (Thursday), which, although assigned
to the autumnal season of Atonement and Tabernacles,
actually traverses the full year round, ending up at
the Dedication festival of the next section: ibid.,
The festal year thus forms the base of the Seer's four-sided "sacred diagram" around which he constructs his apocalypse. The diagram is diamond-shaped; each of the four sides represents a season of the year. The diagram is further overlaid with the signs of the zodiac, the twelve stones of the High Priest's breast-plate, the twelve tribes of Israel, and the four corners of the earth. South corresponds to the summer solstice between the spring and summer seasons. The diagram is then divided horizontally between heaven and earth, and vertically between the temple and the altar. The Seer then follows this diagram around the year through each of the six sections, freely drawing on the various associations of imagery which it affords him. For example, in the second section (4-7) he can use imagery associated with the following materials: the fresh waters above the firmament created on the second day; the feasts of Passover and Pentecost; the season of spring, including movement from the spring equinox to the summer solstice; the zodiacal signs of Aries, Taurus and Gemini; the precious stones sardius, sardonyx, and emerald; the tribes of Judah, Benjamin, and Joseph; the directions from East to South; heaven; and the altar.

If Farrer's thesis were correct it would be of considerable significance for our study; but we are not convinced. Although some may accept it as the "most fruitful piece of biblical exegesis which has appeared in living memory,"

we are rather inclined toward skepticism. The scheme is too ingenious and elaborate, and the explanations for irregularities are too contrived. A detailed refutation is outside the scope of this study; a few examples of our objections must suffice.

The Seven Trumpets are said to reflect the seven days of the creative week: each trumpet brings down judgment on an element of creation. The first two days, however, witnessed the creation of light and the firmament, whereas the first two trumpets bring judgment on land and sea. Farrer explains that the Seer, by dividing the works of the third day, can still obtain a list of six and let the first two works of Genesis go. His comment that the Seer did this deliberately to emphasise the number three, which "is prominent throughout the whole seven" trumpets, is too contrived to be convincing.

Again, although the first section (1-3) is supposed to reflect the winter season of Dedication, Farrer admits that the contents of the Seven Letters are not related to any season. The only connection with Dedication, then, is that of the seven lampstands with references in Numbers 7-8 and Zechariah 4, which Farrer maintains were the lectionary passages for that feast. This seems a slender connection, indeed, on which to associate three whole chapters with the Feast of

2. Ibid., p. 61.
3. Ibid., p. 102.
Dedication.\(^1\)

The jewels in the New Jerusalem (21.19-20) are supposed to be those arranged in four rows of three each on the High Priest's breast-plate.\(^2\) These do not occur, however, in the order of Exodus 28, but the Seer has re-arranged them in the most complicated manner, which only Farrer can analyse: each of the rows of three stones is assigned to a side of the sacred diagram, beginning with the Spring quarter and moving clockwise around the year. This would result in the order of Exodus 28 if the names of the stones were written consecutively around the lower sides. But, Farrer maintains, John wrote them rightside up on the two lower sides of the diagram, and from left to right on each side. This results in the order: sard, topaz, emerald, carbuncle, sapphire, jasper, amethyst, agate, ligyry, onyx, beryl, chrysolith. But when John lists them in the Apocalypse, he begins at the right-hand corner, with the Autumn equinox, and reads counterclockwise backwards through the year. This results in the order: jasper, sapphire, carbuncle, emerald, topaz, sard, chrysolith, beryl, onyx, ligyry, agate, amethyst. Farrer admits that this still "is not quite St. John's list." Indeed even after this incredible juggling, five of the twelve stones

---

1. Even that slender connexion is rendered dubious, however, by the lack of evidence for any universal lectionary usage in the 1st century synagogue: see Appendix III, "Synagogue Worship," pp. 293-296 and Chapter II, "Early Christian Worship," pp. 99-100. Farrer also draws upon material in Jeremiah 24, which he claims was a Dedication lesson, p. 145. But there is no evidence whatsoever for this lesson; cf. T.W. Manson's review in JTS, 50 (1949), p. 208.

do not correspond! Farrer's explanation is, that "it was to be expected: St. John never copies anything as it stands, he always exercises his wit upon it."¹

None of these examples is sufficient in itself to undermine Farrer's thesis. But these are only a few of many, the totality of which renders the whole argument unconvincing. The schemes do not correlate with the material in Revelation without considerable adjustment. Farrer offers ingenious explanations; but as T.W. Manson has observed, "it is the fact that explanations are necessary which shakes our confidence."² Manson has also pointed out that the method by which Farrer establishes connections between Old Testament passages and details in the Apocalypse is often arbitrary and uncontrolled, characterised by processes of psychological association rather than logic and reason.

Farrer's work is by no means without value. Though we must reject his elaborate theory of diagrammatical construction, many of his analyses of particular symbols are cogent and satisfying,³ and should be of some value in the study of the Apocalypse; but each individual passage must be weighed in terms of its immediate interpretation, and not in relation to a complicated scheme of composition.

The same criticisms apply to the work of D.T. Niles, who has adopted Farrer's theory with reference to the days of the week, the festal calendar, and also the suggestion,

³ As W.D. Davies has pointed out in the Congregational Quarterly, 28 (1950), pp. 73-74.
only lightly touched upon by Farrer, that the six sections also reflect the daily morning sacrifice of the Temple, divided rather artificially into six phases: the dressing of the lamps, the blood-offering, the incense-offering, the burnt-offering, the drink-offering, and Levitical psalmody. Niles gives no credit to Farrer, however, nor does he attempt to prove or illustrate his thesis.

A. van Gennep has proposed the peculiar notion that the Apocalypse is the catechism of an initiation ritual of an Asian Jewish-Christian sect, perhaps founded, or directed by John. To obtain full membership one had to submit to an initiation ritual consisting of several stages. This ritual was secret, and its esoteric nature could only be divulged by John himself and his accredited priests. Thus, for example, the Christ of the vision in 1.12 ff. is not the Christ of the gospel, but the physical image of a composite divinity denominated "Christ," hidden in the Holy of Holies,

1. D.T. Niles, As Seeing the Invisible (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1962), pp. 99-115. A similar thesis was advanced earlier by P. Joseph Peschek, Geheime Offenbarung und Tempeldienst (Paderborn: Verlag Ferdinand Schöningh, 1929), to whom neither Farrer nor Niles gives any credit. Peschek's thesis (which often omits source references) differs in that he claims Revelation follows the entire daily Temple service from morning to evening. The ingenuity with which Peschek, Farrer and Niles work out their schemes is a classic example of the manner in which inventive minds may "discover" fundamentally exclusive outlines in the very same material: the Apocalypse simply cannot be patterned after the morning sacrifice only and at the same time follow the entire daily Temple worship from morning to evening. The Apocalypse undoubtedly reflects features of Temple worship; but the hypothesis that it follows the Temple service is less than convincing. As Delling has pointed out, "this should warn us all the more strongly against drawing inferences too quickly about Christian worship" from the Apocalypse; Worship in the New Testament (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1962), p. 46.

and exposed to the novice early in the ritual. Later the
novice encounters the great High Priest, seated on a throne
and surrounded by twenty-four initiates of a higher degree
(4.1ff.). The Lamb of 5.6 is neither the Paschal Lamb nor
the Lamb of God, but a mannequin designed to terrify the
novice. The Heavenly Woman of 12.1ff. is a statue, or per-
haps a High Priestess. The Harlot of 17.1ff. is a statue
of a popular female sex goddess. The New Jerusalem (21-22)
is a real object transported into the Hall of Initiation at
the climax of the ceremony. Thus all the images of Reve-
lation are thinly veiled descriptions of real objects in the
initiation ritual; John's readers would understand precisely
to what he is alluding.

Notwithstanding the vast knowledge of comparative
religions manifested by the author of this improbable theory,
and the appealing manner in which it is presented, we find
ourselves incapable of taking it seriously. Although some-
thing is known of so-called Jewish Christianity, there is
little concrete evidence of its existence as anything
distinct from the rest of the early Church at the end of the
1st century; the whole Church at that time was still very
Jewish, not only in orientation, but even in composition.¹
Of the particular sect which the Seer is supposed to have
directed we know absolutely nothing. The existence of such
a sect in the great churches of Asia Minor (cf. the Seven
Letters) would hardly pass unnoticed.

¹. So J. Van Goudoever, Biblical Calendars (Leiden:
   E.J. Brill, 1961), p. 151; cf. also above, Chapter II,
If the Apocalypse is such a document as van Gennep suggests, and its author the leader of such an unorthodox sect, it is difficult to understand how the book came to acquire the degree of acceptance and influence that it did in such a short time after its composition.  

Perhaps the greatest objection is the very implausibility of the theory itself, and the methodology used to establish it. As with others of his day, van Gennep has succumbed to the tendency of the comparative religions school to draw upon material from all over the world in an effort to substantiate its theories. Thus van Gennep draws comparisons between the Apocalypse and the most diverse religious sources: the cults of Dionysius and Orpheus, Australian and Negro initiation rites, Siberia, the Egyptian Book of the Dead and Book of the Opening of the Gates, Western Africa, the Italian carnival, Assyrian and Hindu divinities, Haitian voodoo rites, and even the ceremonies of the Ku Klux Klan in America. Granting the eclectic nature of 1st century religion we must still ask if it was possible for such a rite to have existed, bearing affinities with such diverse parallels, and if there is any other evidence for such a sect.

The influence of pagan religion on early Christianity has perhaps been neglected in the modern reaction to the

1. Thus Justin, c. 135 A.D., asserts that it was written by "John, one of the twelve apostles of Christ," Dial. c. Trypho 81; so also Melito, c. 165 A.D., in Eus. IV. 26.2; Irenaeus, c. 180 A.D., in Adv. Haer. III.11:1, IV.20.11, V.35.2; Tertullian, c. 200 A.D., Contra Marcion III.14.24; cf. also its acceptance in the Muratorian Canon.
comparative religions school; but it is precisely this sort of excess which led to the modern reaction. Thus, while we may allow consideration to a few of van Gennep's comparisons, we must decisively reject his thesis as a curious artifact of scholarly zeal in the earlier decades of this century.

An attempt has been made by Massey H. Shepherd to trace the outline of a Paschal liturgy in the Apocalypse. Over two-thirds of his short work\(^1\) is devoted to an analysis of the Pascha during the first two centuries of the Church. Shepherd discusses several New Testament texts which he maintains reflect the Passover celebration in the apostolic age,\(^2\) then turns to an argument that the Gospel of Mark reflects the Roman Paschal liturgy. The adoption of the Markan passion narrative led to the Quartodeciman controversy; the Quartodeciman practice was the original, and the later controversy is proof that a Sunday Pascha was observed in Rome as early as the Gospel of Mark. The Church's Pascha c. A.D. 200 is then outlined in some detail, based primarily on the baptismal liturgy of Hippolytus.\(^3\)

Having discussed his two main premises, that (1) a Christian Sunday Passover rite existed in the 1st century A.D., and (2) the nature of its observance c. 200 A.D. is known, Shepherd concludes with his main thesis and final point, that the Apocalypse "follows the order of the Church's

---

2. I Corinthians, especially 5.7-8 and chapter 10; Acts 2, which reflects a celebration of Pentecost, thus implying the observance of the fifty days from Passover.
Paschal liturgy. He is careful to avoid the pitfalls of over-elaboration or claiming too much: Revelation is not a liturgy as such, nor is it a lectionary or a liturgical homily; but the "Paschal liturgy has suggested to the Seer a structural pattern for the presentation of his message," which pattern Shepherd reconstructs.2

Thus the Seven Letters (1-3) reflect the scrutinies; the Heavenly Liturgy and the first six Seals (4-6) are the vigil; the Sealing (7) is the initiation; the Seventh Seal, the Censing, the Trumpets, the Woes, the Vials and the Hallelujah (8-19) are the synaxis; and the Marriage Supper of the Lamb and the Consummation are the Eucharist.

Shepherd's thesis is weak both in his premises and conclusion. It is by no means clear that there was a Christian (as distinguished from Jewish) Passover rite as early as the composition of Mark, much less that it corresponded in detail to the Roman baptismal liturgy of 200 A.D.3 To argue from the Quartodeciman controversy of the last half of the 2nd century for the existence of a developed Sunday Pascha in Rome a century earlier is sheer conjecture: one could equally argue,4 though with equal lack of persuasion, that the Quartodeciman controversy is proof of an original universal Sunday Pascha, which was only changed in Asia Minor.

2. Ibid., p. 83.
with the appearance and acceptance of the Fourth Gospel. The most probable origin of the Quartodeciman controversy was the diversity of liturgical practice in the early Church:¹ as the custom of celebrating a specifically Christian Pascha developed (as opposed to the earlier Christian practice of celebrating the Jewish feast)² differing dates of observance arose in different quarters, finally resulting in the controversy of the late 2nd century.

But this by no means supports the idea that there was a developed Christian Paschal liturgy at the time of the composition of the Apocalypse. Indeed the earliest explicit evidence for any sort of specifically Christian Paschal celebration³ is in the Epistle of the Apostles, 15, which is dated at the earliest c. 130-140 A.D., and only reflects an all-night vigil followed by an Agape meal at cock-crow.

There is no evidence for baptism being connected with the Passover until the time of Hippolytus⁴ and Tertullian.⁵ That baptism was by no means restricted at that time to the Pascha is clear from the passage in Tertullian, in

2. Other than a slightly Christianized version of the traditional Jewish feast, as may be reflected in I Cor. 5.7, Jn. 19.36. Cf. van Goudoever, op. cit., p. 156. See also Ch. II, "Early Christian Worship," pp. 83-85.
4. Comm. on Daniel 16.
5. De Baptismo 19.
which he suggests the period from Passover to Pentecost as particularly suitable for baptism, and concludes by urging any day, any hour, for "if there is a difference in the solemnity, there is no distinction in the grace."\(^1\) Also Hippolytus himself, in the very passage Shepherd maintains is Paschal, allows a woman who is menstruous on the day of baptism to be "set aside and baptized on some other day."\(^2\) In fact, the Hippolytan liturgy, on which Shepherd bases his description of the "Church's Pascha c. 200 A.D.," is nowhere identified as a Paschal liturgy, but is in fact the prescribed baptismal liturgy for use at any time. Thus, while it may be probable that the rubric for baptism at dawn followed by the Eucharist was observed at Easter in Hippolytus' day, this so-called "Paschal liturgy" was by no means celebrated only at Pascha. It is questionable, therefore, whether the Hippolytan rite should be identified as the "Paschal Liturgy."

That rite is probably a reminiscence of the early weekly liturgy of a Christian Saturday night service, following upon the synagogue minḥah, which carried over to Sunday morning and developed into a weekly Easter vigil and celebration.\(^3\) As the Christians were cut off from the synagogue, and Sunday morning worship replaced that of Saturday night, the earlier form was retained in an annual Passover vigil and feast, including a reading and a homily,

\(^1\) Ibid.
and augmented by fasts preceding the actual night of vigil and morning of Agape celebration. This seems to be the basic paschal rite as reflected in the meagre evidence of the 2nd century.\(^1\) This Paschal reminiscence of the early church's worship was eventually conflated with the baptismal liturgy as it occurred to various theologians that Passover was an especially suitable time for baptism.\(^2\)

If our reconstruction of the development of the Passover be accepted, which we feel is the most that can be maintained on the basis of the evidence, then it is easily seen that any theory such as Shepherd's is immediately ruled out; there is absolutely no concrete evidence that the Paschal liturgy was at all developed at the time of the composition of the Apocalypse, much less that the baptismal liturgy had been conflated with it.

Even if we allowed Shepherd's premises, his correlation of the structure of the Apocalypse with the Paschal liturgy is less than convincing. The burden of proof for such a theory falls upon its proponent; Shepherd simply states the theory without making any effort to substantiate it. We are utterly unconvincled. How does the Heavenly Liturgy and Six (of the Seven) Seals (4-6) correspond to the vigil? It is stretching the powers of imagination to their furthest limits to associate the reading of the Law with the first six Trumpets, the Prophets with the Little Scroll and the Two

---

1. See Ep. Apostles 15; Melito's Homily on the Passion, especially 1 and 11; the evidence of Appolinarius in the Chronicon Paschale refers only to the date of the Passover.
2. Cf. Hipp., Comm. on Daniel 16; Tert., De Baptismo 19.
Witnesses, and especially the Gospel with the Seventh Trumpet and the Vials of final retribution. Moreover, what evidence does Shepherd have for the reading of the Law, Prophets and Gospel in any liturgy of the 1st century, Paschal or otherwise? Finally, to ask his readers to associate the final three-and-a-half chapters of Revelation with the Eucharist solely on the basis of the brief mention of the Marriage Supper of the Lamb in 19.7 and the invitation of 22.17 is to transgress the bounds of credulity; we are compelled to reject Shepherd's thesis in toto. As C.C. Richardson comments on Shepherd's work: "Since Christianity is basically about the passion, the Resurrection, baptism, and the Lord's Supper, we can find these almost anywhere."^2

B. THE ENTIRE APOCALYPSE AS PATTERNED FOR LITURGICAL USAGE

In the second category of theories of liturgical patterns in the Apocalypse is a theory which attempts a positive answer to the question, Was the book intended to be used liturgically? If so, it is all the more likely that certain sections must be interpreted liturgically. Nils Lund claims that the Apocalypse is such a liturgical document, "written to be read in public and to be read in toto... at the worship service of the congregation."^3 This conclusion is based partly on the formalities with which the book opens

and closes, but primarily on the literary pattern of the whole book, which Lund maintains is a perfect balance in both content and form.  

This pattern is characterised above all else by its chiastic form. In an earlier work Lund has attempted to demonstrate the presence of chiasmus on a large scale in the New Testament. According to Lund the simple chiasmus, which is an inverted parallelism in the manner \( a \ b \ b' \ a' \), is common to all cultures, and may often be accounted for as an unconscious human tendency. But although the Greeks recognised the simple chiasmus as a literary device, the extended chiasmus is a distinctly Semitic, non-Greek pattern.

Lund illustrates profusely from the Old Testament, then analyses the epistles and gospels in some detail. Two examples will illustrate his analysis:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{Arise,} & a \\
&\text{Shine,} & b \\
&\text{For thy light is come,} & c \\
&\text{And the glory} & d \\
&\text{Of Yahweh} & e \\
&\text{Upon thee is risen.} & f \\
&\text{For behold, darkness shall cover} & g \\
&\text{the earth,} & g' \\
&\text{And gross darkness} & h \\
&\text{the peoples.} & h'
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{But upon thee will arise} & e' \\
&\text{Yahweh,} & f' \\
&\text{And his glory upon thee be seen} & d' \\
&\text{And nations shall come to thy light} & c' \\
&\text{And kings to the shining} & b' \\
&\text{Of thy rising.} & a'
\end{align*}
\]

(Isa. 60.1-3)

---

1. Ibid., pp. 248-249.
4. Ibid., p. 44.
Besides the obvious extended chaotic structure, this passage illustrates several of Lund's points. The turning point is in the centre, with the two extremes moving towards it. Moreover, the central lines not only focus on a different subject (the vengeance of God) but are alternating rather than inverted, thus illustrating the use of a different poetic pattern within a larger chiastic framework, a literary device used by the Hebrews to call attention to a contrasting or particularly important point. Although most of the lines contain a parallelism of words, the Hebrew of the first and last do not: the first line uses the verb הָקָדָם (qāḏām) and the last uses נָעַר (nāʿar). But there is a parallelism of ideas, thus demonstrating Lund's argument that Hebrew chiasmus extends to ideas as well as words.

And he came to Nazareth where he had been brought up, and entered as his custom was on the sabbath day into the synagogue.

A And stood up to read.
And there was delivered unto him the book of the prophet Isaiah,
And he opened the book and found the place where it was written,

"The spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he anointed me
To preach good tidings to the poor:
He hath sent me* to proclaim to the captives release,

B And to the blind recovering of sight,
To send the crushed into release,**
To proclaim***
The acceptable year of the Lord."****

And he closed the book,
And gave it back to the attendant,

A' And sat down,

And the eyes of all in the synagogue were fastened on him,
And he began to say unto them, etc. (Lk. 4.16-21a) 1

1. Ibid., p. 236. The italics (underlined here) are Lund's.
Lund observes that the central section (B), which is essentially a quote from Isa. 61.1-2a, has been modified in four places, all of which result in a better chiastic parallelism: (1) the Septuagint phrase "to heal the broken-hearted" has been dropped (*) since there is no parallel in the corresponding line; (2) a whole line (**) has been interpolated from Isa. 58.6, and the verb has been adapted to the chiastic parallel by changing it from the imperative to the infinitive; (3) the verb καλίω (***) which offers a closer parallel to ἐξάγγελίζω in the parallel line; (4) finally, the elimination of the Septuagint phrase "and a day of recompense" (****) is easily explained as a further modification in the interest of a chiastic parallel.

These two examples are illustrative of a wealth of material in Lund's books, some of which is more convincing than the rest. His analysis demonstrates an extensive use of the chiastic form in the New Testament. Lund maintains that chiasmus reflects liturgical usage. He gives many convincing examples of the chiastic structure of certain Pauline passages generally acknowledged as liturgical.

The Pauline epistles are liturgical documents: "Their character as public liturgical writings is accentuated by the

1. As both Henry J. Cadbury, in JR XXIII (1943), pp. 62-63, and J. Levine, in HTR 69 (1947), pp. 541-542, concede. C.F.D. Moule, in An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1963), says that Lund's work is interesting and may be important; but he wonders if the extended chiasmus is as essentially Semitic as Lund argues, and questions the validity of some of Lund's examples.

fact that they were cast in the well-known Old Testament liturgical forms."\(^1\)

Lund argues similarly concerning the Synoptic gospel material. The units of the gospel tradition did not just accidentally arise; they were intelligently constructed for didactic-liturgical usage. This is evident from their Hebrew poetic patterns, the most significant of which is the extended chiasm. These patterns are also amply illustrated.\(^2\) Lund observes that Matthew uses the chiasm most extensively, and concludes that it is thus both the most Hebraic in character and the most liturgical in function.\(^3\)

In the final section of his earlier work\(^4\) and in Studies in the Book of Revelation Lund argues that Revelation not only uses the chiasm extensively, as well as other Hebrew poetic patterns, but is in fact itself one grand chiasmus of ideas. After arguing the point in some detail, often convincingly, Lund concludes that the Apocalypse was meant to be read in toto at one time in public worship. His argument is fourfold: (1) the formalities with which the book opens and closes are liturgical. (2) The whole structure is liturgical. (3) To read different portions of the book on separate occasions would defeat the author's original purpose, since widely separated series are parallel. (4) A trained reader could read the book in little over two hours; there is nothing in the evidence of early worship which

---

excludes a reading of that length.  

Lund's thesis deserves careful examination. He manages to avoid, to a large extent, the contrived ingenuity of similar elaborate analyses which renders most critics wary and skeptical. His detailed comments on the structure and meaning of passages in the book are often cogent and convincing. If his conclusions are accepted significant implications follow for exegetical approaches to the Apocalypse, as well as for analyses of critical problems in other New Testament literature.

Our evaluation rests upon the answer to four crucial questions: Is chiasmus really used extensively in the New Testament? Is chiasmus a liturgical form? Is the whole of the Apocalypse chiastically structured? Was it meant to be read in public? We have already answered with a qualified affirmative to the first question. Although some of his analyses appear forced, Lund has convincingly demonstrated to us that the Biblical writers often tend to invert what they repeat, sometimes on a grand scale.

The question of the chiasmus as a liturgical form is more difficult. Lund too easily assumes this as "probable;" he neither offers sufficient evidence, nor quotes any other modern scholar to that effect. The synagogue liturgical

3. In a written communication with the late Professor Lund's most ardent pupil, Mr. J. Lundbom of San Francisco Theological Seminary, I have attempted to locate evidence for this aspect of Lund's thesis. Mr. Lundbom knew of no such evidence. More recently D.F. Noble, in a doctoral dissertation, has asserted that chiasmus constituted an inverted form of the various types of thematic structure.
material does not conform to such a chiastic analysis. Nevertheless, an unqualified negative seems too hasty.

Lund has demonstrated that certain liturgical passages, as in the Psalms and Pauline material, do follow a chiastic structure. Chiasmus is primarily a poetic form; but although it does not always indicate liturgical usage, it may be considered as corroborative evidence of such.

Lund's analysis of the whole structure of the Apocalypse would be more convincing were it not for two serious flaws: he is forced to emend the text, and some of the material stands in parallel only by a rather free association of ideas. Lund argues that four passages, which he calls "projections," have been moved from the rear toward the front of the book; thus to reconstruct the original order they must be moved back. There are two longer and two shorter projections: 7.1-17 is placed after 8.5; 10.1-11.13 is placed after 11.19; 8.2 is placed after 7.17 (which has already been placed after 8.5); and 15.1 is placed after 15.4. In support of this emendation Lund observes that each projection has been moved forward

---

1. At least not to our attempts at such an analysis. See the texts in Appendix III, "Synagogue Worship," pp. 306-317.

2. Cf. the chiastic structure of the entry liturgy at Qumran, Appendix IV, "Qumran Worship," p. 347.
by the same distance in the original Greek, and when moved back to their "original" position yield a "striking chiastic symmetry."¹ This movement forward was done by neither a stupid editor nor a clumsy scribe, but by "the author himself...to tie the parts of the book together and show the sequence."² Notwithstanding this clever explanation, the necessity for emendation is a weakness altogether too characteristic of discoveries of form in the Bible,³ and urges us to caution.

Even after the emendations the parallels are too often forced and only harmonised by a contrived association of ideas. For example, the Seven Epistles (2-3) and the "Seven Last Angels" (17.1-22.5) are supposed to be parallel. Lund lists seven similes used in both passages.⁴ But in the latter passage, the similes follow neither the same order as in the former passage, nor the reverse order, nor any order whatsoever. Moreover, they all occur in the last four Angels; the first three are not represented. Lund acknowledges, furthermore, that several similes used in the Seven Epistles do not occur in the Seven Angels; "but since these do not recur in the last series of Seven Angels, they cannot enter into the scheme." One can prove any manner of structural correlation by such reasoning, so long as a few coincidental parallels may be found. In a book as full of imagery as the Apocalypse this is easily done.

¹ Chiasmus, p. 328.
² Revelation, p. 35.
³ As Cadbury has observed, op.cit., p. 63.
⁴ Revelation, pp. 353-354.
We suspect that Lund's zeal has overreached his judgment. That the Apocalypse is a structural unity we accept; but we must reject Lund's scheme as too contrived and elaborate. His detailed comments on various passages are of considerable value, however, in the exegesis of relevant texts.

Having rejected Lund's overall chiastic analysis, and having qualified his assumption that chiasmus indicates liturgical usage, can we accept his conclusion that the Apocalypse was meant to be read in public worship? We believe it was, but not on the basis of Lund's arguments. There must have been some structure to the book, perhaps a multifarious one; that is evident from the various outlines which have been deduced from it. Its purpose was to encourage the Church in time of trouble; it is thus directed to Christ's "servants," and specifically addressed to seven important churches in Asia Minor. As Lund has demonstrated, the book is full of Hebrew poetic forms, which were undoubtedly meant to be read and heard. The book begins with a public address, and concludes with the Greek translation of the ancient prayer, Marana tha, and a public benediction with the congregational Amen. Whether Lund's overall analysis be accepted or not, his contention that the book loses its climactic effect if it is not read in toto at one time would appear to be valid.

One final argument, which Lund fails to mention, convinces us that the book was meant to be read aloud. This

is the passage in 1.3: "Blessed is he who reads and those who hear the words of this prophecy and keep what is written in it; for the time is near."

The verb ἄναγνωσκός, the present participle of which is used in this verse, has the basic meaning of simply "to read," and does not necessarily imply reading aloud in public. The term for public reading in the synagogue is the derivative, ἔναγνωσται, and the term most frequently used for the office of reader is not the present participle but ἄναγνώστης. Thus it is doubtful that John is here referring to any technical office in the Church comparable to that of reader in the synagogue. But that he is referring to a public reading is probable on two counts: (1) the verb ἄναγνωσκός is used in Philo, the New Testament, and the early Fathers in contexts which clearly refer to the public reading of Scripture. John's use of the present participle emphasises the blessing which attends the act of reading "this prophecy" rather than the office which the reader may hold. (2) The context clearly indicates a public reading: not only is "he who reads" blessed, but also "those who hear." Thus we conclude that the Apocalypse was intended to be read aloud in public worship, as probably were other documents of the

2. Ibid., p. 275.
3. Philo, Hypothetica VIII.7.13; Quod Omnis Probus 82. Lk. 4.16; Acts 15.21; II Cor. 3.15; Col. 4.16; I Thess. 5.27; II Clem. 19.1; Justin, Apol. I.67; Shep. Hermes I.iii.3, II.iv.3.
C. RESTRICTED LITURGICAL PATTERNS WITHIN THE APOCALYPSE

Several attempts have been made to discover an actual early Christian liturgy embedded in passages of the Apocalypse. Lucetta Mowry has suggested that Rev. 4-5 contains "the earliest known form of a Christian service of worship, possibly the Eucharist." She observes that all four of the hymnic lyrics in that passage have associations not only with the Old Testament, but also with the synagogue and Hellenistic imperial cults. Material similar to Rev. 4-5 had its setting in Jewish and Greek cultic life. Thus argues Mowry, this passage is in all probability a reflection of a Christian worship service.

Upon closer investigation Rev. 4-5 is seen to have a close association with synagogue worship. The themes of creation and redemption, as expressed in the Yotzer Kedushah, and Geullah, are paralleled in the correct sequence in


4.8-11 and 5.9. The scroll which no one can unseal except the Lamb, the Lion of Judah, corresponds to the reading of the Torah. Finally, the vials are interpreted by John himself as prayers.

But, observes Mowry, this is a Christian service. It is probably eucharistic: the lyrics are Paschal, the stress is on the Lamb of God, and the whole passage follows Rev. 3.20, which Mowry understands as a eucharistic invitation. She explicitly assumes the structure as well as the forms to have been based on the synagogue, and concludes that Rev. 4-5 reveals the earliest known form of Christian worship as follows:

1. Invitation (3.20, 4.1)
2. Sung Trisagion (4.8)
3. Sung praises to God by the choir while the congregation prostrates itself (4.11)
4. Reading of Scripture (5.1-7)
5. Prayers, including a hymn to Christ (5.8-12)
6. Congregational doxology and Amen (5.13-14)¹

Several objections can be raised against this thesis. The association with the synagogue liturgy is not so close as Miss Mowry assumes. The Kedushah, which is the synagogue Trisagion, followed rather than preceded the Yotzer;² in Rev. 4 the trisagional hymn precedes the hymn Mowry associated with the Yotzer. The Yotzer emphasises God the Creator as the Giver of Light; Rev. 4.11 praises God as

---

¹ Mowry, op.cit., p. 84.
Creator of all things. Rev. 5.9-10 is supposed to reflect the Geullah, because they both deal with redemptive themes. But there is no similarity in the texts themselves, and several Geullah themes are omitted; the theme of redemption is far too common in both scripture and worship to provide any basis for assuming an association between the Geullah and Rev. 5.9-10. It may be further observed that both the Yotzer and the Geullah are prayer-blessings attending the recitation of the Shema; in the Apocalypse the Shema is omitted, and the relevant passages are stated by the author to be hymns.

The identification of the scroll with the Torah is also unsubstantiated, and rests on associations of the most tenuous sort. Mowry observes that the Scroll is an ophisthograph. Ezekiel 2.10 mentions a scroll written on both sides which came from the hand of God, was full of lamentation and woe, and tasted sweet as honey. Mowry says this is the background for the scroll of seven seals in the Apocalypse, and must be the Torah: the tablets of the Law were engraved on both sides (Ex. 32.15); the Psalmist refers to the Law as "sweeter also than honey" (ps. 19.10); and a scroll held by a standing figure on a panel in the Dura synagogue which is inscribed on both sides is "probably" the Torah. The speciousness of this whole line of argument is so obvious it needs no refutation; it is totally unconvincing.¹

¹ Pierre Prigent, Apocalypse et Liturgie (Neuchâtel: Delachaux et Niestle, 1964), explicitly rejects Mowry's argument, p. 70; so also Delling, Worship, p. 46, fn. 1.
That the scroll represents a revelation from God is clear enough; but it is a revelation of things to come and not the Torah, or any other writing already in circulation.¹

The order of service, as Mowry interprets it, does not conform to the synagogue service either. The so-called Kedushah and Yotzer are reversed, as already pointed out. The reading of scripture not only precedes the prayers, which it follows in the synagogue, but is placed in the position of the Shema, which is dropped,² unless we regard the scroll as the Shema rather than the reading of the Torah. Although the latter view is more likely, it is still highly improbable. Furthermore, Mowry ignores the fact that the scroll is neither unsealed nor its contents proclaimed in any way in chapter 5; this only takes place in chapters 6 ff.

Mowry too easily assumes that the pattern of Christian worship was based squarely on that of the synagogue. We have already shown that this cannot be assumed.³ It is difficult to correlate this "service of worship" with what we already know of Christian worship during the period. Where does the εὐχαιρετήσεως, which was such an important function of the bishop,⁴ fit in? If this service is eucharistic, as all regular corporate worship seems to have been at this time,⁵ how and where does the Eucharist fit in? The difficulties raised by Mowry's suggestion are too serious and

¹. So Charles, I, pp. 136-139, and most commentators.
⁴. Ibid., p. 72.
⁵. Ibid., pp. 66-69.
manifold to allow conviction. While there is undoubtedly some connection between the heavenly and earthly worship, we are not persuaded that Rev. 4-5 contains the earliest known pattern of a Christian service of worship.

Somewhat more convincing is the thesis of Pierre Prigent in his short book Apocalypse et Liturgie. Prigent also detects similarities to the synagogue service in Rev. 4-5. He understands it as an "echo" of a liturgical rite actually used in the church of the Seer. But it cannot be restored in detail; the apocalyptic literary mold has led the author to impose modifications and adaptations of the great moments of an actual liturgy, whose sources are Jewish.¹

Rev. 4 is essentially a Creation liturgy, followed by a Redemption liturgy in chapter 5, the whole of which constitute a unified eucharistic liturgy, probably Paschal. Prigent points to the emphasis in the hymn of praise (4.11) on God as Creator and compares this to the Yotzer; like Mowry he finds support for this comparison in the occurrence of the Trisagion (4.8) in the Yotzer Kedushah, which was a combination of Isa. 6.3 and the first vision of Ezekiel. The whole of chapter 4 is based on the first vision of Ezekiel which, argues Prigent, was interpreted in certain gnostic Jewish circles as a cosmogony. Thus the combined evidence strongly points to a Jewish liturgical origin for chapter 4.²

2. Ibid., pp. 49-55.
But it is not a Jewish rite; it is Christian. The Trisagion, although not occurring in Hippolytus' *Apostolic Tradition*, does occur in other early Christian rites. According to I Clement 34r, argues Prigent, it is part of the eucharistic liturgy. It is also found in the ancient Antiochene liturgy of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, VIII.12, where it leads into the Eucharist. Thus a line may be traced from the Jewish to the Christian liturgies; Rev. 4 fits distinctly into the gap, disclosing to us an echo of an early stage in the liturgical evolution from the Jewish Yotzer liturgy to the Christian Eucharist.

This is finally confirmed, according to Prigent, by the role of the twenty-four elders. He accepts the argument of Feuillet that the twenty-four elders are men. But they are not to be equated with the Church; rather, they are the great figures of the Old Testament. The Trisagion of the eucharistic liturgy in *Ap. Const.* VIII.12 is preceded by a prayer which lists the acts of God in the history of Israel through the great Old Testament saints from Abel to Joshua. Similar lists appear elsewhere. These lists must have had a common Jewish liturgical background, which Prigent identifies as Psalms 105-107. Thus the Jewish source (the synagogue Yotzer service, including Psalms 105-107), the early Christian rite (*Ap. Const.* VIII.12), and Rev. 4 all have the same emphases in common: the creative acts of God, the historical deeds of God, and the

praise of God as Creator.

Prigent observes that the point of chapter 5 is not the contents of the scroll, nor its nature, but whether anyone can be found worthy to reveal its contents. The elder (5.8), representing the Old Testament, assures the Seer that One has conquered who can open the scroll: he is the Lion of Judah, the Root of David, both of which were understood as Messianic terms in the Old Testament. But to the Seer, who stands in the New Covenant, Christ appears as a Lamb "as though slain," a Christian Messianic concept. Thus the scroll must represent the Old Testament, for only Christ, who has now appeared at the end of the age, can open the words of God and explain the Scriptures. Prigent implies that liturgically this may be a reflection of the Shema, which followed the Yotzer in the synagogue, and summed up the Old Covenant.¹

The Lamb, or Ram (τὸ ἄρνιον) has a double Christian reference: the child-servant (παις) of Isa. 53 and the Paschal Lamb. Prigent argues that the praise offered to the Lamb (5.9-10, 12-13) accords well with the redemptive themes of the Geullah, and again reflects the Jewish source of the rite. But in its Christianised form it has become the characteristic theme of the Passover Eucharist.²

The eucharistic element of this liturgy is borne out not only by the parallel of chapter 4 with the rite of Ap. Const. VIII.12, but also by the liturgical structure of the Seven Epistles. These parallel the structure of 22.17-21,

2. Ibid., pp. 74-76.
which, argues Prigent, is an invitational formula to the Eucharist:

17: Invitation
18-19: Warning and anathema
20: Assurance of Christ's coming
21: Prayer for Christ's coming (Marana tha)

The Seven Letters follow the same liturgical scheme, and thus lead up to the eucharistic liturgy of 4-5; 3.20 clinches the argument as an invitational formula to the Eucharist.¹

Thus in Rev. 4-5 we have an echo of a Christian rite, based on Jewish sources, which was an early stage in the development of the Passover Eucharist. By transposing it into the apocalyptic literary genre the Seer intended to encourage and exhort the Church in its living hope of "le retour de son Seigneur dont la présence est déjà manifeste dans les sacrements," especially the Paschal liturgy.²

Prigent presents his thesis persuasively; many of his arguments in points of detail are convincing. There are certainly many points of contact with the Jewish and Christian worship of the 1st century in these two chapters. But the evidence is not always carefully compared, and his conclusions do not necessarily follow from his arguments.

Chapter 4 is a heavenly liturgy of praise to God the Father; this praise centres round the nature of his person

---

¹. Ibid., pp. 37-45, 77-79.
². Ibid., p. 79.
(holiness) and the worth of his deeds (creation). Both of these themes are reflected in the Yotzer and its Kedushah, and it is likely that the Seer was influenced by the worship of the synagogue at this point. But this is not to say that he consciously followed the text of the synagogue prayers, or that he deliberately followed the pattern of a synagogue service. Upon a closer examination the parallel begins to break down; so do Prigent's other arguments with regard to detail, as does the comparison of chapter 4 with the later Christian liturgy of the Ap. Const. VIII.12.

The fourth chapter of the Apocalypse draws upon the vision of Ezekiel; it also reflects the influence of such interpretations of that vision as The Chapters of Rabbi Eliezer the Great. This is sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the Seer is portraying a heavenly creation liturgy. But it does not prove the thesis that he is following the pattern of the synagogue liturgy. As we have already pointed out, the Kedushah follows the Yotzer, whereas in chapter 4 the order is reversed. In 4.2-7 we are supposed to have a proclamation of creation and redemptive history leading up to the trisagional response of praise in 4.8-11. Prigent claims that this reflects the Jewish liturgy, including Ps. 105-107, the Yotzer and its Kedushah. His arguments must be analyzed in detail.

The proclamation of creation consists of the throne

2. Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer IV.
(2-3), lightning, voices and thunder (5), the sea of glass and the four living creatures (6-7). The main support for this argument is that the throne, sea of glass, and the four living creatures are derived from the first vision of Ezekiel, which was interpreted cosmogonically in certain Jewish circles of which the Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer is representative. The sea of glass is supposed to represent the firmament, and the four living creatures represent the four seasons as well as the four corners of the earth. In addition, the lightnings, voices and thunderpeals reflect Jubilees 2.2, in which God is stated to have created the angels of those phenomena on the first day.1

But the passage in Jubilees 2.2 mentions not only the creation of the angels of lightning, voices and thunder, but also those of fire, wind, clouds, darkness, snow, hail, hoarfrost, cold, and heat.2 Why did the Seer select only lightning, voices, and thunder? And why does he not mention any other aspects than the throne, the sea of glass, the seven spirits,3 and the four living creatures? The answer is surely that these are features of the divine throne, which it is John's primary purpose to describe. We suggest that the Seer is not so much concerned with a proclamation of creation, as with a revelatory description of the Creator Himself. The whole of Rev. 4-5 is a heavenly liturgy of praise.

2. As well as the angels of such non-material things as the presence, sanctification, spirits of his creatures, and daily and seasonal change.
3. Which Prigent erroneously interprets as the Holy Spirit, p. 51. Jub. 2.2 and Pirke Eliezer IV clearly reveal that these are God's ministering angels.
to God and Christ. God is praised for his nature (holiness) and for his work. The great work of God is creation; thus the worshipful response is one of praise, not for his act of creation, but to God himself as the Author of creation.

Worthy art thou, our Lord and God, To receive the glory and the honour and the power. For you have created all things And through your will were all things created. (4.11)

This important distinction serves to show that in 4.2-7 we have not a proclamation of creation, but of the sovereign, eternal and holy God.

If this be the case the argument that the twenty-four elders are the great figures of the Old Testament, and represent the liturgical recitation of the acts of God under the Old Covenant, is weakened: if creation is not being proclaimed, it is less likely that history is. The latter view rests on the assumption that there is a Jewish liturgical source which includes such a historical list, as found in Psalm 105-107. But there is absolutely no evidence that such a list was ever included in the Yotzer, or preceded it; nor have the Psalms mentioned ever been used, to our knowledge, in such a way. In the modern service both the Hallel and the Song of Moses (Ex. 15.1-18) precede the Shema service, which begins with the Yotzer, and there is good reason for supposing this practice to be ancient;¹ but neither of these contain such a list of Old Testament personages. Thus the equation of the twenty-four elders with the great Old Testament saints rests solely on an

¹. Singer, Jewish Prayer Book, pp. 29-36; cf. also the discussion in the Introduction, pp. xxxiv-xxxix.
extremely tenuous association with such lists as occur in the much later Apostolic Constitutions. Furthermore, the order in the Liturgy of St. James is creation - list of figures; whereas in Rev. 4 (if we accept Prigent's interpretation) it is reversed. One wonders why this is so if the twenty-four elders actually reflect a liturgical reference to the great historical personages of the Old Testament. It is our opinion that the obvious answer is that they do not.

The Trisagion of Rev. 4.8 undoubtedly reflects the Kedushah. But is it the Yotzer, or any other particular Kedushah? The only similarity is the first line of Isa. 6.3:

> Holy, holy, holy
> Is the Lord God Almighty.

The rest of the verse, as well as the rest of the Kedushah, is omitted or altered in Rev. 4. In the Kedushah, the seraphim chant the Trisagion; the four living creatures offer the response of praise (Ezek. 3.12). This is changed in the Apocalypse: the Seer has conflated the seraphim and living creatures, so that the two unite in chanting the Trisagion; the response of praise, which is also changed, is offered by the twenty-four elders. Besides not according well with Prigent's interpretation of the twenty-four elders as Old Testament figures, one wonders why John should have altered his liturgical source so much, if indeed he was intending to follow such a source.

Nor does the Trisagion correspond to that of the Liturgy

---

2. There was more than one Kedushah in the synagogue service, see Appendix III, "Synagogue Worship," p. 300.
of St. James, in which the seraphim and cherubim are not conflated, but join together with all the angels of heaven and the congregation on earth in chanting the Isaianic Trisagion, which is repeated in full, and to which is added a shortened form of Ps. 146.10. There is no further response of praise. If Rev. 4.8-11 represents an intermediate stage between the Jewish source and the Liturgy of St. James, several difficulties remain unanswered: Why did the Church replace the second line of Isaiah 6.3, only to drop the replacement ("Who was, and is, and is coming") and take up the original form later? Why did the Church later add a shortened form of Ps. 146.10, which is the final response of the Kedushah of the Eighteen Benedictions, to an Isaianic Trisagion which is supposed to devolve from the Yotzer Kedushah? Why did the Church conflate the figures of the seraphim and cherubim, only to separate them again? Why did the Church accord to the figures of the Old Testament the privilege of responding to the Trisagion, only to drop the response altogether later? It would seem very difficult, indeed, to trace a line from the Jewish Yotzer liturgy through Rev. 4 to the later Christian liturgies.

Prigent rightly rejects Mowry's supposition that the scroll of Rev. 5 is the Torah: but is he correct in arguing


2. In fact, the Kedushah response was not altogether dropped: recorded in Ap. Const. VII.33-35 are the first three of the Eighteen Benedictions of the synagogue, Christianised and greatly expanded. At the conclusion of the third benediction, as in the synagogue service, is the full Kedushah, with Isa. 6.3 and Ezek. 3.12 combined as in the synagogue; see Appendix III, "Synagogue Worship," pp. 312-314.
PAGES MISSING IN ORIGINAL
the 1st century. But this he derives from the first verse: "the good workman receives the bread of his labour with boldness." But this passage is so obviously an exhortation to good works, and the "bread" a simple simile for rewards in a general sense, that it is very difficult indeed to follow Prigent's argument that the passage is eucharistic.

Furthermore, where does the Eucharist fit in - before, during, or after chapter 5? Are we to understand the scroll as the reading of scripture, or the actual recitation of the Shema in a Christian service - a practice for which there is absolutely no evidence? Is the hymn of 5.9-10 and its response a Christianised Geullah, or a Christianised Torah blessing, or a eucharistic prayer? If the latter, does it precede or follow the Eucharist? Or is it supposed to be an early form of the anamnesis? If so, it bears little resemblance to any later forms of which we have any knowledge. Again, the argument that the Seven Letters follow more or less the same structure as 22.17-21, which is supposed to be an invitation to the Eucharist, is less than convincing. That all early Christian worship services were eucharistic seems demonstrable; that Rev. 4-5 constitutes a special Paschal Eucharist is, in our view, highly improbable.

3. Prigent only suggests that it was a Paschal Eucharist. He offers no proof other than the redemptive ideas associated with the Christian Passover. But cf. our discussion of Massey-Shepherd's thesis above, pp. 136-141.
D. CONCLUSION

Nevertheless, we have admitted that Rev. 4-5, as well as other parts of the Apocalypse, reflect Jewish and Christian worship. What, then, do we have in Rev. 4-5? It is clearly a liturgy, set in heaven, offering praise to God the Holy Creator (chapter 4) and to Christ the Messianic Redeemer (chapter 5). These two themes, we suggest, have determined the content and pattern of these two chapters, which constitute a unified literary construction and do not reflect any actual liturgy on earth, whether Temple, synagogue, pagan, or Christian.

But is there no relationship with the worship on earth? Otto Piper has shown that the idea of the common participation of men and angels in the heavenly worship, an idea foreign to Jewish thinking, is characteristic of both the Apocalypse and the early Christian liturgies. From this Piper concludes that the scenes of the heavenly worship are related to worship on earth. The Apocalypse, however, cannot be considered the source of later Christian liturgies: none of the hymns, poems, phrases, imagery, and language appear before the 4th century. The same non-occurrence argues against the embodiment of an actual later liturgy in the Apocalypse. Thus, argues Piper, correctly in our view, Revelation must be related to earthly worship in that

it reflects "the liturgical theory and practice of its age."\(^1\) This view is further supported by the liturgical orientation of Jewish apocalyptic, to which literary genre Revelation belongs, in which the heavenly worship reflects the theology and practice of the priestly Temple worship on earth.\(^2\)

But, we must still ask, in what way? We would suggest that an understanding of the Seer's use of Christian worship may be found most clearly in conjunction with an analysis of his use of the image of the Temple; and secondly, that in chapters 4-5 and other scenes of the heavenly worship, certain aspects of the Church's structure for worship are reflected in such a way as to exemplify clearly John's use of Christian worship, thus offering us a glimpse into the nature of worship in the larger churches of Asia Minor c. 100 A.D.

---

1. Ibid., p. 12. Thomas F. Torrance, "Liturgy and Apocalypse," Church Service Society Annual, 24 (1954), rightly observes that since the worship on earth is considered only an echo of heaven, in whose worship the Church participates on earth through the Spirit, one only finds fragmented snatches of the earthly worship in the Apocalypse, pp. 13-14.

CHAPTER IV
LITURGICAL STRUCTURE IN THE APOCALYPSE

A. THE TEMPLE IN THE APOCALYPSE

The Temple was the heart of Judaism, the focus of its national religion. If it could not play the active role in daily worship for most Jews that the synagogue did, the Temple continued to exert a predominant influence on both their thinking and their emotions, even after its destruction.¹ We have already seen the centrality of the Temple in apocalyptic literature as the eschatological dwelling place of God;² we should not be surprised to discover that the early Christians adopted the image of the Temple and re-interpreted it according to the newness of eschatological fulfilment in Christ.


It is common knowledge that the early Church thought of itself as the New Temple, the dwelling-place of God on earth. The author of Hebrews introduced the further concept of a Heavenly Temple, after which the earthly one is patterned. But it is supremely in the Apocalypse that we find the idea of the Heavenly Temple developed.

John the Seer was steeped in the worship of the Tabernacle and Temple, the forms of which had become as early as Isaiah and Ezekiel those by which the future Messianic Age was interpreted. This intertwining of liturgy and eschatology was further developed in apocalyptic. In Revelation, which stands in the traditions of both prophecy and apocalyptic, these forms are Christologically transformed for use as the language of apocalyptic liturgy. "In Biblical and early Christian understanding liturgy and eschatology are inseparable." But we would argue that the worship of the Temple is not the primary action of the play: rather it is used as a piece of stage scenery in which to introduce the dramatis personae.

1. Cf. I Cor. 3.16-17; 6.19-20; 2 Cor. 6.16-17.1; Eph. 2.20-22; I Pet. 2.4-10; I Tim. 3.15; Heb. 3.1-6. Cf. also the excellent discussion in McKelvey, op.cit., pp. 92-139.

2. Heb. 8.2, 5; 9.11, 23-24. There are possible allusions to this idea in other New Testament passages: John 14.2, 3, 6 ("my Father's house"); Gal. 4.26 ("the Jerusalem above"); II Cor. 5.1-5. Again see the excellent discussion in McKelvey, op.cit., pp. 140-154.


7. We borrow the image from McKelvey, op.cit., p. 161. In an article which appeared after this section was originally composed, Leónard Thompson argues similarly, "Cult and..."
R. J. McKelvey has pointed out in his excellent monograph *The New Temple* that in the Apocalypse we must distinguish between the New Temple, the Heavenly Temple, and the New Jerusalem. As with other early Christian writers, John thinks of the Church as God's New Temple on earth. He expands the idea of the Heavenly Temple, already introduced in Hebrews and elsewhere, which is the divine reality of the universe: it is the palatial sanctuary of God in which the true worship of all creation is performed (see especially 7.15), a worship in which the New Temple on earth participates through the Holy Spirit; it is also the heavenly centre from which the decrees of God are issued forth and carried out in history. But John also conceives of a New Jerusalem, a completely new world of the future, which is the new people of God, complete and fully redeemed.

The Heavenly Temple is a Holy of Holies, set apart

Contd.) Eschatology in the Apocalypse of John, "J Rel, 49 (1969), pp. 330-350, particularly p. 342. Thompson further proposes that the "worship life of the early church was the model for the seer in his presentation of cult and eschatology," but suggests that a substantiation of this thesis requires considerably more detailed analysis, p. 350. It is our hope that this thesis provides at least the beginnings and basis of such an analysis.


2. The idea of a heavenly sanctuary is not, of course, original with the early Church: it reaches back at least as far as Isaiah, and recurs frequently in Jewish literature. What is unique is the latter aspect, viz., that the Church constitutes a New Temple on earth, and that it participates in the heavenly worship with the angels through the Holy Spirit. Cf. Otto Piper, "The Apocalypse of John and the Liturgy of the Ancient Church," *Church History, XX* (1951), pp. 10-12.
from all else as the hidden dwelling-place of God; but in the New Jerusalem everything is holy, and all the redeemed have bold and direct access to God through Christ. Thus there is no need of a Temple, and God himself both constitutes the Temple (21.22) and dwells among his people, who thereby constitute a Temple (dwelling-place of God) as well (21.3). The present Heavenly Temple (4-20) and the New Jerusalem (21-22) must thus be distinguished. Using McKelvey's helpful outline as a base for our discussion, we turn to an analysis of John's use of the Temple in the Apocalypse.

The New Temple on Earth. Christians are already priests in God's Kingdom on earth: Christ has

made us a kingdom,
Priests to his God and Father. (1.6)

made them a kingdom,
And priests to our God. (5.10)

Not only are Christians the servants of God in the Temple, but together they constitute the New Temple on earth. This is seen clearly in 11.1-3:

And there was given to me a measuring staff like a rod, saying, 'Rise up and measure the Temple of God and the altar and those who worship in it. But leave out the outer court, and do not measure it; for it is given to the nations, and they will trample over it for forty-two months. And I will grant to my two witnesses that they should prophesy one thousand, two hundred and sixty days, clothed in sackcloth.

The desecration of Antiochus Epiphanes is used as an image of the persecution of the Church;¹ the Temple

¹. Though John may be thinking of the destruction by the Romans in A.D. 70; see infra, p. 172, fn. 4.
(including the altar) is the Church. As McKelvey has pointed out, the thought is that the Church is inviolable because it is measured and set apart. Here John speaks in the language of the Jerusalem Temple; he is to measure the Temple and the altar, i.e., the whole of the inner court where Jews gathered to worship; the outer court, or Court of the Gentiles, is given over with the Holy City to be trampled by "the nations." The Temple and the altar are figures of the Church on earth; it is unclear whether the outer court refers to spurious Christians or Jews, but the

1. Op. cit., p. 159. Cf. Zech. 2.5; the same thought lies behind 7.1-8 (the numbering of the 144,000).


question need not concern us here. What is noteworthy is that the physical description of the Temple is used as an image of the earthly Church: it is the dwelling-place of God (τὸν ναὸν τοῦ θεοῦ), in which worship is offered to him. Thus we have an example of the Jerusalem Temple spiritualised for use as an image of the Church on earth; no one would claim that the earthly Church thereby actually resembled the Temple in any way.

The Heavenly Temple. Most of the Temple imagery in chapters 4-20 is used to represent the heavenly dwelling of God, in which the true, heavenly worship of God is offered in which the Church on earth participates through the Holy Spirit. It is important to note that just as the New Temple is but patterned after the heavenly sanctuary, so its earthly worship is but an echo of the heavenly; thus we can only expect to find fragmented sketches of historical worship. But in composing his vision the Seer had to communicate in terms of that with which he and his audience were familiar. Thus we find the Heavenly Temple pictured in images taken from its earthly counterparts (we refer to the Jewish Temple as well as the New Temple, the Church).

used. The Holy of Holies, which contained the Ark of the Covenant in Solomon's temple and remained empty in subsequent ones, has been transformed in the Apocalypse into the divine throne-room. The two cherubim of the Solomonic mercy-seat become the four living creatures surrounding the throne, an adaptation of Ezekiel's vision. There does not seem to be an entirely consistent concept of the Heavenly Temple's actual appearance, for the Ark of the Covenant appears in 11.19, though elsewhere it has been transformed into the divine throne. This latter point is significant, for it not only demonstrates the author's lack of concern to portray physical appearances, either heavenly or earthly, but also provides us an example of the resuscitation of a previously transformed image to suit the needs of the vision. The Ark was an earthly witness to the Covenant between God and Israel; in the context of 11.1-19 which, as we have seen, refers to the Church on earth, the Ark becomes a heavenly testimony to the New Covenant between God and the true Israel, the Church, through which Covenant the faithful have perfect access to God. Thus we see that the author felt free to adapt and change images to suit his purposes. Nowhere do we have a picture of the Jerusalem Temple as it actually existed; and yet we catch glimpses of it here and there as images of the Heavenly Temple.

In 14.1-5 John sees a vision of the Lamb and the 144,000, who are his followers gathered on Mt. Zion to offer praise to God in a "new song" which only the redeemed can

learn. Undoubtedly we have here a mixture of images: the
great annual festal gatherings at the Temple in Jerusalem,
with the apocalyptic expectation of the Messiah on Mt.
Zion,¹ which itself probably derives from the annual
gatherings. There is no question but that the New Temple
on earth, the Church, is here represented in the midst of
tribulation in the act of worship, which is understood as
the eschatological service of God. Again we have an
example of the Church represented in terms of the Temple,
but spiritualised. No one would maintain from this text
that the Church ever gathered on Mt. Zion to worship God,
but it did assemble regularly to sing a "new song." Thus
we have a reflection of Christian worship, but in the imagery
of Temple worship.

This point is illustrated again by the use of the
altar. There is only one heavenly altar,² the altar of
incense, for "since there could be no animal sacrifices in
heaven, only bloodless sacrifices and incense could be
offered thereon."³ But the offerings of incense at this

1. So Charles, op.cit., II. p. 5; cf. IV Ezra 2.42-45;

2. Many commentators detect two heavenly altars; but these
are nowhere distinguished in the textual references: 6.9;
8.3, 5; 9.13; 14.18; 16.7. Charles has shown conclusively
that John followed the cosmology of apocalyptic and rabb-
inic Judaism, which conceived of only one heavenly altar,
the altar of incense, op.cit., I, pp. 226-230. McKelvey
also argues that there is only one, op.cit., pp. 160-165,
but surely he is wrong in his assumption that it is the
great altar of burnt-offering. Nevertheless, as Congar
has pointed out, the heavenly altar does occasionally
participate in the characteristics of the altar of burnt-
offering, op.cit., pp. 208-209.

3. Charles, op.cit., I, p. 228. The altar of 11.1, which
obviously refers to the great altar of burnt-offering,
is not in the Heavenly Temple, but is used to describe
the Church; the New Temple; cf. above, pp. 171-172.

---

¹ So Charles, op.cit., II. p. 5; cf. IV Ezra 2.42-45;

² Many commentators detect two heavenly altars; but these
are nowhere distinguished in the textual references: 6.9;
8.3, 5; 9.13; 14.18; 16.7. Charles has shown conclusively
that John followed the cosmology of apocalyptic and rabb-
inic Judaism, which conceived of only one heavenly altar,
the altar of incense, op.cit., I, pp. 226-230. McKelvey
also argues that there is only one, op.cit., pp. 160-165,
but surely he is wrong in his assumption that it is the
great altar of burnt-offering. Nevertheless, as Congar
has pointed out, the heavenly altar does occasionally
participate in the characteristics of the altar of burnt-
offering, op.cit., pp. 208-209.

³ Charles, op.cit., I, p. 228. The altar of 11.1, which
obviously refers to the great altar of burnt-offering,
is not in the Heavenly Temple, but is used to describe
the Church; the New Temple; cf. above, pp. 171-172.
golden altar (8.3-4) are specifically interpreted for us as the prayers of the saints. No one would seriously suggest that the Church of the 1st century actually offered incense with their prayers on a golden altar; yet the image does reflect a Christian liturgical practice - prayer.

The New Jerusalem. John has eliminated the eschatological Temple of apocalyptic expectations in the New Jerusalem of chapters 21-22. There was no longer any need of a sacrifice, since Christ's death fulfilled all sacrificial offerings; the New Temple on earth had replaced the Jewish Temple, and fulfilled the expectations of an eschatological Temple. The Temple was essentially the dwelling-place of God, the holy sanctuary set apart from all uncleanness and sin for the tabernacling of the Holy One. But the New Jerusalem is itself holy: it is formed out of the material that was once the New Temple, God's dwelling on earth, now complete and fully redeemed. The bride is adorned and ready (21.2) and the marriage is consummated (21.9). Thus God no longer needs a sanctuary set apart from the uncleanness of his people, and there is no Temple in the Holy City; the throne of God and of the Lamb is placed in the heart of the city, open to all, and gives rise to the river of the water of life (22.1-2).

But although there is no Temple, John has recourse to the imagery of the Temple, both the Jewish prototype and the Church, to convey his message. Thus the symmetry of the city (21.16) is meant to symbolise, as in Ezekiel's vision of the eschatological Temple (Ezek. 40.2 ff.), "the Israel of the end-time, restored and united for the service.
of God. "1 But here Israel is transformed, into the whole body of the redeemed 2 symbolised by the New Jerusalem. Over this Ezekielian image of the Temple John superimposes the Isaianic one of the New Jerusalem. 3 The resulting picture is one of "a great pilgrimage city, through whose gates stream the nations and great ones of the earth, offering their homage to God." 4 The background for this is probably the great pilgrimage feast of Tabernacles with its emphasis on light and water, as J. Comblin has demonstrated. 5 Even so, in the New Jerusalem we have but little reflection of the worship of the earthly Church; probably because John conceived of everything as so new in the city to come that it could only just be communicated in terms of that which is already known: "It does not yet appear what we shall be." 6

Thus we see that John uses the language, forms, and images of the Temple to represent the New Temple, the

2. On the gates of the city are inscribed the names of the twelve tribes of Israel, 21.12, and on the foundations the names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb, 21.14.
3. Isa. 65.17-19. McKelvey has pointed out that the ambiguity arising from such a mixture of images is disturbing only to modern minds, op.cit., p. 174.
4. Ibid., pp. 174-175.
6. I John 3.2. Whether the Seer is also the author of the Johannine epistles or not, he seems to share this sentiment. It is not without significance that only 1 1/4 chapters (21.1-22.5) out of 22 are devoted to a description of the new world to come.
Heavenly Temple of which the New Temple is an earthly echo, and to a lesser extent, the New Jerusalem. The language, forms, and images must not be interpreted as literal representations of the actual worship and nature of the Church: but they do reflect the Church symbolically. John uses the Jerusalem Temple and its worship as images. But it is also clear that he similarly draws upon the worship of the New Temple, the earthly Church, to portray the Heavenly Temple. Just as the images of the Jerusalem Temple, while not reflecting actual Christian practices, do reflect actual Jewish Temple practices, so we may assume that images drawn from the New Temple, the Church, similarly reflect actual Christian practices. The difficulty lies in distinguishing which images are derived from the Church.

Our conclusion is as follows: the Seer of Revelation uses Christian worship as the scenic backdrop for the apocalyptic drama; it is not the primary focus of the book, but a vehicle for its message of hope, encouragement, and warning. But John does not always portray Christian worship directly: frequently he draws upon Jewish forms and images, especially those of the Temple, which he then spiritualises. Therefore references traceable to the Temple are Jewish, and must not be understood as literally illustrative of actual Christian practices. They may reflect Christian worship, however, as we have seen most clearly in the offering of incense (= Christian prayer, 8.3-4).

Thus certain guidelines emerge to assist us in the task of analysing the liturgical images in the Apocalypse: those which have no Jewish background, but are clearly
liturgical, are directly indicative of Christian worship. Those which have a Jewish background must be analysed in detail: some passages are interpreted for us, as in 8.3-4; some are a mixture of Jewish and Christian, which may be regarded as reflective of Christian worship when the details are extricated from each other if they afford a parallel with Christian liturgical practices for which there is a modicum of external evidence; others are purely Jewish and must be pronounced such.

The application of our thesis can be illustrated by an analysis of the scene of the heavenly worship.

B. THE SCENE OF THE HEAVENLY WORSHIP

In Chapter II we analysed Christian worship in the 1st century according to structure, baptism, Eucharist, and liturgical forms. As intimated in the Introduction to this thesis it is our limited purpose to concentrate on liturgical structure in our analysis of the Apocalypse, fitting each component into its place in the historical development of Christian worship as outlined in Chapter II. Nevertheless, we have already had occasion to refer to our discussions of baptism, Eucharist, and liturgical forms, and shall still require to do so in the remainder of this thesis.

We have discussed under the category "structure" those aspects of worship relating to time of worship, calendrical

1. Although certain liturgical texts may be the compositions of the author, they still reflect the forms of Christian worship.
usage, order of service, organisation into liturgical offices, and the setting of worship. It is with the latter aspect that we would begin, as illustrative of our thesis.

We have already observed that the scene of the heavenly worship is a palatial sanctuary containing images derived from both the Jerusalem Temple and the apocalyptic concept of the divine throne. But the picture in Revelation differs from both its Jewish sources in several particulars; those differences offer us an illustration of John’s use of Christian materials in his portrayal of the heavenly sanctuary.

Most of the details are given in the first scene (4.2-5.14); others are added in later scenes. The throne forms the focal point, with God seated upon it, overarched by an emerald rainbow. On each of the four sides of the throne is a living creature. Around the throne are the thrones of the twenty-four elders, clothed in white with golden crowns upon their heads. Seven torches of fire burn before the throne, and beyond that is "as it were" a sea of glass, like crystal. 15.2 adds that the sea of glass is mingled with fire. Around the elders is a vast multitude of angels. The Seer seemed unwilling to place the Lamb which was slain in a particular spot, for he is said to be simply "ἐν μέσῳ" the throne and the four living creatures and "ἐν μέσῳ the elders" (5.6). Other details added from

1. Raymond R. Brewer, "Revelation 4.6 and Translations Thereof," JBL, LXXI (1952), pp. 227-231 has argued that ἐν μέσῳ should be translated "in between" in 4.6, and similarly in 5.6. Charles, Revelation, I, p. 140, maintains a similar point of view, but for different reasons. Charles argues that the LXX constantly translate the Hebrew idiom יְדֵמֶשׁ, meaning "between!" (Contd.)
later scenes are: a vast multitude of the redeemed clothed in white (7.9) standing beside or around the sea of glass (15.2); in one scene of worship they hold palm branches (7.9-12) and in one they hold harps (15.2-4). 1 The golden altar of incense is difficult to place; the only indication we have is that it is "before God" (ἐνώτιτον τοῦ θεοῦ, 9.13). 2 It is perhaps safe to conjecture that it stood

Contd.) as εν μεσω. But Brewer's argument is based on his assumption that the entire scenic backdrop of Revelation is based on the Greek amphitheatre. If Charles is correct, this is another example of the Jewishness of the author. In our view it is much more likely that the Jewish-Christian author would draw upon Jewish and Christian materials for his setting than upon the Greek amphitheatre. Indeed, this is the point of our thesis. In any case, if the Lamb be somehow located in 5.6 "between the throne and the four living creatures and between the twenty-four elders" (a translation which I find extremely difficult to understand - which is the Lamb between?) it is clear that the Lamb is not stationary, for in the very next verse he moves up to the throne to receive the scroll. On balance it would seem to us that the Seer is not concerned to specify a location for the Lamb, since He is a principal actor in the drama and moves about (in 14.1 he appears standing on Mt. Zion), and has purposely chosen εν μεσω as a linguistic means by which he may include the Lamb in the scene of the Heavenly Worship without pinpointing his location.

1. The objection that these must be two different groups because they cannot hold palm branches and harps at the same time is not valid. They are represented in both scenes as those who have conquered: in the former they bear the palm of victory offering praise to him who provided victory; in the latter they sing the new song of Moses and the Lamb, thus accompanying themselves with harps.

2. The other references to the heavenly altar are: 6.9; 8.3, 5; 14.18; 16.7.
just beyond the seven torches, as the altar of incense did in the Jerusalem Temple.¹ The ark of the covenant is mentioned only once (11.19), and appears as something of an anomaly.² If John ever conceived of it as forming a permanent, integral aspect of the Heavenly Temple, then it must have been located underneath the throne, as in the Solomonic Temple it rested within (and thus under) the mercy seat.³

Can this scene tell us anything about the setting of worship in the Church c. 100 A.D.? Dom Gregory Dix seems first to have made the suggestion that the Apocalypse reflects the contemporary arrangement of the church for worship at that time.⁴ According to Dix the churches from a very early period, especially in the cities, were forced to assemble in the houses of their wealthier members, where alone was there sufficient room to contain all who gathered, and which also provided a domestic setting for the eucharistic supper. The Roman houses of the period, in which the relatively affluent class dwelt, were widespread throughout the Empire, and afforded arrangements which precisely suited the needs of the Church. Dix maintains that the ground-plan of the Roman house subsequently formed the basic model for the earliest actual church buildings. From this ground-plan, and the evidence remaining from the 2nd and 3rd centuries, Dix reconstructs the arrangements

---

2. See supra, p. 174.
for worship as early as can be determined. He then observes that the scene of the heavenly worship in the Apocalypse conforms to this pattern, thus concluding that already at the end of the 1st century these arrangements were being used.

Unfortunately, Dix cites no authority for his description of the ground-plan of the Roman house, nor does he authenticate the extent of its use in Asia Minor. Moreover, he does not analyse sufficiently the corresponding details between the Apocalypse and the so-called early place of worship. A few scholars have made passing remarks on the physical arrangements of the Apocalypse but, to our knowledge, a detailed analysis has yet to be carried out. It is the purpose of our thesis to undertake such an analysis at this point.

1. Farrer, Images, supports Dix's notion, though without mentioning him, pp. 105-106; but on p. 179 he somewhat inconsistently insists that chapters 4-5 are a fusion of the Temple and synagogue. Shepherd, op.cit., also states that the heavenly scene is an idealised meeting place of the Church, p. 87; but he rejects Dix's suggestion that the impluvium (see below) was used as a baptismal tank, p. 56. Mowry argues that it is a heavenly palace, based on the royal courts of earth, "Rev. 4-5 and Early Christian Liturgical Usage," JBL, LXXI (1952), pp. 76-77; but McKelvey has rightly observed that ancient temples were as much palaces as sanctuaries, op.cit., p. 160, and that kings often acted as priests, p. 165. Moreover, the true king of Israel was Jahweh, whose dwelling (and therefore court, or palace) was the Temple; thus it is not surprising to find the mercy-seat transformed into the throne. It is still a temple which John is describing. Moule, Worship in the New Testament, remarks in passing that the Apocalypse reflects the arrangements of Judaism, not Christianity, p. 66; he does not go into detail. Delling, Worship, argues correctly, we think, that Christian and Jewish elements are interwoven, pp. 45-46; he goes into a minimum of detail.
We must first seek to verify Dix's description of the Graeco-Roman town-house, (for such it is that Dix actually describes) and the extent of its use, especially in Asia Minor. In fact, upon investigation Dix is found to be essentially correct in his description. The prevalent components of the town-house of the 1st century A.D. were a combination of Roman and Greek elements, and may be described as follows.¹ The house was more or less divided into two parts, one public and one private. The latter, termed the peristyle, (1 on the diagram, p. 185) was based on the older Greek house, and consisted of a central court, and/or garden, around which were arranged various chambers for the private use of the family. Our main concern is with the public portion of the house, which was the Roman contribution, and through which one usually had to pass to reach the peristyle from the main entrance. It must be emphasised, however, that in many cases the Greek and Roman elements were fused, and by no means did all houses have both atrium and peristyle. The following description is of the classic Graeco-Roman public room, as exemplified in the Casa di Pansa in Pompeii (see diagram).

¹ The authorities for our description, from which these details are gathered, are here listed for convenience: R.C. Carrington, Pompeii (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1936); Harold North Fowler and James Rignall Wheeler, A Handbook of Greek Archaeology (New York: American Book Company, 1909); R. Cagnat et V. Chapat, Manuel d'Archéologie Romaine (Paris: August Picard, 1916); Ernest Nash, Roman Towns (New York: J.J. Augustin, 1944); H.B. Walters, A Classical Dictionary (Cambridge: at the University Press, 1916). The accompanying diagram is of the relevant parts of the Casa di Pansa in Pompeii, which according to Cagnat and Chapat, op.cit., is by far the most common type of Graeco-Roman house, see p. 281?1.
FLOOR PLAN OF THE PUBLIC PART OF THE CASA DI PANSA IN POMPEII
(Taken from R.C. Carrington, *Pompeii*)
One entered through the vestibule (2), usually up two or three steps, into the atrium (3), a large hall in the centre of which was a shallow pool called the impluvium (4). An opening in the roof above the impluvium, toward which the roof sloped gently, allowed rain water to drain into it. The roof was sometimes supported in larger houses with columns around the edge of the impluvium; there were usually four; though one house at Pompeii had sixteen.  

Beyond the atrium was situated the tablinium (5), a special chamber, sometimes elevated, which was reserved for the public and official duties of the head of the household. In early times it served as the master's bedroom; later, when the peristyle was added and most of the private chambers removed to the other part of the house, the front (and sometimes the rear) wall was removed and the tablinium became the master's special place for transacting business, entertaining guests, and presiding over any public or formal gatherings or occasions held in house. When such occasions were held a special chair of honour was usually placed in the tablinium, and guests of honour attended the master's side. The tablinium could also be used for entertaining guests at meals, as well as the two chambers which flanked it, one or both of which could serve as a triclinium (6), or dining room. A private triclinium at which the family and intimate guests dined was usually located in the peristyle.

The atrium was flanked at its head by two side wings, called alae (7), in which were sometimes kept the portraits and face-masks of family ancestors, as well as gods. In front of the tablinium was often situated a marble table called the cartibulum (8); this served the dual purpose of providing a convenient desk on which to transact business, and also functioned as a serving table for feasts on important occasions. Finally, a narrow hallway called the andron (9) between the tablinium and one of the side chambers led from the atrium into the peristyle. The chambers on the side of the atrium, which had once been bedrooms, were sometimes still used as such, but often served other purposes, especially as guest rooms or as quarters for the chief servants of the household. The rooms flanking the vestibule were often operated by the family or let out as shops.

There were many variations in the way houses were combined, but various component parts of the three elements atrium, tablinium, and peristyle are found in almost every Graeco-Roman dwelling.

It will readily be seen that the public portion of a private dwelling, whether atrium or adapted peristyle, was eminently well-suited to the needs of the churches. It will also be immediately obvious that the cruciform shape

---

1. Ibid., p. 352. The alae were frequently missing in Greek houses, as were the gods and statues.
2. Cagnat et Chapat, op.cit., p. 284. See the photograph of the Casa di Lucretius Fronto at Pompeii on p. 283.
of the atrium-tablinium-alae almost certainly played an
important role in the development of church architecture,
especially in the west.¹ But the question for us is,
How extensive was this pattern in the 1st century, and more
particularly, was it used in Asia Minor, the home of the
churches to which the Apocalypse was addressed (and where it
probably originated)?

The archaeological evidence of private houses in pre-
Roman times in the Hellenistic world is extremely scanty,
because Greek social life centred round public buildings
rather than the home; private dwellings were constructed
merely of a perishable wooden framework filled in with sun-
dried mortar.² With the coming of the Romans and the
fusion of the two cultures, private dwellings were also
transformed: the remains of late 2nd and 1st century B.C.
houses at Delos bear many resemblances to the pattern of
the Casa di Pansa at Pompeii.³ As Roman power spread, the

¹ Thus, e.g., the basilica of St. Clement in Rome is built
upon the 1st century dwelling of Titus Flavius Clemens,
Richard Krautheimer, Early Christian and Byzantine Architecture (Harmonds-
worth, Middlesex: Penguin Books Ltd, 1965) disagrees with this suggestion on
the grounds that the alleged resemblance of the Roman town house to the early
transept basilica "fails with the realisation that the transept was always exception-
able in Christian basilicas," p. 314, n. 24. Whilst this may be generally
true, the most significant exception is the Church of St. John the Theologian
in Ephesus, described above on pp. 189-190. It is of significance for this
thesis that Ephesus is generally regarded as the ecclesiastical home of the author
of the Apocalypse. Nevertheless, Dix's theory concerning the universal use of
of the Roman town house in the early Church is weakened.

² Fowler and Wheeler, op. cit., p. 188.
³ Ibid., p. 190. See the diagram above, p. 185.
Romans sought to extend Roman culture: thus Sir William Ramsay has devoted an entire volume to various examples of the Social Basis of Roman Power in Asia Minor. In great cities such as Ephesus the Roman influence was especially strong.¹

It is of great interest to note the construction of the earliest Christian church building at Ephesus, the Church of St. John the Theologian. A certain underground tomb was traditionally the grave of John the Apostle as early as the end of the 2nd century. Early in the 4th century a vault was built over it, which was soon extended for use as a church.² It was cruciform in shape, with an altar in the east end over the tomb of John, at the point where the transept intersected with the nave. Instead of a full choir, however, there was an elevated, semi-circular apse, in which the bishop and the elders sat, exactly in the pattern of the paterfamilias and his honoured guests, in the tablinium of the Graeco-Roman house. Thus, especially when the ground-plan of the Church of St. John the Theologian is compared with that of the church in Dura-Europos (which corresponded exactly to the ground-plan of a private dwelling in Dura), the evidence argues strongly in favour

1. (Aberdeen: University Press, 1941); see especially pp. 48-50. It must be noted, however, that the architectural influence was by no means one-way; the peristyle seems to have played an important role in the shaping of the atrium, so Dr. Coulton of the Department of Classical Archaeology, University of Edinburgh.

of the early church at Ephesus meeting in the public hall of houses of the Graeco-Roman pattern. (See n. 1a on p. 190a attached)

This conclusion is further corroborated by evidence found in three 2nd century apocryphal Acts, all of which originated in Asia Minor. In the Acts of John, probably written at Ephesus not later than the mid-2nd century,\(^1\) the church is represented as assembling regularly at the house of Andronicus, who was wealthy enough to employ among his servants a steward. The discourse, prayers and Eucharist are all described as occurring in the same place.\(^2\)

In the Acts of Paul, written about 160-190 A.D.,\(^3\) the brethren are seen gathering in the house of Onesiphorus in Lystra. A virgin, Thecla, sits in the window listening to Paul speak, but she cannot see him. This would be the case, of course, with anyone sitting in one of the windows at either end of the alae.

Perhaps of most importance is evidence in the Acts of Peter, which according to James\(^4\) was written not later than the end of the 2nd century by a resident of Asia Minor who was unfamiliar with Rome. Peter stays in the house of Marcellus, a lapsed believer, who is eventually restored to the faith and opens his house for worship; widows and the

---


Krautheimer, op. cit., contests this view on two grounds. He maintains that the Graeco-Roman town house was obsolete by the middle of the 1st century A.D., p. 314, n.24. He gives no evidence for this assertion, however, which contradicts the other sources referred to in this section. Nor does this view correspond with the evidence of the house of Marcellus in the Acts of Peter, described above on pp.190-191. Krautheimer further suggests that the public or audience halls of the town house were "utterly unsuited" for the ritual meals. Cf., however, the description of the town house and the uses of the public hall for entertaining guests at public feasts, p. 186, fn. 3, and p. 187, fn. 2 above.

Secondly, Krautheimer maintains that up to 200 A.D. Christian churches were composed largely of the lower and artisan classes, and consequently would have met in the typical cheap houses of the period, pp. 2-3. This is contradicted, however, by his assertion that by 200 A.D. a rich and clear liturgy had evolved, which required anterooms, baptistries, confirmation rooms, instruction rooms, dining rooms, vestries, and even libraries, all of which required to be inter-connected. It is difficult to conceive how such a liturgy with such physical needs could have developed in the small, simple houses of the lower and artisan classes. Krautheimer's point may well hold true in those areas where the Christian Church was very small or just beginning, in rural areas, and even in urban areas there were probably congregations meeting in these smaller houses. Nevertheless, in large urban areas the requirements of the Church, certainly as early as the time of Ignatius, would have necessitated the use of larger homes, and it is surely incorrect to assert that there were no wealthy believers during the period willing to lend their homes to the Church for their services of worship. Cf. especially Ep. James 2.1-9, in which the Christians are upbraided for showing partiality to the wealthy in their congregations.

Nevertheless, Krautheimer's evidence concerning the earliest church buildings through the Roman Empire leads us to guard against holding too narrow a view of the uniformity of the practice of holding Christian worship services in the early Church in the Graeco-Roman town house, as opposed to other types of domestic architecture.
poor as well as senators and many wealthy people of Rome attend the assembly on the Lord's Day. In the course of the narrative several details of Marcellus' house are mentioned, all of which conform to the usual Graeco-Roman pattern: a porter meets Peter at the vestibule; beyond the vestibule is a hall, or covered court, containing a pool, in which is a statue of Caesar; one of the rooms beside the entrance has a fish hanging in the window, which could either indicate a shop, or an interesting alternative, a sign that a Christian church met at that house; Marcellus' steward is found eating in a triclinium, of which there are several; when the poor widows whom Marcellus had invited in for dinner finished eating they "arose" and went into the "hall" to pray.

Thus we conclude that Dix has some justification for suggesting that early Christians assembled for worship in houses of the Graeco-Roman pattern. But was this the case as early as the Apocalypse? Does the heavenly scene of worship reflect this arrangement, as Dix maintains, but does not substantiate?

The comparison is striking at first glance. Central to the picture is the heavenly throne, comparable to the bishop's throne or chair in the tablinium. Around the throne are the thrones of the twenty-four elders, comparable to the chairs of the elders who sat beside the ecclesiastical paterfamilias, also in the tablinium. The golden altar

2. Acts of Peter 9-21. In Ch. 20 Peter enters into the dining hall (triclinium) of Marcellus' house, where the Gospel was being read to the widows who had been invited in for dinner, alms and prayer. It is not at all clear that the dinner was eucharistic, or that a regular service of worship was being conducted. Nevertheless, such a reference should warn against too strict an assertion that worship was always held in the hall, or atrium, of the house.
stands "before God," just as the cartibulum stood before
the bishop for use as a eucharistic table. Beyond that
is a glassy sea, surrounded by the faithful, just as the
everly worshippers must have assembled around the impluvium
which, suggests Dix, may well have been used for baptism.¹

But there is no detail in John's description for which
some Jewish background cannot be suggested; therefore each
detail must be scrutinised for evidence suggesting possible
Christian influences. As we analyse these details it must
be borne in mind that John has no intention of reproducing
any particular earthly scene of worship: he is presenting
a heavenly setting, and draws freely upon images, both
literary and liturgical, with which he is familiar and which
will provide a suitable backdrop for the main action of the
drama. Thus we cannot expect to find a correspondence in
every detail with either Temple or church.

The first detail that arrests our attention is the
throne, and him who sits upon it, surrounded by an emerald
rainbow. Various backgrounds have been suggested for
John's image: the imperial cult of Rome, with the throne as
the supreme expression of Roman power, in contrast to which
the throne of God suggests omnipotence far surpassing the
earthly power of man:² or the splendour of the royal courts
of the ancient Orient, in which the despot rules with
absolute power.³ Although the image in the Apocalypse may
have been influenced to a small extent by such sources, it

² Erik Peterson, The Angels and the Liturgy (London: Darton,
Longman & Todd, 1964), pp. 5-6; Caird, op.cit., p. 62;
Kiddle, op.cit., less explicitly so; op.pBL1.
³ Lucetta Mowry, "Revelation 4-5 and Early Christian
is certainly from the stream of Old Testament and later Jewish literature, tradition, and worship that John has derived his picture of the heavenly throne.¹

The prophets and psalmists thought of God as a king enthroned in heaven:

And Micaiah said,
Therefore hear the word of the Lord:
I saw the Lord sitting on his throne,
And all the host of heaven standing beside him.
On his right hand and on his left.
- I Kings 22.19

God reigns over the nations;
God sits on his holy throne.
- Psalm 47.8²

It is not without significance that from a very early period the divine throne was conceived as the focus of a heavenly temple:

The Lord is in his holy temple,
The Lord's throne is in heaven.
- Psalm 11.4³

The seed of this concept is probably to be found in the Holy of Holies of the earthly temple, in which dwelt the Almighty, and before that in the ancient tabernacle, with its ark and mercy-seat flanked by two cherubim, where

¹ So, most commentators: see Charles, op.cit., I, p. 112; Swete, op.cit., p. 67; Beckwith, op.cit., p. 496; Glasson, op.cit., p. 39; Loisy, op.cit., p. 122; Ernst Lohmeyer, Die Offenbarung des Johannes (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1953), p. 45; and many others.
² Cf. also Ezek. 1.26., Dan. 7.9.
³ Cf. also Isa. 6.1; Jer. 17.12.
I will meet with you, and from above, the mercy-seat, from between the two cherubim that are upon the ark of the testimony, I will speak with you of all that I will give you in commandment for the people of Israel.

- Exodus 25.22

The concept of a divine throne was further developed in the intertestamental period, although descriptions of the throne are relatively rare.\(^1\) It is important to note that the throne continued to be thought of as the focal point of the heavenly temple:

And thereupon the angel opened to me the gates of heaven, and I saw the holy temple, and upon a throne of glory the Most High.

- Test. Levi 5.1

The similarity between this passage and Rev. 4.1-2 is striking.

Another description of the heavenly throne which almost surely lies in the background of the throne of the Apocalypse is II Enoch 21.1-22.2, in which worship is also mingled with a description of the heavenly throne as the heavenly creatures sing the Trisagion to the Lord seated on his throne of glory.

The divine throne of glory eventually assumed such pre-eminence in Jewish tradition that in the Rabbinic writings it is considered to be one of the seven items created before the foundations of the world.\(^2\)

This Jewish tradition is undoubtedly the background of the image in the Apocalypse, which maintains the concept

---


2. See the many references in Strack-Billerbeck, op.cit., I, pp. 974-975.
of the throne as the focal point of the heavenly temple.  
But the most striking similarities of all are to be found in the later work, Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer, which must certainly reflect the Jewish school of thought in which John the Seer was well-versed.  

In Chapter IV of that work the creation on the second day is described: the firmament above the heads of the four living creatures; the seven ministering angels who are like "a flaming fire" and "minister before him within the veil;" the throne of glory, whose occupant is described as fire and hail, corresponding to the jasper and carnelian of Rev. 4.3; the four living creatures surround the throne, each attached to a leg of the

1. Contrary to Loisy's assertion that the combination of throne and temple is inconceivable here, op. cit., p. 122. Even Peterson, who thinks the background is the imperial cult, points out that it is also a temple, and the elders are both kings and priests, op. cit., pp. 5-6. Charles says, correctly we think, that the throne is within the Holy of Holies of the heavenly temple, op. cit., I, p. 112. But he raises the question of how the presence of the twenty-four elders within the Holy of Holies can be reconciled with the background of the Jewish temple, which he leaves unanswered. This important detail is discussed below.

2. A point which only seems to have been observed by Strack-Billerbeck, op. cit., III, p. 798, and Pierre Prigent, Apocalypse et Liturgie (Neuchâtel: Delachaux et Niestlé, 1964), pp. 52-55.

3. In ancient times the most valuable jasper was the white variety, and the carnelian was a red stone, Bock, op. cit., p. 41. Thus it is probable that the glory reflected in the jasper and carnelian of Revelation 4 reflects the same ancient polarity of white and red which is portrayed as hail and fire in Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer 4.
throne and each having four faces, arranged in such a way that each one presents a different face in a different direction. The scene finally concludes with worship in the form of the Kedushah, the highlight of which is the Trisagion quoted in Rev. 4.8, and the central words of the Shema. The similarities between the two works are too close and too many not to postulate a relationship of some sort: although the Apocalypse is earlier, the Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer is characteristic of the tradition with which the Seer is familiar.

Thus it may be forcefully argued that the heavenly throne of the Apocalypse only reflects Jewish tradition, and tells us nothing about Christian worship. But is there no Christian evidence to be considered?

We have already outlined some of the evidence for the bishop's chair as the focal point of the congregational organization for worship. Even today the Church of Rome speaks of the throne, or cathedra (chair) of Peter. A cathedral is that church in the diocese in which the bishop's chair stands. Although the altar has long since become central to the worship of the Roman Church, the pontifical High Mass still focuses on the bishop's throne until after the Creed. This is a relic of the ancient arrangement: as late as the Ordines Romani of the early Middle Ages the

2. See above, p. 188, fn. 1, and also the description of the Church of St. John the Evangelist in Ephesus, p. 189.
papal cathedra is still in the centre of the apse, with bishops and elders seated around him on his right and left. This arrangement, represented in the earliest churches, reflects the ancient concept of the bishop, not as the vicar of Christ who performs the "eucharistic mystery," but as the ruling representative of the Father who pastors and teaches his flock. This concept of the bishop was symbolised by his chair: "for the cathedra is the symbol of teaching." It was only natural that the "father" of the Christian family should thus occupy the chair of the paterfamilias in the Graeco-Roman house; the symbolism was rich, and perhaps may have itself contributed to the idea of the bishop as the representative of the Father.

This idea goes back very early. In the early third century we read that the bishop presides "in typum" of God, and that he sits on his throne in the midst of the elders.

1. See further descriptions in Jungmann, op. cit., pp. 118-119.
2. See above, p. 189; cf. Dix, op. cit., p. 32.
4. Irenaeus, Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching, 2.
5. In an interesting article entitled "The Influence of Architecture upon Liturgical Change," Studia Liturgica, 9 (1973), pp. 230-240, John G. Davies specifies certain 'laws' governing the influence of architecture upon liturgy, one of which is that "architecture produces liturgical change when a use is found for a feature which had no original specific purpose," p. 236. Is it possible that we have an example of this 'law' in the richly symbolic adaptation by the early Christians of the cathedra of the paterfamilias in the Graeco-Roman town house?
6. Did. Apost. 9, 12; see the edition of R. Hugh Connolly (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1929), pp. 88, 119, as well as lxxxix and xci for the dates and origin.
We have already quoted Irenaeus, Hippolytus, and earlier 2nd century sources testifying to the importance of the bishop's teaching and its relationship to the throne, but the most important evidence comes from Ignatius. Writing not more than ten to fifteen years after the composition of the Apocalypse, he compares the bishop to the Father; he says that respect rendered to the bishop is tantamount to rendering it to the Father, who is bishop of all; he not only says that the bishop is a type of the Father, but even says that the bishop sits in the place of the Father.

Thus it may be admitted that outside evidence does exist for the bishop's throne being reflected in the Father's throne of the Apocalypse. The concept is undoubtedly derived originally from Jewish sources, but John introduces two significant new features, which tend to support the view we have taken: the ἰχνος and the πρεσβύτερος. The ἰχνος can be either a semi-circular rainbow, or more frequently, the headless statue of Hippolytus discovered in the 16th century beside the road to Tabor, in which he is depicted as enthroned and teaching, i.e., a bishop, The Apostolic Tradition, pp. xxx-xxxi.

1. See fn. 4, p. 197.
2. See Chapter II, "Early Christian Worship," p. 72, fn. 1. Cf. also the headless statue of Hippolytus discovered in the 16th century beside the road to Tabor, in which he is depicted as enthroned and teaching, i.e., a bishop, The Apostolic Tradition, pp. xxx-xxxi.
3. See above, pp. 189-191.
5. Magn. 3.1.
6. Trall. 3.1.
a halo;\(^1\) that it refers to the latter in Rev. 4.3 is the verdict of almost every commentator.\(^2\) It is significant to note in the light of this new feature that in some of the earliest churches were representations of a hand pointing from a nimbus in the apse above and behind the bishop's throne.\(^3\)

Secondly, R.H. Charles, while insisting on the Jewish temple as the background for the heavenly sanctuary, nevertheless raises the question of the presence of the twenty-four elders in the Holy of Holies. This element, states Charles, "cannot be really harmonised" with the other temple symbols.\(^4\) The twenty-four elders in the heavenly temple have no background in Jewish apocalyptic,\(^5\) so that discussion

1. Arndt and Gingrich, p. 381.
2. So Charles, op.cit., I, p. 115: "The conception of a nimbus encircling supernatural beings or deified men... was current among the Greeks and Romans;" cf. also Beckwith, op.cit., pp. 497-498; Bousset, op.cit., p. 245, and many others.
3. Dix, op.cit., p. 32.
5. With the possible exception of Dan. 7.9, which Farrer, in his commentary, p. 89, mentions: Daniel looks, and "thrones were placed, and one that was ancient of days took his seat." But there is no mention of elders or anyone else besides the Ancient of Days. Piper suggests that the elders may be John's interpretation of Test. Levi 3.8, op.cit., p. 11; but that passage only mentions "thrones and dominions," not elders, which are in the fourth heaven removed from the "Great Glory" who dwells in the "Holy of Holies." It is important for our discussion that in the Apocalypse the elders are seated on thrones within the Holy of Holies in the presence of the "Great Glory" himself. Also of importance is the silence of Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer on the subject of heavenly elders, as that work affords the closest Jewish parallel with the tradition of the Apocalypse, see p. 195 above. Kiddle's assertion, op.cit., p. 84, that the twenty-four elders must have been figures in the popular apocalyptic of John's day is totally without any foundation in factual evidence.
must centre on the role of the elders in the Apocalypse itself.

The various interpretations fall into two categories: (1) they are men; (2) they are heavenly beings. In favour of the latter is the fact that the elders perform certain functions traditionally ascribed to angels in Jewish literature: the Seer addresses one as κύριε (7.13); an elder acts as a heavenly interpreter (7.13); one of them encourages the Seer (5.5); they offer up the prayers of the faithful (5.8) and sing hymns (5.9, 14.3). The view of certain commentators of the history of religions school, however, that the twenty-four elders represent angelic kings reflecting an ancient oriental background of astro-mythological tradition has been rejected by Charles and many others as too far-fetched: such coincidences as do occur are easily explained from within Judaism. A more acceptable view is that propounded by Charles that the twenty-four elders are "the heavenly representatives of the faithful in their twofold aspect as priests and kings;" the number twenty-four is derived from the twenty-four priestly orders.

The evidence seems to us, however, to favour the former view, viz., that the elders are glorified men. As Feuillet

1. See the Jewish references in Charles, op. cit., I, p. 130.
has pointed out, Christian readers of the Apocalypse would not be inclined in any way to associate the word with angels; they are never referred to as such in Scripture.\(^1\) Furthermore, the arguments favouring their angelic nature do not necessarily stand. The vocative \( \kappa \upsilon \rho e \) (7.13) does not necessarily imply a supramundane nature; it also signifies a common term of respect offered to another man, which the present context does not rule out. Nor does the act of encouraging the Seer (5.5) indicate any angelic status; indeed, this was one of the important functions of the elders in the earthly church.\(^2\) The offering of praise to God in hymns (5.9, 14.3) is not restricted to the angels: the multitude of the redeemed do the same (15.3). The elder acts as interpreter in 7.13 because it fits into the literary pattern of the book. John presents a series of visions, in each of which the participants function as agents in the ensuing action: thus the first vision (4-5) gives rise to the Seven Seals (6-8.1) which are acted upon by the four living creatures and an elder (7.13). In subsequent actions the agents are the angels of the immediately preceding visions.

Finally, it is a significant argument in favour of the humanity of the elders that they offer up the prayers of the saints (5.8), for if they are the representatives of

---

1. André Feuillet, L'Apocalypse (Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1963), pp. 72-73. The statement in Isa. 24.23, often appealed to by interpreters who support the view that the elders are angelic beings, that God will manifest his glory "on Mt. Zion and in Jerusalem before his elders" is hardly an unambiguous reference to angels.

the faithful, as Charles maintains, then their presence in the Holy of Holies becomes clear: they represent redeemed humanity, no longer excluded from the "Great Glory," but having direct access to the presence of God (cf. 7.15, 21.3). Feuillet argues further that the elders are men on the basis of the alternative reading in 5.10, in which the elders sing, "Thou hast made us a kingdom and priests to our God."²

On the other hand, the view of Prigent that not only are the elders men, but they represent the great figures of the Old Testament, is unacceptable for the reasons outlined above.³ The oldest interpretation, first mentioned by Victorinus, that they are the twelve patriarchs and the twelve apostles, thus representing the Church in its totality,⁴ is tempting but incapable of support from the text, although Caird has maintained that there is no reason why the twenty-four elders of the Heavenly Temple (4-5) should not become the gates and foundations of the New Jerusalem (21-22), which are especially identified as the patriarchs (or twelve tribes of Israel) and apostles.⁵ Indeed, if one compares the component parts of the Heavenly Temple and the New Jerusalem the only possible correspondence in the latter to the twenty-four elders is found in the twelve gates and twelve foundations. Even so, it is incapable of proof.

4. Held more recently by Sweete, op.cit., p. 69; and Glasson, op.cit., p. 39.
5. Caird, op.cit., p. 64.
The most that can be said is that in his Heavenly Temple John sought to portray the presence of the representatives of the people of God by means of elders, just as they were represented in the earthly temple. The number 24 would have immediately suggested itself as the number of priestly and Levitical courses, as well as those of the Ma'amadoth, and may also have given rise in the Seer's fertile imagination to the symbolic value to be found in the total of twelve patriarchs and twelve apostles, which then become the twelve gates and twelve foundations of the New Jerusalem. But all this still leaves unanswered the question of how they came to be present in the Holy of Holies, to which only the High Priest had access, and why they are grouped immediately around the throne of God.

Acknowledging that although there is no apocalyptic background for this concept, and that its origin must have been the earthly temple, we would maintain that the transference of the twenty-four elders from the temple court, not just into the temple itself, but into the very Holy of Holies, is the result not only of the Christian theology which John accepted but also of Christian liturgical practices which he knew.

We have already noted the important role of the elders in the life of the early church. They were those men who by virtue of their charismatic ability and spiritual attainment naturally rose to leadership. They seem to have been

originally appointed by the apostles and their successors, and continued to be closely associated with the apostles.

We have also observed that the ancient arrangement for worship in which the elders were grouped around the bishop is reflected in the remains of the earliest church structure at Ephesus itself, the early 3rd-century Church of St. John the Theologian, which is patterned on the style of the public section of the Graeco-Roman town house in which many early churches assembled for worship. We have seen that the role of the elders in worship at the time of Hippolytus was to assist in the offering of prayers and responses, functions which the elders of the Apocalypse also perform. We also observed that Clement of Rome, writing at the time of the Apocalypse, refers to the sacerdotal nature of elders as priests. When all this evidence is added together it is difficult not to infer that the elders in the Heavenly Temple are grouped around the throne of God in the same manner that their earthly echoes in the earthly temple, the elders in the church, were grouped around the earthly type of the Father, the bishop.

2. Ignatius often refers to the elders as presiding in the place of, or as a type of the "Council of the Apostles," Magn. 6.1, Trall. 3.1, Smyrn. 8.1.
3. See above, pp. 189, 196. The early 3rd-century Did. Apost. also specifies that the elders should sit grouped around the bishop, Ch. 12.
5. Ibid., pp. 70-71. This early priestly theology of the church explains why the elders are dressed in white garments with golden crowns on their heads: they are both priests and kings.
Thus we begin to see our hermeneutical principle\textsuperscript{1} exemplified: the scene of the heavenly worship is liturgical but not distinctly Christian, and cannot be said to be directly indicative of Christian worship. But when the details are analysed certain differences from the Jewish practice appear which afford a parallel with Christian liturgical practices for which there is a modicum of external evidence: the bishop's throne, and the elders grouped around it.

The crystal sea and the heavenly altar exemplify a further category: possibilities incapable of proof, the arguments for which their being reflections of Christian worship do not receive sufficient outside corroboration, but which cannot be altogether ignored.

The sea of glass has variously been understood as reflecting the apocalyptic heavenly sea, the brass laver of purification in the Jewish temple, or an ancient oriental mythological conception symbolising evil. The last alternative, put forward by Caird,\textsuperscript{2} rests on the unlikely assumption that the sea out of which the beast ascends (13.1) is identical with the crystal sea before the throne, and is highly improbable.

On the other hand, it is very difficult to assign the image to either apocalyptic or the temple. We have already observed that John's vision of the Heavenly Temple is a fusion of Jewish cosmology with the worship of the Jewish temple. As far back as Genesis 1.7 the idea of a "firmament"

\textsuperscript{1} Outlined above, on pp. 178-179.
separating the earthly waters from the "heavenly sea" was current, and continued down to the time of the Apocalypse.

Praise him, you highest heavens,  
And you waters above the heavens!  
- Psalm 148.4

Later apocalyptic assumed a heavenly sea: Jub. 2.4 repeats the idea of Gen. 1.7 in its creation account; II Enoch 3.3 speaks of a "very great sea" in the first heaven, "greater than the earthly sea;" and Test. Levi 2.7 knows of a sea that hangs between the first and second heaven. The direct descent of the image in Revelation seems to be from Ezekiel through the tradition of that Jewish circle of thought represented by the somewhat later Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer, whose cosmology we have already seen to bear a close resemblance to that of John the Seer.

In Ezekiel 1 the four living creatures and their accompanying wheels are described; above these is "the likeness of a firmament, like awesome crystal." Above the firmament is the throne of glory. R. Eliezer has somewhat confused things by assigning the four living creatures (with their wheels) to each leg of the throne of glory (chapter 4); but in the same chapter he locates the heavenly crystalline firmament above the heads of the four living creatures, as in Ezekiel, thereby placing the heavenly sea above the throne of God.

In Revelation the four creatures are still around the throne, but the crystal sea is neither over the throne (as in R. Eliezer) nor under it (as in Ezekiel); it is ἐνώπιον τοῦ θρόνου, before the throne. Why did John choose to
locate it there? Although several scholars have traced the crystal sea back to the heavenly sea of apocalyptic they fail to comment on its shifting position.\(^1\)

Other scholars have stressed the temple characteristics of the scene, and find in the sea of glass a reflection of the brass laver in which priests administered their ablutions of self-purification.\(^2\) This argument is somewhat strengthened by the term \(\varphi \alpha \lambda \alpha \omega \alpha\), which reflects the Hebrew \(\Omega\), or sea, used to designate the brass laver; both Ezekiel and R. Eliezer term the heavenly sea a \(\gamma \iota \rho \gamma\), or "firmament." This interpretation emphasises the sacerdotal nature of the heavenly palace-sanctuary as well as the priestly character of the multitudes who gather beside it.

Other scholars maintain that both images coalesced in John's fertile imagination.\(^3\) But is there no possibility of Christian influence? The sacrament of baptism immediately presents itself, and Farrer and Dix have both argued in its favour. Farrer emphasises the associations between the Temple rites of purification and the baptism of believers as a baptism of "God's new people of priests, who have their ministry in heaven."\(^4\) Dix has suggested

1. See Charles, op.cit., I, pp. 117-118; Kiddle, op.cit., pp. 88-90; Beckwith, op.cit., pp. 499-500; Frigent, op.cit., pp. 51-54. Swete assumes that John is thinking of the glass floor of the royal palace, thereby emphasising the costly splendour of the heavenly court, op.cit., p. 70; this view at least acknowledges the location of the sea.


4. Revelation, p. 91; cf. also Images, pp. 64, 158-160, 162.
that the impluvium or pool in the public part of the Graeco-
Roman town house,¹ served as a baptismal tank.² If so,
the crystal sea may have suggested the baptismal impluvium
to the minds of John's readers. In favour of this view
is the fact that the sea of Rev. 15.2 probably reflects
the Old Testament image of the people of God having passed
through the Red Sea of trial and deliverance,³ and could
well be a symbol of baptism.

Furthermore, 15.2 introduces a new element into the
crystal sea - fire. To the early Christians fire not only
symbolised trial and persecution, but also the Holy Spirit.
In this context it probably represents a further development
of the apocalyptic idea of a heavenly sea mixed with fire,
as expressed in II Enoch 29.2, which describes the
"heavenly water" mixed with the "heavenly fire." Cullmann
has pointed out that the tendency in other Johannine
writings was to emphasise the unity of baptism by the Spirit
and baptism in water.⁴ Other New Testament writings
emphasise this unity as well.⁵ There may even be an
association in the Apocalypse itself of the Holy Spirit with

1. See above, p. 186.
2. Dix, op. cit., p. 23.
3. As most scholars agree, cf. Charles, op. cit., II, p. 33;
Swete, op. cit., p. 194; Caird, op. cit., p. 197; Kiddle,
op. cit., pp. 300-301; Bousset, op. cit., pp. 392-393.
Both Beckwith, op. cit., p. 674 and Loisy, op. cit., pp. 279-
280 reject this image; but the context of fire, deliver-
ance, and especially the New Song of Moses sung by those
standing by the sea, which is based on the song of deliver-
ance of Ex. 15.1-18, argues very strongly in its favour.
4. Early Christian Worship, p. 76. Cf. especially Jn. 3.3.
5. Cf. Mt. 3.11, 16-17; Rom. 6.4. Cf. the analysis of Gal.
5.19-23 by Pierre Prigent to the same effect, "Une Trace
de L'Ériturgie Juüaochrétienne dans l'Épitre aux Épîtres du
l'Apocalypse de Jean," Recherches de l'Institut de
Recherche, 60 (1972), pp. 169-170.
baptism in 22.17:

The Spirit and the Bride say, "Come." And let him who hears say, "Come." And let him who is thirsty come, let him who wills receive the water of life freely.

Thus in Rev. 15.2 it can reasonably be argued that the mixture of fire with water represents baptism.

If so, there may also be a reference to the impluvial tank which formed a part of the scene for earthly worship: just as the multitude stand by or next to (ἐντῷ with the accusative) the sea in the Heavenly Temple, so the redeemed assemble in proximity to the baptismal impluvium in the worship assemblies of the New Temple on earth.

Against this, however, is the lack of outside corroboration for the impluvium actually having been used for baptism. On the contrary, the Didache expresses a preference for running water, as does Hippolytus. Justin Martyr states that after baptism the initiates were "escorted to

1. Caird views this passage as "unmistakably liturgical," but interprets it as an invitation to the Eucharist, op.cit., pp. 286-287. Surprisingly, the passage is seldom alluded to in modern works on early worship. Our suggestion that the invitation to drink of the "water of life" is a baptismal allusion is not inconsistent with Caird's view; cf. the evidence for the first Eucharist as the culmination of the baptismal service in the early church, Ch. II, "Early Christian Worship," pp. 80-82. In support of this view we would draw attention to the evidence for the association in the early church of both baptism and the Eucharist with the impartation of life, through the Holy Spirit, see Ch. II, "Early Christian Worship," pp. 77, 120-3. Cf. the similar conclusion concerning the Seer's use of eucharistic-baptismal allusions in Revelation 21 and 22, Prigent "Liturgie Judéochrétienne," pp. 171-172. Cf. also the "water of eternal life," Jn. 4.13-14, which Cullmann suggests refers to baptism, Worship, p. 83.

2. Did. 7.2; Ap. Trad. 21.2.
the assembled brethren" who had been in prayer. Nevertheless both the Didache and Tertullian specifically allow for the use of still water; Tertullian actually mentions a "tank." It is difficult to imagine what tank would be referred to other than the impluvium.

The suggestion is an interesting possibility, with sufficient internal evidence to militate against its outright rejection. But the lack of external corroboration and the contradictory nature of the external data lead us to conclude that although the early churches may have used the impluvium as a baptismal tank, it is incapable of proof, when considered in isolation, that the crystal sea of the Apocalypse actually reflects the impluvial baptismal tank.

The other interesting possibility for which there is internal evidence is that the cartibulum, or table in front of the chair of the paterfamilias, served as a eucharistic altar, and this is reflected in the heavenly altar of the Apocalypse. The background is obviously the Jewish temple, and most probably the altar of incense in the Holy Place; the heavenly altar of incense is a characteristic of Jewish apocalyptic.

In evaluating this suggestion two questions must be considered: Did the early church view the eucharistic table

2. Did. 7.2; De Bapt. 4.
3. As Shepherd does, The Paschal Liturgy and the Apocalypse, p. 56.
as an altar? What are the functions of the heavenly altar in Revelation?

We have sought to demonstrate at some length\(^1\) that the controlling eucharistic idea in the early church was the sacramental communion of spiritual life, and that the remembrance of Christ's sacrificial death for sin was subordinate. But the concept of the eucharist as an offering, as distinguished from sin-sacrifice, appears early. The eucharistic elements are actually called an "offering" by Hippolytus, and they were collected from the people, brought forward by the deacons and placed on a table before the congregation, where they were blessed by the bishop.\(^2\) A few decades earlier Justin refers to the eucharistic elements as "sacrifices" in opposition to Jewish sacrifices.\(^3\) Irenaeus emphasises the importance of offering gifts "at the altar" frequently; he identifies the gifts as prayer, and locates the altar in heaven.\(^4\) But he immediately goes on to say that earthly things are types of the heavenly realities,\(^5\) from which we can conclude that he is speaking of earthly prayer offered at the earthly altar and thence ascending to the heavenly reality. Somewhat earlier the Shepherd of Hermas speaks of Christian intercession as ascending to the altar of God.\(^6\)

The concept of a Christian altar extends back further

---

5. Ibid., IV. 19. 1.
6. Mand.-X...3...2-3...
than the mid-2nd century however. Ignatius, writing only a decade after the Apocalypse, speaks of "one eucharist, one flesh, one cup, one altar, one bishop;"¹ and he urges Christians to come together "as to one Temple, as to one altar."² The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews knows of a Christian altar "from which those who serve the tabernacle have no right to eat."³ Finally we would suggest that the Christian Sitz im Leben of Matthew 5.23-24, in which the faithful are urged to "leave your gift at the altar and make peace with your brother," may be the altar of eucharistic offering in the Christian church, as exemplified in the later Roman rite of Hippolytus.⁴

Thus we see that the church conceived of a Christian altar at a very early stage as a place of offering for both prayer and the eucharistic elements, functions for which the cartibulum was admirably suited in those churches which assembled in Graeco-Roman dwellings. But is this reflected in the Apocalypse?

There are two basic functions of the heavenly altar. One is clearly identical to that of the altar of the early church: an angel is given incense to mingle with the prayers of all the saints upon the golden altar before the throne; and the smoke of the incense rose with the prayers of the saints from the hand of the angel before God. — Rev. 8.3-4

1. Phil. 4.
2. Magn. 7.2.
4. Cf. Did. 14.2, in which Christians having a quarrel with a brother are admonished to be reconciled before "offering" a "sacrifice" at the eucharistic table.
The other function seems to be connected with the judgment of God. In 6.9 the souls of those martyred for the Word of God lie under the altar awaiting the judgment and vengeance of God on their enemies; this is the Christian outgrowth of the Jewish belief that martyrs are a sacrifice to God.\(^1\) In 8.5 the angel fills the censer with fire from the altar and throws it in judgment on the earth; the altar fire is judgmental fire. Again, a voice from the four horns of the altar commands an angel to judgment, 9.13, and in 16.7 the altar bears witness to the justice of God's wrath.

But the most significant passage in this category is 14.17-20, in which an angel who has power over the fire comes out from the altar and commands another angel with a sickle to reap the vintage of the earth and throw it into the great wine press of God's wrath, which results in a stupendous blood-bath. This is obviously the poetic vengeance of God upon the forces of iniquity who, like the Harlot, are "drunk with the blood of the saints and the blood of the martyrs of Jesus" (17.6): those who have slain the saints on the altar of sacrifice have reaped vengeance from the altar of judgment.

But is there not also a close connection with the supreme martyr, he who is called Faithful and True, whose name is the Word of God (19.13) for whom the martyrs have been slain (6.9), and who in turn judges and makes war (19.11) and treads the wine-press of the fury of the wrath of almighty God (19.15)? One is immediately impressed

\(^1\) Cf. II Tim. 4.6; Phil. 2.17; Ignatius, Rom. 2.2. See the full and convincing discussion in Charles, \textit{Apoc.}, I, pp. 172-174.
with the identical images used in connection with both Christ and the heavenly altar. Above all, we read that he is clad in a robe dipped in blood (19.13), the blood of the martyrs of whom he is pre-eminent.1

Thus we see that the function of the altar as a source of judgment is intimately connected with the concept of the martyrs as blood-sacrifices, and Christ himself as the supreme blood-sacrifice. Could this not be an early reflection of the eucharist as a sacrificial offering?2 Just as early Christians drank of the cup of Christ, which was his life-blood, so they had to be prepared to drink of the cup of his suffering.3 Indeed, we have already seen that to confess Christ as Lord (μαρτυρέω, "bear witness") implied the possibility of martyrdom, and the Greek verb

1. Charles rejects the idea that the blood in which the robe is dipped is Christ's own, and argues that since the final battle has not yet begun, it must be the blood of the Parthian kings whose destruction was prophetically prophesied in 17.14, op.cit., II, p. 133; others argue against Charles that the battle prophesied in 17.14 must be the one about to take place; most commentators go on to conclude that the bloody garment is a proleptic image of the imminent judgment, so e.g. Kiddle, op.cit., p. 385, and Beckwith, op.cit., p. 733. Our own view, that it is the blood of the martyrs for the Word of God, was formulated first upon our own examination of the text, and is also held by Caird, op.cit., pp. 242-244, in which he further draws attention to the use of the image of the wine-press in both instances. He makes no comment on the other connections, however, viz., the martyrs are slain for the Word of God (6.9, 19.13); they are given white robes as are the heavenly armies (6.11, 19.14); they ask for him to avenge their blood (6.10).


3. Cf. Mk. 10.38 ff., 14.36, Jn. 18.11, and especially the Martyrdom of Polycarp 14.2: "I bless thee, that I may share, among the number of thy martyrs, in the cup of thy Christ:" it should also be noticed that the basic theme of the Apocalypse is endurance in persecution.
If so, then we have the same two functions of the altar in the Apocalypse as in the early church: prayer-offering and eucharistic-offering. Nevertheless the outside evidence is not sufficient to corroborate our primary concern here, viz., whether or not the heavenly altar reflects the cartabulum-altar in the earthly setting for worship. But the possibility can by no means be excluded.

A final category is comprised of those details for which there is no Christian parallel and no Christian evidence, and must be pronounced as purely Jewish. Such are the four living creatures on each side (or corner) of the throne; this is a popular Jewish apocalyptic image which has been transformed through several stages. So also is the ark of the covenant (11.19), which is a clear reminiscence of the Solomonic temple.

More difficult is the question of the seven torches, which we also believe to be purely Jewish. The seven torches are derived from apocalyptic, but differences have arisen among scholars as to which apocalyptic background is here reflected: the Holy Spirit, as exemplified by the seven searching eyes of the candlestick in Zech. 4.5 ff., or the archangels, as exemplified by Jub. 2.2. et al. If we decide in favour of the latter interpretation, then the suggestion presents itself that the seven torches may reflect the deacons assembled before the bishop's throne to

2. See the excellent discussion, together with references, in Charles, op.cit., I, pp. 119-123.
assist him in the liturgy.

The strongest argument in favour of the latter view is the apocalyptic tradition itself. On the first day of creation, according to Jub. 2.2, God created "all the spirits which serve before him." The first and foremost of these are the "angels of the presence." I Enoch 20 lists the names and functions of the seven archangels "who watch" - Uriel, Raphael, Raguel, Michael, Saraqael, Gabriel, and Remiel. The later work, Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer, 4, which shares so much with the tradition in which the Apocalypse stands, states that the "seven angels which were created first minister before him within the veil," and they are "a flaming fire." I Enoch 90.21 also seems to reflect the idea of seven angels before the throne.

Charles has argued that although John polemicises against angel worship, he places the seven spirits in parallel position with the seven stars (3.1), and since the latter are concrete beings (they are identified as the angels of the seven churches, 1.20) the seven spirits must be also. Thus, he concludes, the seven spirits must be the seven archangels. ¹

Against this are the arguments in favour of the view that the seven torches, or spirits, are an image of the Holy Spirit. Zech. 4.5 ff. speaks of a lampstand with seven lamps, standing between two olive trees; the seven lamps are the "eyes of the Lord, which range through the whole earth." These lamp-eyes of God are meant to symbolise the Spirit of God, as a reminiscence of the lampstand

¹Charles, supra cit., I, pp. 17, 317.17.
in the Temple. John is evidently familiar with the vision of Zechariah: he uses the figure of the two olive trees to represent the two witnesses in 11.4. It is also true, however, that in the latter passage he states that the two witnesses are the two olive trees "and the two lampstands which stand before the Lord of the earth." Although he has doubled the number of lampstands he is clearly referring to the vision of Zechariah, which would seem to argue against such a background for the seven torches, or spirits. Furthermore, the lampstands in Zech. 4.5 and Rev. 11.4 are single stands with seven lamps (ἀγαλματία); in Rev. 4.5 the seven spirits are symbolised by seven torches (ἁμάρτα λέοντος).

A closer examination, however, reveals that John has not fixed on the image of the lampstand in Zechariah's vision as a symbol of the Holy Spirit, but on the further image of the eyes (Zech. 4.10), and has freely altered and rearranged his sources and images to conform to his own purposes, which is characteristic of his methodology. This becomes explicit in Rev. 5.6, in which John states that the seven eyes are the seven spirits; in 4.5 the seven torches are the seven spirits. Thus the seven torches are the seven spirits, which are the seven eyes of Zech. 4.5 ff., which is a symbol of the Spirit.1

1. It must be acknowledged that John probably had the Jewish temple in mind as well as Zechariah when constructing the heavenly scene of worship, and that the torches probably reflect the seven-lamp candlestick in the Holy Place as well, despite the difference in construction (see above). But the very change from a lampstand to seven torches indicates that he was not intent on merely reproducing the earthly temple in heaven, and that he meant more specifically to symbolise the Spirit by using the imagery of Zechariah.
This view is substantiated, in our opinion, by the inclusion of the "seven spirits who are before his throne" in the centre of the trinitarian benediction of Rev. 1.4-5. This is surely an indication that the seven spirits are an apocalyptic image designed to symbolise the fullness of the Holy Spirit as the radiant glory and instrumental power of God.¹

If this be the case it is most unlikely that the seven torches reflect the earthly deacons. We must also reject the notion that the early church decorated their meeting-place with seven torches in front of the bishop's throne; if they did use torches, as they must have at night, their function was purely practical, and to have placed them between the bishop and the congregation would have been most impractical. John is here building upon a purely Jewish apocalyptic background.²

To summarise: we have sought to illustrate our thesis by an analysis of the scene of the heavenly worship, which may constitute a reflection of the earthly setting for worship. Upon examination none of the details was found to be lacking in Jewish background, and so could not be

---

¹ This view is accepted by most commentators: Swete, op.cit., p. 6; Beckwith, op.cit., pp. 425, 499; Caird, op.cit., p. 15; Kiddle, op.cit., pp. 86, 99-101; Farrer, Images, pp. 60, 99-101, 226; Morris, op.cit., p. 48. The idea that the seven derive from oriental or Roman practices seems most unlikely, cf. Peterson, op.cit., p. 3, and Lohmeyer, op.cit., p. 47.

² It is true that the Apostolic Constitutions, 2.26, identify deacons as a type of the Holy Spirit. But that work is late, and insufficient evidence for arguing that the seven torches, symbolising the Holy Spirit, also reflect the earthly deacons.
considered directly indicative of Christian worship. Each detail was then examined for possibilities of a Christian background: the throne and the elders were found to afford parallels with Christian liturgical practices for which there was sufficient external corroboration to warrant their being regarded as reflective of Christian worship; the crystal sea and the altar were found to afford attractive possibilities for which there was considerable internal evidence, but which lacked sufficient external corroboration to render them capable of proof; the four living creatures, the ark of the covenant, and the seven torches were found to be purely Jewish.

Each of these details was examined in isolation; when they are considered together the case for the inclusion of the altar and crystal sea as reflections of the earthly setting is somewhat strengthened, leading us to conclude that although the Jewish background of these details must be acknowledged, the heavenly scene as portrayed by John, and especially the changes he introduced in details, must have brought to mind in his readers the striking similarity between the setting for worship in the Heavenly Temple and the New Temple on earth, the church in which they assembled to offer sacrifices of worship to God.

1. The hermeneutical guidelines of our thesis are outlined above, pp. 178-179.
C. OTHER STRUCTURAL EVIDENCE

Most of the data in Revelation referring to liturgical structure has already been examined: a few passages still await our attention.

Relating to the time of worship is the famous passage in 1.10: "I was in the Spirit ἐν τῷ Κυρίῳ ἡμέρᾳ." Although the background could be the Jewish apocalyptic "Day of the Lord,"¹ that interpretation is rejected by almost every modern commentator as false to the context.² The simplest explanation is grammatical: it is the day belonging to the Lord, "The Lord's Day," used as a technical term to denote the first day of the week on which Christians gathered to worship. Deissmann argued by comparison with Graeco-Roman inscriptions and papyri that the term meant "Imperial Day" in opposition to the imperial cult of the Caesars.³ According to Deissmann κυριακὴ was used as early as 68 A.D. to denote anything appertaining to the imperial government: "imperial treasury," "imperial service," and so forth. He also observes that as early as the time of Augustus a certain day, known as Σεβασμός, was set aside (probably monthly) in honour of the emperor. From this Deissmann surmises

2. It has recently been demonstrated that there is no example of its being used apocalyptically until at least 450 A.D.; see Wilfrid Stott, "A Note on the Use of the Word κυριακὴ in Rev. 1.10," NTS 12, (1965-1966), pp. 70-75, especially p. 71.
that the term Κυριακή was used by Christians to denote the Lord's Day, or Imperial Day, in opposition to the imperial cult. In support of this view is the suggestion that since all the early examples of Κυριακή denoting Sunday are from Asia Minor, the term may have originated in that province of the empire in which Christians suffered such severe persecution at the hands of the imperial power.

Against this view is the complete lack of Christian evidence as to such a usage: its first appearance is in our text, and there it is already a term sufficiently common to be recognised by John's readers as the common day or worship; nowhere do we find it used in a context clearly indicating "imperial." On the contrary, the three earliest examples after our own passage indicate otherwise: it is Christ's day in opposition not to Rome, but to the sabbath; it is the day of celebration of the resurrection of Christ; it is the day of assembling for the eucharistic offering.

All we can conclude from Rev. 1.10 concerning early


2. Did. 14.1; Ep. Barn. 15.9; Ign., Magn. 9.1; Gospel of Peter 35; Ep. Apost. 17; Acts of John 106; Melito of Sardis, "πέρι Κυριακῆς."


Christian worship is that by the end of the 1st century A.D. "The Lord's Day" was an established term in Asia Minor for designating the day of worship. In our opinion it probably originated spontaneously as a fitting designation of the day on which the church celebrated the resurrection of Christ the Lord in the Eucharist, the eighth day which symbolised the New Covenant of God through Christ the risen Lord.\(^1\)

By so designating the day of worship the early church gave expression to its supreme eschatological confession, "Jesus is Lord."\(^2\) (See also n. 2a on p. 222a attached)

We have already commented on the work of Austin Farrer who claims that John patterned his book on the Jewish festal calendar.\(^3\) While disallowing Farrer's general thesis, we would not deny that reflections of Jewish holy days occur in the Apocalypse.\(^4\) But whether or not this proved Christian observance of the Jewish festal calendar is another matter. John the Seer was steeped in the Jewish tradition, and his sacerdotal emphasis and orientation may indicate that he might even have been a converted priest. But his use of imagery taken from the Jewish feasts hardly proves their observance among Christians of his day. Nevertheless,


2. So Stott, *op.cit.*, pp. 74-75. See Strand, however, for a convincing argument that it is impossible on the basis of present evidence to make any assertions on the meaning of "the Lord's Day" in Rev. 1.10, *op.cit.*, pp. 180-181.


4. So the slain Paschal lamb appears in 5.6; the faithful praise God with palms in their hands as at Tabernacles in 7.9 ff.; the final judgment surely reflects New Year, 19-20; and 213-225 probably reflects the Feast of Tabernacles, as does 14.1 ff., see Comblin, *op.cit.*
2a. For a full discussion of the various modern views see Willy Rordorf, Sunday (London: SCM Press Ltd, 1968), pp. 205-215. Rordorf also concludes that "The Lord's Day" was used as a designation for Sunday, the day of Christian worship, as opposed to the other theories described above.
as Delling has observed, it would be most improbable that Jewish Christians would cease to observe the great Jewish feasts, even by the end of the 1st century, though infusing them with Christian meaning.¹ So John has Christianised the Jewish calendar in Revelation: the paschal lamb of 5.6 is Christ; the multitude in 7.9 ff. wave their palms and offer praise to God "and to the Lamb;" the conquering instrument of God's judgment (New Year) is the Word of God revealed as King of Kings and Lord of Lords (19.11 ff.). We can only reiterate our earlier conclusion:² Christians probably observed the Jewish feasts for several decades, infusing them with Christian interpretations; as their contact with Jewish worship diminished, however, so did their Jewish observance of the holy days; but those which were particularly capable of Christian interpretation became the basis, along with Easter, for the Christian calendar.

We have also analysed those theories which claim to detect a pattern for worship in the Apocalypse and rejected them.³ In particular we noted that although Rev. 4-5 constitute a heavenly liturgy composed by the author, offering praise to God the Holy Creator (4) and to Christ the Messianic Redeemer (5), attempts to find therein an order of an early Christian worship service lack support. Nevertheless many forms and elements do appear which upon further investigation, outwith the scope of this thesis, may give

us an indication of the contents of Christian worship, though hardly an order of service.

Three other possible clues to the structure of early Christian worship require comment. In 14.1 ff. the Seer beholds the 144,000 on Mt. Zion with the Lamb, singing a new song before the throne. These are described as those

- who have not defiled themselves with women, for they are chaste;
- who follow the Lamb wherever he goes;
- who have been redeemed from mankind as firstfruits for God and the Lamb;
- and in their mouth no lie was found, for they are spotless.  

- Rev. 14.4-5.

Further on, in verse 13, a brief benediction is inserted into the flow of action:

Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord henceforth. Blessed indeed, that they may rest from their labours, for their deeds follow them.

Is it possible that we have here reflections of an early Christian funeral service? We know very little of the early Christian burial customs. It was natural that as the expected \( \pi \alpha \rho \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \alpha \) was delayed a concern for the Christian dead should develop; this is already reflected in the letters of Paul.\(^1\) By the end of the 2nd century the Church at Rome possessed Christian cemeteries;\(^2\) in the early 3rd century there appears a rubric to offer the Eucharist "in your cemeteries and on the departures of them that sleep."\(^3\) Towards the end of the 4th century a complete

---

1. Cf. I Thess. 4.13-18, and I Cor. 15. According to the latter passage, verse 29, some sort of baptism for the dead was being practised even in Paul's time.
3. Did. Apost. 61.
prayer on the occasion of the death of a believer is recorded, together with instructions to remember the departed on the third, ninth, and fortieth days.1 Moving back into the early 2nd century we read that the Christians in Smyrna collected the bones and ashes of the martyred Polycarp and placed them "where it was meet" to assemble there and celebrate the anniversary of his martyrdom.2 One of the oldest catacombs in Rome is supposed to have belonged to a certain Titus Flavius Clemens with whom the famous bishop may either be identified or have had some connection.3

But the most important evidence is found in the mid-2nd century Acts of John, which treats of the latter days of the same John to whom tradition ascribes the authorship of Revelation.4 Two passages are of significance. Chapter 62 ff. tells the story of Andronicus and Drusiana, a Christian couple, the latter of whom John raised from the dead. John and the brethren went to Drusiana's tomb at dawn to offer a Eucharist, "it being the third day now from Drusiana's death."5 The celebration of the Eucharist on the third morning after death is assumed as common practice.

Of most significance, however, is John's prayer at

4. For date and origins see James, op.cit., pp. 228-229. Cf. Hennecke, op.cit., Vol. II, pp. 214-215, however, who maintains that it was 3rd century.
his own death, for in that prayer he mentions two distinctive points recorded in the passages we have quoted from Revelation: his virgin chastity, and rest from his labours.

All of this does not prove that Rev. 14.4-5 and 14.13 reflect some early Christian funeral service. Nevertheless, both passages exhibit a poetic and therefore possibly liturgical structure: 14.4-5 is a triad of eulogies, each beginning with ὄντος, and the first and third ending with a structurally similar description, "they are chaste," "they are spotless;" 14.13 is a benediction in the usual Jewish form. Thus the suggestion seems to us a plausible one, though incapable of proof.

The reference to virgins in 14.4 raises the question whether this may reflect an order of celibates in the early church. Commentators have sought to avoid this implication by various means. Ignatius is frequently quoted as referring to widows as virgins because of their purity and devotion, and it is argued that the term in Rev. 14.4 is a symbol for purity of heart. More plausible is the suggestion that the symbolism here employed is martial, and rests upon the Deuteronomistic regulations for holy war, which require ritual purity on the part of God's warriors.

5. Deut. 20, 23.9-10. This view is put forward by Caird, op. cit., p. 179.
purity against the whore of Babylon. In this sense they are "virgins."

Another solution, offered by Charles, is that this is an interpolation by a monkish editor. In the present text the appellation "virgin" describes the 144,000, who are supposed to be the "first-fruits for God and the Lamb." As such, they were interpreted by the monkish interpolator to be of the highest Christian character, which for him meant celibacy. Thus he added the words in 14.4a: οὗτος εἶναι μετὰ γυναικῶν οὐκ ἐμολύνθησαν πρεπεῖν γέρουν. The objection to this view is that it is sheer conjecture: there is no evidence, textual or otherwise, to support it.

Charles' view has merit in that it acknowledges the literal meaning of the words in the text. Kiddle rejects the suggestion of an interpolation and admits, rightly in our opinion, that celibacy rated highly in John's list of saintly virtues, especially in the light of the coming ordeal. Celibacy attained prominence in certain circles of the church not long after the composition of the Apocalypse. We refer again to the Acts of John 112-115, in which the Apostle is pictured as thanking God at length on his deathbed for preserving him from sexual intercourse with women; the Acts of Thomas expresses the same sentiment. According to Hippolytus, Marcion established churches of celibates, and Irenaeus reports that the early Gnostics Saturninus and

4. Phil. 7:17 ff.
Basilides taught that "marriage and generation are from Satan." Tatian is reputed to have looked upon marriage as "corruption and fornication." Thus it would not seem unreasonable to conclude that the Seer is here expressing celibate tendencies which later found a widespread reception in the church; but there is no external evidence in support of the idea that a class of monkish celibates already existed in the church at that time.

It is possible that John's celibate tendency is related to his role as a Christian prophet. The office of the prophet is widely attested in the early Christian writings, and the references in the Apocalypse do not really add much to our discussion above. It is clear that John considered himself a prophet, and his work a prophecy. The Christian prophets were the true heirs of the Old Testament prophets; upon them the Spirit had been poured out in the new age in accordance with the prophecy of Joel 2. Their mission was comparable to that of the Old Testament prophets: they were to proclaim God's word by bearing

2. Eusebius, H. E. IV. 29. 3.
3. Though it must be acknowledged that there were probably not a few voluntary celibates, such as Paul and perhaps the Seer himself, engaged in the peripatetic mission of the church.
5. 10.8-11, 22.9.
6. 1.3, 22.7, 10, 18.
7. Rev. 10.8-11 recalls the experience of Ezekiel, 3.1 ff; see the discussion in Charles, Revelation, I, pp. 267-268.
8. 1.10, 4.2, 19.10, 22.6.
witness to Jesus Christ;\(^1\) and to prophesy the impending judgment on evil and divine triumph.\(^2\) Thus it may be said, since John uses the apocalyptic literary mode, that the Apocalypse is a true representative of what may be called "prophetic-apocalyptic."\(^3\) The life of a peripatetic prophet is hardly conducive to marriage; thus it may be that voluntary celibacy characterised most (if not all) of this class of Christians, and was thus highly praised by John.

Delling has raised the question whether the white garments in which the heavenly faithful are clothed\(^4\) may have been used in the worship services in the churches with which John was familiar.\(^5\) In this connection Delling notes that one passage refers to the present time, but it is used metaphorically,\(^6\) and the others must be interpreted against their Jewish apocalyptic background. This is the view of most commentators:\(^7\) the white robes are the eschatological symbol of the resurrection body in its victory, purity and bliss. The white robe is used similarly in Jewish apocalyptic.\(^8\)

---

2. 4.1, 10.8-11, 22.6. 11.1-13 partakes of the nature of both aspects of the prophetic mission.
4. 3.4, 4.4, 6.11, 7.9-13, 19.14.
6. 3.18.
7. So e.g., Charles, Revelation, I, pp. 82-83; Caird, op.cit., p. 85.
8. Cf. I En. 62.16; II En. 22.8; IV Ezra 2.39-44; Asc. Isa. 9.9. White is also the colour of angels, or their garments: cf. Ps. 104.2; II En. 1.5; Mk. 9.3; Mt. 16.5; Acts 1.10; so also in Revelation 1.13-15, 5.15.5-8.3.
But does this simple metaphorical interpretation not overlook the connection between Jewish worship and apocalyptic? The latter reflects a priestly theology with a strong emphasis on the Temple.¹ The normal temple dress of a Jewish priest was a white garment, which was symbolic of ritual purity.² Which came first, the liturgical dress or the apocalyptic symbol? The answer is obvious: the Jewish apocalyptic symbol derives from Jewish liturgical practice.³ We would admit the apocalyptic background: but at the same time we would ask, Is it not possible that the symbol is simultaneously drawn from Christian liturgical practice?

It is true that there is no outside evidence for early Christians adorning themselves in white robes during their regular worship services, and it would be reading too much into history to conclude such from our text. But there is evidence of the use of white garments in a special Christian context, viz., baptism.

We have observed that although the white robe has proven antecedents in Jewish apocalyptic as an eschatological symbol of the resurrection body in its victory, purity and bliss, this may well be derived in turn from the priestly dress in the Temple. White garments were similarly used by early Christians in a liturgical context,

3. The Essenes also used the white robe liturgically, adorning themselves in such after their ritual lustrations, Josephus, Wars, II. viii. 5-7. Cf. Appendix IV, "Worship at Qumran," pp. 344-345.
Three other New Testament passages use the metaphor of "removing" or "putting off" evil and adorning or "putting on" the new clothes of Christ in a baptismal context, which would tend to corroborate a primitive usage of the practice recorded by Hippolytus in the latter half of the 2nd century A.D. This in turn would add weight to the suggestion that the Elder has derived his image from Christian baptism.

This is supported further by an examination of his usage of this image. In 3.18 Christ counsels the Laodiceans to buy white garments to clothe their nakedness (the state in which Christians were baptised) and salve to anoint their eyes. The act of anointing the baptisand with oil is clearly attested in Hippolytus and elsewhere. This would seem to support the interpretation of the reference to white clothing in a baptismal context. Rev. 7.9-17 speaks of a multitude in Heaven clothed in white, who have come out of the great tribulation. It has been argued by Charles that the white robes refer to resurrection bodies, and since this scene occurs before the Resurrection the white-robed multitude must be martyrs. But although the martyrs in 6.11 are given white robes, it does not necessarily follow that the multitude in 7.9-17 are martyrs. Rather do they represent the redeemed of earth, clad in robes of righteousness,


and significantly, they have made their robes white by washing them in the blood of the Lamb.

The baptismal allusion here is more apparent when compared to the benediction in 22.14 on those "who wash their robes" that they may have the right (or access) to the tree of life." In the early Church there is evidence that the Eucharist normally followed baptism, even as the image of the tree of life here follows that of washing their robes.

We would thus conclude that both external and internal evidence favour the theory that the Apocalypse reflects a practice of adorning new baptizands in white garments.

We must agree with E.F. Scott, however, when he insists that the author is not emphasising that aspect of the rite itself, but its significance, viz., the eschatological victory and purity already realised proleptically for the Christian in the present.

D. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

In this chapter we have sought to ascertain whether the Johannine Apocalypse affords any insight into the structure of Christian worship at the time. Certain hermeneutical principles had to be established in order to provide

1. Both the textual and internal evidence favour this reading over the alternative, cf. Charles, op.cit., and Swete, op.cit., loc.cit.
guidelines for evaluating the evidence.

We found these guidelines rooted in John's use of the Temple in the Apocalypse, which led us to the conclusion that just as the images of the Jerusalem Temple, while not reflecting actual Christian practices, do reflect actual Jewish Temple practices, so we may assume that images drawn from the New Temple, the Church, may similarly reflect actual Christian practices.

Thus the guidelines emerged:

1. Those liturgical images which have no Jewish background, but are clearly liturgical, are directly indicative of Christian worship.

2. Those which have a Jewish background must be analysed in detail: some passages are interpreted for us, as in 8.3-4; some are a mixture of Jewish and Christian, which may be regarded as reflective of Christian worship when the details are extricated from each other if they afford a parallel with Christian liturgical practices for which there is a modicum of external evidence; some have little or no external evidence, but in context may be regarded as possible allusions to Christian worship.

3. Those which are purely Jewish must be pronounced as such.

We then applied our thesis to those images which possibly contained references to liturgical structure in the early Church. The most important of these was the scene of the heavenly worship which we maintain must have brought
to mind in the hearers and readers the striking similarity between the setting for worship in the Heavenly Temple and the New Temple on earth, the church in which they assembled to offer sacrifices of worship to God. In particular, we concluded that the throne and the elders were found to afford parallels with Christian liturgical practices for which there was sufficient external corroboration to warrant their being regarded as reflective of Christian worship; the crystal sea and the altar were found to afford attractive possibilities for which there was considerable internal evidence, but which lacked sufficient external corroboration to render them capable of proof; the four living creatures, the ark of the covenant, and the seven torches were declared purely Jewish.

We also examined other structural evidence. The "Lord's Day" was a Christian term, denoting the day of Christian worship, with possible eucharistic and eschatological overtones. Jewish feasts were probably observed with diminishing frequency, and were infused with Christian meaning. Rev. 14.4-5 and 14.13 may reflect some early Christian funeral service, but the lack of external evidence renders such a view incapable of proof. Although no external evidence exists for a class of monkish celibates at the time of writing, it is possible that the Seer held virginity in such high esteem as necessary to the life and work of a Christian "prophet." Finally, we concluded that the practice of adorning new baptizands in white garments is replete with liturgical references.
In the previous chapter we examined various theories purporting to find liturgical patterns in the Apocalypse, and concluded that although none of these could be substantiated in our view, certain interesting insights, and possibly useful tools for the study of references to early Christian worship generally in the Apocalypse emerge, especially in the work of Farrer, and perhaps of more significance, Lund.

In conclusion, we would maintain that Revelation is replete with liturgical references. It must again be emphasised that a detailed examination of possible references to baptism, the Eucharist, and liturgical forms is outwith the scope of this thesis, except as they have touched upon our analysis of liturgical patterns and structure. Nevertheless, we maintain that such a study would be of considerable value in adding to our knowledge of early Christian worship as well as our understanding of the Johannine Apocalypse. It is our view that the hermeneutical principles developed in this thesis, rooted in the literary and liturgical background of the Apocalypse, provide the necessary guidelines with which to undertake such a study, as exemplified in our analysis of liturgical structure.
APPENDIX I

APOCALYPTIC AND THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

The Community of the Covenant, whose literature has been discovered at Qumran, was essentially an apocalyptic sect, which had gone into the desert, entering the New Covenant of the last days, to await their rebirth as the New Israel in the Kingdom of God. Cross states that these Essenes were rooted in the Judaism of the 2nd century B.C., which was basically a coupling of priestly Law and thoroughgoing apocalypticism.

Apocalyptic literature and ideas certainly had their place among the Covenanters. Numerous fragments of Daniel, Jubilees and I Enoch have been found. An Aramaic Testament of Levi and a Hebrew Testament of Naphtali have also been found. These are usually considered to be sources for the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. Förster has pointed out that the apocalyptic writings found at Qumran

1. Cf. CD 4.2-4, 6.18-19, 8.21; IQ34 bis et bis 2.5-8. To go so far as to say that "the apocalyptic community was at once the future congregation of the elect and the present sect whose life was conceived as a foreshadowing of the New Age" may perhaps be reading too much recent New Testament Theology into the texts, but nevertheless underscores the eschatological tension in which the Community conceived its existence. See Frank Moore Cross, Jr., The Ancient Library of Qumran (London: Gerald Duckworth & Co. Ltd., 1958), p. 64.

2. Ibid., pp. 54-55.


contain peculiar features recurring in other Essene literature, a fact which has led some to assert Essenism as the milieu and source of the apocalyptic literature. The apocalyptic literature which has been mentioned certainly influenced the Dead Sea Sect, but there is no evidence that the Covenants influenced the apocalyptic literature. The other literature found at Qumran, while bearing certain similarities to apocalyptic, also contains marked differences.

Burrows has pointed out the danger in seeking to ascertain "the eschatology" of Qumran. Among the scrolls found there seem to be variant ideas, just as in the other apocalyptic literature. Russell lists twenty Qumran works which have some association in outlook with apocalyptic literature. Of these we would eliminate two. The Prayer of Nabonidus (4Q Nab) resembles Daniel 4, and may be its source. But neither Daniel 4 nor the Prayer of Nabonidus

1. Förster mentions the solar calendar, strict consecration of the Sabbath, the emphasis on the superiority of the priesthood over the kingship, certain expressions such as "walk perfectly," "repent with one's heart and soul," "do not turn to the right or to the left from any of God's ways," "circumcise the heart." See Werner Förster, Palestinian Judaism in New Testament Times (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1964), p. 77. See also Martin Hengel, Judaism and Hellenism (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1974), pp. 112-113. Unfortunately Hengel's works appeared too late to be incorporated in detail in this thesis.


can really be said to be apocalyptic. Again, the Genesis Apocryphon (IQ Gen. Apoc.), while containing references to Enoch as taught by the angels and sharing their lot, contains neither apocalyptic ideas or characteristics.

The apocalyptic literature of the Covenanters, then, together with brief descriptions of the apocalyptic ideas to which they refer, is as follows:

The Commentaries on Isaiah (4Q pIsa), Hosea (4Q pHos), Micah (1Q pMic), Nahum (4Q pNah), Psalm 37 (4Q pPs37) and especially Habakkuk (1Q pHab) are significant as primary examples of the peculiar apocalyptic exegesis of the Covenanters. Rather than new predictions, or re-interpretations of old ones, they consist of prophetic texts interpreted apocalyptically in terms of current events. There are two underlying assumptions: (1) the scriptures do not refer to the prophets' days, but to the end times, which for the Covenanters is the present; and (2) the secret words of the Prophets have now been given their true interpretation by the Teacher of Righteousness.¹

The Manual of Discipline (1Q S) contains a section on dualism, with references to judgment, eternal life, and the triumph of righteousness (3.13-4.26). There is also a passing reference to the eschatological Prophet and the "Messiahs of Aaron and Israel" (9.11).

The Messianic Rule (1Q Sa) contains instructions for "the end of days" regarding the instruction of individuals in the precepts of the Covenant, the organization of the

¹ Russell, op.cit., p. 181.
eschatological Community and roles of its members, precedence
in the Community, and the eschatological banquet.

The Book of Blessings (1Q Sb) refers to the "angels
of the Presence," and the (Messianic) "Prince of the
Congregation."

The Zadokite Document (CD) includes references to this
period of wickedness, dualism, the coming Messiah, the
destruction of the wicked, the judgment, and the final over-
throw of Belial. It also mentions the calendar of Jubilees
as that which is the true one.

The Testimonies Scroll (4Q Test) is a Messianic
anthology of five Old Testament proof-texts, including
references to the eschatological Prophet.

The Hymns (1Q H) contain certain apocalyptic ideas:
14-17 refer to the dualism of the spirits of good and evil;
6 mentions the time of judgment and the eschatological
battle against the ungodly; 3 refers to the Messianic woes,
possibly as the birth-pangs of God's redeemed people (or
the Messiah.)

The War Scroll (1Q M) gives directions for the final
apocalyptic battle. It reflects historical methods of war-
fare.1 The war is to last forty years. It is conceived
as an earthly battle, with the sons of light taking a
definite part. They are led by a "mighty man" (the Davidic
Messiah?), and are assisted by the angels. The battle is
culminated by the overthrow of Satan by God with the help
of Michael, and the final presence of God's Kingship over
Israel.

The Book of Mysteries (1Q Myst) asserts the triumph of righteousness over evil. It speaks of the mysteries which are hidden from the wicked, but made known to the elect, and of the knowledge that shall fill the world in the coming age.

The Midrash on the Last Days (4Q Flor) speaks of the eschatological Temple, the Davidic Messiah, and the Messianic woes.

The Description of the New Jerusalem includes a description of the eschatological Temple and the perfected liturgy.

The Angelic Liturgy (4Q Serek) contains the heavenly blessings of the seven archangels, references to the heavenly worship, and a vision of the divine throne-chariot.

The Pseudo-Daniel Apocalypse contains "Daniel's" account of the history of the world, given to the king and his court, from the Deluge to Hellenistic times, which are understood as the last days.

From this brief survey it can be seen that the Qumran Community was concerned with basically the same eschatological concepts and subjects as apocalyptic literature in general, although its particular eschatology was coloured by its self-image as the Remnant of the New Covenant living in holiness in the desert in the last days. The eschatology tends more toward the nationalistic and earthy than the transcendental, cosmological type. This is also characteristic of other earlier apocalyptic literature. No fragments of the Similitudes of Enoch, which was the latest part
of I Enoch, have been found. Significantly, the transcendent Son of Man concept, which is developed in the Similitudes, is not found in any of the other Qumran literature.

It is hardly germane to our purpose to discuss the various eschatological concepts found in the Dead Sea Scrolls in detail. It is relevant, however, to point out that the Covenanters conceived of the future elect in the coming Kingdom as essentially a worshipping community endowed with all the eternal blessings of God.¹

As far as the vexing question of whether there were one or two Messiahs is concerned, it seems to us that the evidence favours those who argue for only one Messiah. Despite the complex arguments of Kuhn and others, the case for two Messiahs rests ultimately on the plural form "Messiahs" in 1Q S 9.11, without which we doubt that the question would ever have been significantly discussed. In either view emendation of the texts is necessary, and it seems to us that the plural form of 1Q S 9.11 is more readily explained than the singular forms of CD 8.21 ff. and the numerous references to a single Messiah. In any case all scholars agree that there are three eschatological figures: a Prophet, a Priest, and a King.²

The Covenanter shared the basic philosophical outlook of the apocalyptists. We find evidence of dualism, both cosmological and eschatological. There is undoubtedly a pessimism regarding this age, as well as a deterministic view of the world. It may be difficult to maintain that they shared a non-prophetic view of history, for they seem to have conceived of God as still working in this age, although it is still the dominion of Belial. They certainly did not share the basic problem of the apocalyptists, that of the suffering of a righteous Israel, and its ensuing ethical passivity. On the contrary, they felt that most of Israel had turned to wickedness, and the Covenanter were highly concerned over purity and righteousness during the period of wickedness.


2. 1Q S 3.13-4.26.
3. 1Q S 1.17,23, 2.19; 1Q M 14.9.
4. 1Q S 3.13-4.26; 1Q H 1.23-25, 27-29, 10.1 ff., 12.10 ff.
5. Cf. 1Q pHab.
6. 1Q S 1.17,23, 2.19.
7. Cf. CD 6.10,14; 15.7,10.
The most striking differences between the Qumran literature and apocalyptic are in their methods. Of the works mentioned above, only the Book of Mysteries, the Description of the New Jerusalem, the Angelic Liturgy and the Pseudo-Daniel Apocalypse can really be classified under apocalyptic as a literary genre. As far as we can tell from the evidence, only the Pseudo-Daniel Apocalypse is pseudonymous. The latter is also the only pseudo-prophetic work. It can hardly be said that the authors are primarily writers trying to communicate a message of hope to Israel. On the contrary, Israel was considered as hopelessly wicked. Most of the apocalyptic ideas occur in passing in manuals of instruction, hymns and commentaries of a separatist sect. The War Scroll is more properly a military manual than an apocalyptic message of hope, albeit it does deal with the apocalyptic battle.

There is one example of time computation in CD 8. 14-16, where reference is made to a period of forty years between the Teacher of Righteousness and the day of God's visitation. But even this differs from apocalyptic in that it is plainly stated, and not cryptically couched in mysterious terms of weeks of years, periods, etc.

The only clear example of apocalyptic imagery is the description of the divine throne-chariot in the Angelic Liturgy.

Dupont-Sommer states that the Essenes were "avid for visions, revelations, and apocalypses," and cites 1 Q H 14.7 and 1Q M 10.10-11.1 This would seem to be an overstatement.

1. Dupont-Sommer, op. cit., p. 320.
for although there is some evidence of predictive prophecy and visions among the Covenanters,¹ the main thrust of their apocalyptic method was not revelatory, as in Jewish apocalyptic generally, but interpretative. This is seen especially in the Commentaries, as already mentioned,² the Zadokite document, The Midrash on the Last Days, and The Testimonies Scroll. This "apocalyptic exegesis"³ is very different from "apocalyptic revelation." Apocalyptic declares a new revelation of secrets of the heavenly world and the coming eschaton; the Dead Sea Scrolls declare the hidden meaning of ancient revelations now coming to pass.⁴

Thus we must disagree with Cross and Dupont-Sommer that Essenism was the milieu and source of apocalyptic.⁵ Rather it would seem that the Covenanters were strongly influenced by apocalyptic, and shared in the milieu in which apocalyptic arose and developed. We would still maintain that that milieu was a combination of priestly and Hasidic religion with the folklore of the people, seeking a concrete way of expressing its hope in God in times of trial and suffering.⁶

---
¹ Cf. Dupont-Sommer's references and 1Q Myst 1.8, 4Q Serek.
² Supra, p. 238.
³ Cross' term, op.cit., p. 82.
⁵ Cross, op.cit., pp. 147-150; Dupont-Sommer, op.cit., pp. 368-369.
⁶ Hengel, op.cit., pp. 175-228, develops the view that apocalyptic arose in the milieu of the Hasidim, which was also the common origin for both Essenism and Pharisaism.
APPENDIX II

THE TEMPLE AND ITS WORSHIP IN THE FIRST CENTURY

Until its destruction in 70 A.D. the Temple was the very centre of Judaism and the focus of national religion. Its influence upon the author of the Apocalypse is considerable. The Temple with which he was undoubtedly familiar was that of Herod. Ideas and motifs from previous Temples lingered in his memory, however, such as the ark of the covenant.1

A. HISTORY OF THE TEMPLE

There were three Temples altogether. The first was constructed by Solomon c. 959 B.C., probably as a royal chapel.2 It was destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar in 586 B.C. During the Exile the ruins were probably used by the Jews still in Palestine, especially the altar.3 After the decree of Cyrus many Jews returned to Palestine, and rebuilding of the Temple began under Zerubbabel in 519 B.C. during the reign of Darius. The second Temple remained in use for five hundred years. Finally, Herod rebuilt the Temple, beginning the work c. 20 B.C. The ναός, or Temple proper, was completed in a year and a half, but work continued on the Temple precincts until 64 A.D.4

B. DESCRIPTION OF THE TEMPLE

Since the Temple of Herod was that known in the first century, we will endeavour to give a description of it as reconstructed by modern scholarship, with occasional references to previous Temples where relevant. Our key sources for Herod's Temple are Josephus and the Mishnah tractate Middoth.

The Temple was located on Mt. Moriah, on the eastern side of the Jerusalem wall. The ναός, or Temple proper, was situated on an east-west axis, with the entrance in the east. Thus the worship was oriented toward the west. The Temple consisted basically of a main building surrounded by two courts, an inner and an outer.

The outer court, called the Court of the Gentiles, was lined with large and marvellously decorated porches and chambers. There seem to have been eight gates into the Court of the Gentiles, one on the east, two on the south, four on the west and one on the north.

The inner court, called the Court of Israel, was marked off by a fence and a ten cubit wide terrace, beyond which Gentiles could not proceed. The inner court was further

---

1. Antiquities XV, xii; War V, v.
2. According to Josephus, War V, v, Herod restored the Temple to the original internal dimensions of Solomon's Temple, except that the height was doubled to 60 cubits. The outside dimensions were considerably larger than Solomon's, but Josephus differs with Middoth on many dimensions. Both sources give the same general picture, however, and our description follows the consensus of modern scholarship. Helpful details are found in the sources for the previous Temples, which are I Kings 5-8 = I Chron. 2-7; Ezek. 40-43 (Solomon's Temple); I Chron. 26-28; II Chron. 36.22-23; Ezra; Ecclus. 49-50; I Macc. 1, 4, et infra; The Letter of Aristeas; Josephus, Contra Apion I, xxii; Antiquities XI, viii, 4-5; XII, iii, 3-4; XV, xi, 1 (Zerubbabel's Temple).
subdivided as follows: approaching the inner court from the east were steps leading up to a gate of gold and silver, probably the "Beautiful Gate" of Acts 3,1, which led into the Court of the Women, which was the eastern portion of the Court of Israel. There were two other gates into the Court of the Women, one each on the north and south sides.

Continuing westward, steps led up again to a huge bronze gate, which Josephus calls the Corinthian Gate. This was probably the so-called Nicanor Gate. This gate led into the main part of the Court of Israel. This court had six other gates, three on the north and three on the south sides. It surrounded the Temple proper and the priestly environs of the Temple. The Corinthian Gate, from the Court of the Women to the Court of Israel, led directly into an oblong hall extending north-south along the enclosure separating the Women's Court from the Court of Israel. This hall was called the Hall of the Israelites, and was directly joined to the Hall of the Priests, which lay parallel to it. The two halls were divided by a step of one cubit's rise and slats or sticks. The two halls thus formed one large gathering place. Just inside the entrance to the Hall of the Priests, directly in line with the Corinthian Gate, stood the Dukan, three stone steps from which the Priests blessed the people. The Hall of the Israelites is very probably the location of the lay Ma'amadoth service (see below). The Court of the Israelites also contained the Chamber of the Pancake-Maker in the southeast.

corner, the Chamber of Phinehas the Vestment Keeper in the northeast corner, the Chamber of the Hearth on the north wall, and the Chamber of Polished Stones (the Hall of Gazith, see below) on the south wall.¹

Within the Court of Israel, elevated and set off by a low fence, was the Court of the Priests, which contained the Temple sanctuary itself, and the Great Altar of Burnt-Offering with its appurtenances.

The Temple itself stood in the western area of the Court of the Priests. It was rectangular in shape. Inside it was divided into two parts. The Holy of Holies in the west was 20 cubits square and 60 cubits high.² In Solomon's Temple the Holy of Holies had contained the Ark of the Covenant with two cherubim over it, facing east, their wings extended so as to touch each other and the walls. This was the throne-dwelling-place of Yahweh. But since the Ark had been lost or destroyed in 586 B.C., the Holy of Holies remained empty.

The outer chamber, the Holy Place, was to the east of the Holy of Holies, and measured 20 cubits wide and 20 cubits long. The Holy Place contained the Table of Shewbread to

1. Emil Schürer, A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ, Div. II, Vol. I (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1885), pp. 190-191 identifies the Hall of Gazith with the βουλή on the western edge of the Temple mount. The Mishnah locates it in the Court of Israel, Middoth V, 4, as do Kennedy and Snaith, op.cit., p. 967, and Judah David Eisenstein, "Temple, Plan of Second," JR. This seems more probable, as the Priests retired to this hall several times during the daily sacrifice, and Schürer's location is too far away to be feasible.

2. Solomon's Holy of Holies was only 20 cubits high, thus making it a perfect cube (I Kings 6.5, 16, 19-20).
the north, the seven-branched candlestick to the south, and the Altar of Incense near the entrance. On the Table of Shewbread were twelve large loaves of unleavened bread, in fulfilment of Ex. 25.30 and Lev. 24.5-9. They were changed every Sabbath. Golden urns containing frankincense stood beside them.

The two chambers were separated by a double veil, each of which opened at opposite ends. The effect was that when the High Priest entered the Holy of Holies on the Day of Atonement he passed through the outer veil on one side, walked between them, and entered the Holy of Holies on the other. Thus it was impossible for the Holy of Holies ever to be exposed to view. The interior of the Temple was richly decorated with gold, silver and wood.

The inner apartments were surrounded on the north, south and west by side-buildings, three storeys high, containing small storage chambers. At the entrance to the building, on the east, was a large vestibule, or porch, 100 cubits wide, 100 cubits high, and 20 cubits deep, supported by large pillars. This porch extended 20 cubits on either side beyond the rest of the Temple. In this it differed from Solomon's Temple, which had a much narrower vestibule. Features of Solomon's Temple missing from Herod's were the two giant bronze pillars which stood in the open to the east, flanking the steps leading up to the vestibule. These were called Jachin and Boaz, and although destroyed in 586 B.C., their memory persisted.¹

¹. They are still seen on a fragment of glass dating from the third or fourth century A.D. found in the catacombs of Rome. See Parrot, op. cit., p. 2828.
The gate leading from the vestibule into the Holy Place was covered with gold. Behind it, inside the Holy Place, hung a magnificent curtain of byssus, purple, scarlet and hyacinth, which blocked the view into the Holy Place. Above the gate were golden vines with grape clusters as large as a man. At festivals all Israelites, including women, were permitted to enter the inner court. The gate was opened and the curtain raised to expose the interior of the Holy Place to the view of the worshippers.

Over the front of the vestibule, in the east, Herod erected a golden eagle. This was later torn down by zealous students (?) and never replaced.¹

Twenty-two cubits east of the vestibule stood the Great Altar of Burnt-Offering. The altar was 15 cubits high and 50 cubits square. It rose in a series of concentric squares, each smaller than the one below, in the manner of Ezekiel's altar (Ezek. 43). To the north of the altar were twenty-four rings in the pavement for tying up animals, eight short pillars connected by cedar beams for hanging up the carcasses, and eight marble tables to prepare the slaughtered animals. To the south of the altar were the bronze laver for the ritual washing of hands and feet, a silver table for vessels, and a marble Table of Fat for flesh. The great rock in the present Mosque of Omar is considered by most scholars to be the threshing floor of Araunah the Jebusite purchased by David for an altar and the

¹ Barton, "Temple of Herod."
sitè of the altar in all three Temples.¹

Herod's Temple was very grand. He built porches, columns, chambers, cloisters, etc., and decorated them ornately. He covered most of the Temple proper with gold, and that which was not covered with gold was of the purest white stone. Josephus says that no less than nine of the gates in the Temple were overlaid with gold and silver.² It was undoubtedly one of the wonders of the world in its time. But in spite of its grandeur it was considered less sacred than Solomon's by the Rabbis because it lacked five important accessories: (1) the Ark and the cherubim, (2) the divine fire, (3) the Shekinah, (4) the Holy Spirit, and (5) the Urim and Thummim.³

C. ORGANIZATION; FUNCTION AND DRESS OF THE PRIESTHOOD

The highest religious official in first century Judaism was the High Priest, the ש"יא י"ד. He had an assistant, called the י"deer in the Rabbinic literature. Schürer identifies this Segan with the Captain of the Temple.⁴ He is usually called the יהוד in the Old Testament.⁵ The rest of Israel was divided into Priests, Levites and Israelites.

2. Wars V, v.
3. Yoma 21b.
5. See, e.g., II Kings 23.4, 25.18.
Priests were divided into twenty-four divisions, or courses (דבירי שנים). Each division was further broken down into subdivisions, which were theoretically based on families, and thus called נחלות אבות, Houses of the Fathers. Over each division was a leader, the נושאים והנהנים, and similarly over each subdivision, the נזקק הנהנים.

The Levites were similarly broken down into twenty-four divisions with families, with leaders of each. Each division of Priests and Levites was called upon to serve in the Temple for one week every six months or so. The division actually on duty at the Temple was called the שְׁה יָם, or "Watch." When a division's turn came to serve, the entire body of Priests and Levites travelled to Jerusalem. The various subdivisions, or families, took turns on the days of the week performing the actual Temple duties.

The lay Israelites were also broken down into twenty-four divisions and families, each having its own leader. Unlike the Priests and Levites, however, only a deputation of the division went to Jerusalem during the week of duty, probably consisting of the leaders of the division and families, and other important religious personnel. The remainder of the lay Malahad, or division on duty stayed home, attending the synagogue and fasting on Monday through

---

1. The information on the Priests and Levites is found in I Chron. 23-28, which, although attributing the organization and division of the Priests and Levites to David, undoubtedly reflects its own post-Exilic Sitz im Leben. This division is reflected in the New Testament and the Mishnah.

2. The details concerning this are primarily to be found in Tanakh IV.
Thursday of that week. The creation story was read in the synagogues.

The leaders of divisions and families of Priests, Levites and Israelites are often referred to in the Mishnah as "elders," and may be the elders of Israel of which the New Testament speaks. 1

The functions of the Priests were to administer and officiate at the sacrifices and to administer the Temple stores, furniture and treasury. The lesser duties of Temple administration were performed by the Levites, who also served as gatekeepers, Temple police and musicians. There were permanent officials for certain functions, such as officiating over the daily allocation of priestly duties by lot, the preparation of the shewbread, meal-offerings and frankincense. The Master of Psalmody and Temple Physician were also permanent officials. 2

The lay deputation, or Ma'amad of Israelites, which accompanied the Priests and Levites to Jerusalem participated in the Temple worship by literally "standing by" or "watching" ( chaiy) during the sacrifices, and holding a simultaneous synagogue service. This was probably conducted in the Hall of the Israelites by the Corinthian Gate (see above). This service was referred to as the Ma'amadoth service. Thus a vital connection was maintained between the Temple and the Synagogue.

1. Yoma I, 5; Tamid I, 1; Middoth I, 8. The leader of the division on duty, or Ma'amad, is called the ḫay, Tamid V, 6.
The normal priestly dress consisted of white linen breeches, a white linen coat extending to the feet, and a linen girdle embroidered in purple, scarlet and blue. A white linen turban was worn on the head, and the priests normally went barefoot.\(^1\) The High Priest was present only on occasion. His priestly vestments were very elaborate, and the details are described in Josephus.\(^2\) One item of special interest may be mentioned, the ephod, or cape, the front of which was adorned with twelve precious stones, in four rows of three each: sardonyx, topaz, emerald; carbuncle, jasper, sapphire; agate, amethyst, jacinth; and onyx, beryl and chrysolite. These supposedly represented the twelve tribes of Israel as well as the twelve signs of the zodiac.\(^3\)

D. TEMPLE SERVICE AND THE DAILY SACRIFICE

The worship of the Temple centred around the sacrificial offerings to Yahweh. There were both public and private offerings. The most important public sacrifices were the daily burnt-offerings; the additional burnt-offerings on Sabbaths, new moons and holy days; sin-offerings on new moons and holy days; the priestly and congregational sin-offerings and the scapegoat on the Day of Atonement. There were other, infrequent sacrifices such as

2. Wars V, v.
those at the consecration of the Temple or altar, the installation of priests, and the red heifer offering to make holy water for purging ritual uncleanness from contact with a dead body.¹

The daily burnt-offering, performed at dawn and mid-afternoon, was the most familiar service and formed the basic sacrificial pattern. Thus we present a brief description of the morning sacrifice.²

The Priests on duty arose early, washed and clothed themselves, and assembled in the Hall of Gazith, or Polished Stones (see above). The first of four lots was then cast, to determine who should cleanse and prepare the altar. The Priest chosen then washed his hands and feet at the brazen laver, mounted the altar and removed the ashes. Meanwhile the rest of the Priests washed themselves, and then finished preparing the altar.

Upon re-assembling in the Hall of Gazith the second lot was cast to determine the twelve priests who should prepare the sacrifice. This involves the cleaning and preparing of the altar of incense and the candlestick; the slaughter of the animal, a perfect male yearling lamb, the sprinkling of the blood upon the altar; the flaying and preparation of the animal; and the procuring of the fine-flour offering, the baked-meal offering, and the wine-offering.

1. Detailed discussions of both the public and private sacrifices may be found in George Foot Moore, "Sacrifice," EB, 1903, and Kennedy and Snaith, op.cit.

2. The details are taken from the Mishnah tractate Tamid, which accords basically with Pentateuchal instructions and seems to preserve an accurate tradition.
Then the Priests re-assembled again in the Hall of Gazith and performed the Shema service, consisting of only one blessing before, (probably the Yotzer), the recitation of the Decalogue, the Shema, the Geullah blessing, the Abodah prayer, and the Priestly Benediction.¹

Then the third and fourth lots were chosen, and the remainder of the sacrificial service was carried out. First was the offering of incense. This involved five Priests. As they approached the sanctuary an official called the Hazzan, who seemed to be a sort of steward, assured that it was light "as far as Hebron," a trumpet blew and the gate to the sanctuary was opened. The five Priests entered past the veil into the Holy Place. The one who had prepared the Altar of Incense removed his utensil, prostrated himself, and left. The one who had prepared the Candlestick completed trimming the lamps, prostrated himself and withdrew. A third priest emptied a coal, which he had taken from the Great Altar and placed in a golden pan, onto the Altar of Incense prostrated himself and left. The fourth arranged the incense, prostrated himself and left. Then at the signal of the Hazzan, the fifth priest emptied the golden saucer of incense on the altar, and the incense ascended in clouds of smoke. This was a solemn moment, at which the people withdrew from the Court of the Israelites, prostrated themselves and spread out their hands in silent prayer and adoration. The priest also prostrated himself and withdrew from the sanctuary.

A public recitation of the Shema and its blessings was then conducted, probably in the Hall of the Priests and of the Israelites at the Corinthian Gate (see above). The Priestly Benediction was pronounced from the Dukan by the five Priests who had performed the offering of incense. The people responded with "Blessed be the Lord God, the God of Israel, from everlasting to everlasting."

Then the chosen priests, after placing their hands upon the pieces of the animal which they bore, cast them upon the hearth of the Great Altar of Burnt-Offering. The two meal-offerings were oiled and salted and laid on the fire. Finally the drink-offering of strong wine was poured out as an oblation at the foot of the altar.

At this point two priests standing on the Table of Fat (see above) blew a long blast, three short blasts, and another long blast on their trumpets. Cymbals clashed and the Levitical choir broke out into the Psalm of the day. It was sung in three sections; at the end of each the two priests blew a long blast, three short blasts and a long blast on their trumpets, at which the worshippers prostrated themselves. This concluded the service and private sacrifices followed.

The daily Psalms were as follows: first day, 24; second, 48; third, 82; fourth, 94; fifth, 81; sixth, 93; and Sabbath, 92.

The evening sacrifice began about 3 p.m. It was the same as the morning sacrifice, except that the incense was offered after the sacrifice.
E. CALENDAR

Temple Judaism of the first century followed the Babylonian lunar calendar. Days were reckoned from evening to evening. There were seven days in a week. The seventh was a holy day, and its observance was strictly enjoined as fundamental to Jewish religion. The people ate sparingly on Friday and prepared the Sabbath meals, so as not to do any work on the Sabbath, which was to be a joyous occasion of feasting and resting. The advent of the Sabbath was marked by the Kiddush and closed by its counterpart, the Habdalah.

The months consisted of twenty-nine or thirty days, and there were twelve months in the year. The year consisted of three hundred and fifty-four days. An intercalary month (we-Adib) of twenty-nine or thirty days was added every two or three years. The beginning of the month, or new moon, was a holy day. Although New Year was celebrated on the first of Tishri, the agricultural new year, the festival calendar dated from the first of Nisan, which was the liturgical new year. The list of months, with dates of festivals and holy days, is as follows:

2. Rosh Hashanah I, 1.
New Year and the Day of Atonement were fasts; the others were feasts. After 70 A.D. fasts were also held on 17th Tammuz, 9th Ab, 3rd Tishri, and 10th Tebet.

Three of the holy days were of special significance for Christianity, and require brief comment.

The Passover, or Feast of Unleavened Bread, was held in commemoration of the Exodus. There was to be absolutely no leaven in the bread, food, or even the house. ① The Passover lamb was slaughtered on the afternoon of 14th Nisan, according to prescribed regulations and rituals. ② After nightfall, on the beginning of 15th Nisan, the Passover celebration was carried out in private homes as follows: ③

First Cup Filled
Passover Kiddush
Blessing over the wine (So Shammai; Hillel reversed these)
Partaking of Unleavened Bread and Bitter Herbs, and Lamb, with Blessings
Second Cup Filled
Geullah Recited (See Appendix III "Synagogue Worship," pp. 282, 308-309.)
Third Cup Filled
Recitation of Grace after Meals
Fourth Cup Filled
Hallel Sung
The Grace of Song

① Pesaḥim I-IV.
② Pesaḥim V-IXIX.
③ Pesaḥim X.
New Year was considered to be an annual day of judgment on mankind. The characteristic liturgical feature was the blowing of the trumpet, symbolizing the judgment. It is not known at what point it was blown in the Temple service, but in the synagogues it was blown in connection with the Tefillah, or prayer service.\(^1\) There were three special benedictions for the day, the Malkuyot, Zikronot, and Shofarot.\(^2\) These involved the themes of the reign of God, the judgment of God, and the final gathering of Israel. The 'Alenu prayer was also recited.\(^3\) Thus New Year had a distinct eschatological emphasis.

The Day of Atonement was the annual day of confession and expiation. It fitted in well with the season, falling ten days after the call to judgment on New Year. The main details of the service, which was conducted by the High Priest, were as follows.\(^4\)

After incensing the Holy of Holies, the High Priest stood to the west of the Great Altar, facing the Temple, and placing his hands on the head of a bullock, he confessed for all the Priests as follows:

\[
\text{O Lord, I have done wrong, I have transgressed, I have sinned before Thee, I and my house, O Lord! Forgive the wrongdoings, the transgressions, the sins which I have committed and transgressed and sinned before Thee,}
\]

---

2. Rosh Hashanah IV, 6.
4. Details are taken from Lev. 16 and the Mishnah tractate Yoma.
I and my house, as it is written in the Torah of Moses thy servant: "For on this day shall atonement be made for you." The Priests then responded with the Baruk Shem.

Then he went through the same ritual, changing the words of the confession appropriately, as a confession for all the people. Then the bullock was slaughtered and the High Priest sprinkled the blood on the altar as a sin-offering for himself and the priests. The ritual was repeated with the goat as a sin-offering for all the people.

The High Priest then entered the Holy Place and sprinkled the veil before the Holy of Holies with the blood of each animal. Then mingling the blood, he applied it to the four corners of the Altar of Incense. Returning outside, he applied the mingled blood to the surface of the Great Altar.

He then placed his hands upon the scapegoat and prayed for all Israel as follows:

I beseech Thee, O Lord, Thy people the House of Israel have failed, committed iniquity and transgressed before Thee. I beseech Thee, O Lord, atone the failures, the iniquities and the transgressions which Thy people, the House of Israel, have failed, committed and transgressed before Thee, as it is written in the Torah of Moses thy servant, saying: "For on this day shall atonement be made for you, to cleanse you; from all your sins shall ye be clean before the Lord!"

All the people responded with the Baruk Shem.

1. Yoma III, 8.
3. Yoma VI, 2.
The scapegoat was then guided into the wilderness, and the day of mourning and fasting turned into a festival. The High Priest wore his golden vestments to incense the Holy of Holies, but for the remainder of the service he donned garments of pure white linen only.
APPENDIX III
SYNAGOGUE WORSHIP IN THE FIRST CENTURY A.D.

The Temple represented the official cultus and thereby constituted the focus of national religion in first-century Judaism. The centre of daily and Sabbath worship, however, was the synagogue, which thereby played a significant role in the daily religious life of the people. After the destruction of the Temple the synagogue had to assume full responsibility for maintaining the religious life of Judaism, and thus exerted an even greater influence during the thirty years or so leading up to the composition of the Apocalypse. According to the Talmud there were three hundred and ninety-four synagogues in Jerusalem alone at the time of the destruction of the Temple. Although this statement is late and cannot be regarded in any way as certain, it nevertheless preserves an accurate tradition with regard to the proliferation of synagogues in the first century, both in Palestine and the Diaspora. Jesus taught in the synagogues; Paul evangelized in them; early Christians worshipped in them. In fact, the influence of the synagogue and its worship on the early church can hardly be overestimated. As Bousset said, "Wir vergessen nur zu leicht, lem wir diese Formen gottesdienstlichen Lebens verdanken." Thus a

2. Kethuboth 105a.
reconstruction of the worship of the synagogue in the first century is of essential importance both for our understanding of early Christian worship, and, in particular, for our analysis of liturgical influence in the Apocalypse.

A. SOURCES

One is immediately confronted with the problem of sources, or the lack thereof. It is a very tempting solution to turn to the voluminous Rabbinic literature; but it is a very questionable one, as the earliest segment of the Talmud, the Mishnah, was not compiled in its present form until c. 200 A.D. by Rabbi Judah ha-Nasi. This is not to say, however, that the Rabbinic literature must be ruled out entirely.

What then are our sources, and how may they be used?

(1) There are a few passages in the Old Testament and its Apocrypha which may give some evidence as to the origin and existence of synagogues in pre-Christian times. Its value for first century practices is rather limited.

(2) The New Testament contains frequent allusions to the synagogue and to certain of its practices. Obviously no New Testament author is concerned to portray synagogue worship—this is assumed as common knowledge—and thus the references are only made in passing. Their primary importance lies in their value as corroborative evidence for practices referred to in other sources. The Christian (and sometimes anti-Jewish) bias reflected in the New Testament should in no way affect its historical reliability in this regard.
(3) Josephus refers on several occasions to the synagogue and its worship. Although Josephus is definitely pro-Jewish in his perspective, there is no reason why he should not be considered reliable with reference to practices in the synagogue. Josephus' chief value is also corroborative.

(4) Philo makes a few remarks concerning the synagogue, including some references to the practices of the Therapeutae, an Essene sect in Egypt. It should be remembered that the practices of a sect do not necessarily constitute evidence for the mainstream, and that Philo's work has a definite apologetic flavour. Nevertheless, insofar as Philo is in basic agreement with Josephus and the New Testament, he may be considered as reliable evidence.

(5) Archaeological remains of ancient synagogues are of somewhat limited value, inasmuch as the oldest Palestinian ruins only date from the second century A.D. The oldest synagogues, however, can be assumed to represent archaeological patterns (and their corresponding liturgical functions) dating back at least into the first century.

(6) The Palestinian recension of the Eighteen Benedic tions (the Amidah, or Shemoneh Esreh) reconstructed from the papyrus fragments uncovered at the Cairo genizah at the turn of the century afford valuable evidence as to the text of the synagogue prayers in the first century.

(7) The present Jewish liturgies, the Ashkenazic and the Sephardic, which differ only slightly from one another,

especially with regard to daily and Sabbath prayers, contain forms, many of which correspond very closely to the ancient ones. The present liturgies are very useful for reconstructing ancient forms and even texts, when examined in the light of ancient Rabbinic sources.

(8) Finally, the Rabbinic literature itself remains our most important source. It must be used critically, however, and not indiscriminately. There are five basic critical principles for its use:

(1) Since Rabbinic Judaism tended to conserve rather than reform, its literature may be used as evidence for the principles, spirit and tone of first century Judaism; but since it does reflect a different age and situation, one must be very careful in pressing it for details.

(2) The Mishnah represents the oldest tradition. Although not compiled until c. 200 A.D., it was based on the earlier work of R. Aqiba (d. 135 A.D.) and R. Ishmael, followed by R. Meir, in which were arranged cases discussed by the Rabbinic scholars at the Council of Jamnia after the destruction of the Temple. Thus the Mishnah reflects traditions whose roots extend back well into the first


century.  

(3) Practices and rules deemed by R. Johanan ben Zakkai to be so old that they must date from Moses or the Men of the Great Synagogue are certainly ancient enough to have been in use in the first century.

(4) Practices acknowledged as biblical in origin are always older than those which are declared as Rabbinic institutions.

(5) The sayings in the Gemara and other Rabbinic literature which are attributed to the Tannaitic rabbis of the period preceding 100 A.D. may be considered as generally reliable evidence, although these must be used with some caution because of the rabbinic tendency to ascribe an argument to some ancient source to lend it authority.

It must be remembered that the Rabbinic literature is neither history, theology, nor description. It is a practical assortment of deductions based on the Torah for guidance in Jewish religious life, often amplified by illustration and argument. Thus references to liturgical practices are often only mentioned, and we must cull from them carefully what evidence we can for early Jewish worship.

1. Ismar Elbogen, Der jüdische Gottesdienst in seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung (Frankfurt am Main: J. Kauffmann Verlag, 1924) p. 245, contends that the Mishnah must be regarded as a late source for liturgy, since it reflects the worship of its own time.

W.O.E. Oesterley, The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925) pp. 29-34 on the other hand, points to the abundant evidence for the accuracy of the oral tradition of early Rabbinism and the importance of transmitting tradition correctly, and concludes that we are afforded a limited amount of certainty with regard to the use of the Mishnah.

In conclusion then, with the sources at our disposal we feel we can ascertain the following with regard to synagogue worship in the first century:

(1) the forms and practices with some assurance;
(2) the order of service with probability; and
(3) the texts of several liturgical formulae with relative probability.

Before discussing the forms, order and texts of the liturgy, however, we must discuss the origin and development and the organization and architecture of the synagogue.

B. ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT

Synagogue worship was in a very fluid state during the first century. Many new liturgical forms and texts were being introduced and developed. Three main factors contributed to this development in that period:

(1) the continuing adjustment of the Diaspora Jews to their Gentile environment, and the consequent influx of proselytes and "God-fearers;"

(2) the rise of Christianity and other heretical sects within Judaism;¹ and

(3) the destruction of the Temple in 70 A.D.

For our purpose it is not necessary to ascertain what are the pre-Christian elements of the Jewish liturgy.² We

1. "It is important to remember that Judaism, as it existed before the destruction of Jerusalem, was much more complex and richer in content than it afterwards became when Rabbinism secured its final triumph. Rabbinical orthodoxy was only one among other elements before A.D. 70." W.O.E. Oesterley and G.H. Box, The Religion and Worship of the Synagogue (Bath: Sir Isaac Pitman and Sons, Ltd., 1907), pp. 7-8.

2. As in: Oesterley, The Jewish Background, pp. 36-82.
are concerned with Jewish worship right up to the end of the first century at the time of the writing of the Apocalypse, as it interacted with the forces mentioned above.

The exact origin of the synagogue is uncertain, although it probably dates back to the time of the Exile and was established in Palestine in the subsequent restoration under Ezra.\(^1\) Whether the "Men of the Great Synagogue" ever existed or not is uncertain,\(^2\) (and immaterial for our purpose) but the Jews ascribed to this body, supposedly established by Ezra, the completion of the sacred writings,\(^3\)

1. Bousset, op. cit., pp. 197-198, argues that it originated in the Diaspora and by the third century B.C. had still not been imported to Palestine. This is based on (1) his assumption that the concept of the Learning School reflects Persian influence, and thus must have originated among the Exiles and not in Palestine. (2) II Chron. 17.7-9 refers to a temporary measure in Judah to educate the people in the Law of Yahweh; this, concludes Bousset, demonstrates that the synagogue was unknown in Palestine at the time of the Chronicler (third century B.C.). This argument, however, rests upon critical assumptions and presuppositions of the religionsgeschichtliche Schule which are far from universally accepted. The existence of Learning Schools in Persia does not necessarily mean that they gave rise to synagogues among the Jews—although they may have had some influence. The Chronicler is referring to the reign of Jehoshaphat, and even allowing for his theological interest, some degree of historical perspective must be ascribed to him. If there were synagogues in Palestine when the Chronicles were compiled (whenever that was) the Chronicler would not necessarily have assumed that they existed in Jehoshaphat's time. The argument from the silence of the Chronicler is not very convincing.


2. Abrahams, op. cit., accepts the historical existence of this body, and attributes to them the beginnings of the order of service.

the prescription of the various prayers and benedictions,\(^1\) the authorization of the Feast of Purim,\(^2\) and even the prescription of the Rabbinic curriculum of Midrash, Halakah and Haggadah.\(^3\) This at least indicates that the synagogue extends back well into antiquity. It is not unreasonable to suppose that its origins were both in the Exile and in Palestine as the Jews sought to maintain their religion by means of the study of the sacred writings; and that as small groups gathered here and there a sense of community in worship and instruction developed which proved very useful in the preservation of Judaism. It is quite possible that there may have been a body of leaders in Palestine which gave direction to the establishment of worship in the post-Exilic Jewish community. In any case the synagogue was a fixed institution both in the Diaspora and in Palestine by the first century.\(^4\)

The motto of the Men of the Great Synagogue, "Be patient in judgment, rear many disciples, and make a fence around the Torah,"\(^5\) indicates that from ancient times the synagogue had stood for the study and application of the Torah to daily life, and the instruction of the people in the Torah and its Rabbinic exposition. Thus the original purpose of the synagogue was not as a worship substitute for

\(^1\) Berakoth 33a.  
\(^2\) Megilla 2a.  
\(^3\) Pal. Shekalim 48c.  
\(^4\) As Bousset acknowledges, *op.cit.*, p. 198.  
\(^5\) Pirke Aboth I, 1.
the Temple cultus, but as a place for scripture reading and its exposition. F.C. Grant may well be correct in his contention that the Hasidim, who may have been forerunners of the Pharisees, made the synagogue a true meeting place of prayer and devotion to God.\(^1\) In any case, by the first century it had developed into a regular institution of worship as well as scriptural exposition.

Although the synagogue only replaced the Temple as a liturgical institution after the latter's destruction, it did maintain a close organic relation with the Temple. We know from Tamid V, 1 that the morning Temple liturgy corresponded closely with the first section of the synagogue worship.\(^2\) Liebrich has shown the close correlation of the synagogue liturgy with Nehemiah 9.5-37, from which he concludes that this liturgy has been shaped in large measure by the text of this passage, and is therefore very old.\(^3\) We would suggest rather that this indicates the dependence of both Neh. 9.5-37 and the basic form of the synagogue liturgy on the ancient Temple practice. Whichever of the three is most ancient, there would seem to be a definite relationship among them.

Of interest in this connection is the Ma'amadoth service, performed in the Temple by representatives of the people. It was based on the principle that the two daily

1. Grant, op. cit., p. 41. Martin Hengel maintains that the Hasidim were common forerunners of both Pharisees and Essenes, Judaism and Hellenism (London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1974), p. 176.
2. See Appendix II, "Temple Worship," pp. 256-257
burnt-offerings (Numbers 28.1-4) could not be brought to the altar unless the donor was present.\(^1\) Therefore Israel was partitioned into twenty-four divisions of priests and Levites in I Chronicles 23.6 - 25.31. From each of these divisions, or "watches" (mishmar) of priests, Levites and "Israelites" were sent to the Temple as representatives of the people. Each watch served in this capacity for one week, twice a year. These ma'amadoth ("standers," or observers) prayed over the sacrifice of their brethren, while the rest of the ma'amadoth assembled in their synagogues, and fasted on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday of that week.\(^2\)

By the first century we find numerous references to the synagogue, and it is quite clear that its main purpose continued to be instruction in the Torah; therefore the prevailing character of the worship service was didactic.\(^3\) No doubt much of Jesus' teaching in the synagogues in Palestine was done in the context of the daily and Sabbath worship,\(^4\) as was Paul's in the synagogues of the Diaspora.\(^5\) Nevertheless, it was during this period that liturgical forms and texts were taking definite shape around the praise and prayer sections of the liturgy.

With the destruction of the Temple the synagogue increasingly took on the nature of a substitute for Temple

---

1. This and the following details are given in Ta'anith IV.
4. Cf. Mt. 4.23; Mk. 1.21; Lk. 4.15, 6.6, 13.10; Jn. 6.59, 18.20.
worship, so that by the time of R. Raba (d. A.D. 352) Psalm 90.11, "Lord, thou hast been our dwelling place," was understood to refer to synagogues and houses of instruction.\(^1\)

The synagogue increasingly became the centre of the Jewish community, serving not only as the house of worship, but as the school, assembly hall, and even a place of lodging.\(^2\)

Toward the end of the first century the political situation, the threat from Christianity, as well as developments within the mainstream of Judaism led R. Gamaliel II to set the worship in order, especially the prayers, which he termed Shemoneh Esreh (the "Eighteen"). These had long been in use, but were set in order at this time. The Twelfth Benediction, the curse against heretics, was also composed at this time, by one Samuel the Lesser, under Gamaliel's supervision.\(^3\) Thus the basic Jewish liturgy seems to have been quite fixed by the time of the composition of the Apocalypse.

C. ORGANIZATION AND ARCHITECTURE

Elders are frequently mentioned as a distinct group or office in Judaism.\(^4\) The term is often interchangeable with "scribes."\(^5\) It has been inferred from the existence

\(^1\) Megillah 29a.
\(^2\) Glatzer, \textit{op.cit.}, p. 43.
\(^3\) Berakoth IV, 28b, 29a. \textit{cf.} Elbogen, \textit{op.cit.}, pp. 254-255.
\(^4\) \textit{Cf.} Berakoth 11a; Yoma I, 3, 4; Mt. 15.2.
of elders in the early church that the synagogue was presided over by a council of elders. That this inference is justified has been demonstrated by the discovery of the synagogue inscription of Theodotus at Jerusalem, dating from before the destruction of the Temple, in which a group of elders are mentioned as an integral group in the synagogue.

The same inscription also mentions the ἀρχιερεύς. This "head of the synagogue" is referred to in the Mishnah as the Rosh ha-Keneseth, and is frequently mentioned in the New Testament. As far as we know, his office, perhaps honorary, was that of general supervision and oversight, in some ways comparable to that of an early Christian ἐπίσκοπος. He may have been one of the ruling elders chosen for this position. We have some evidence that he decided who should read the scripture and summoned fit persons to give the homily. His main duty was undoubtedly that of conducting the assembly in public worship.

3. That the term "elders" was applied also in a much broader sense is clear from Berakoth 11a. Is it possible that there might be some connection with the Ma'amadoth? (cf. Ta'anith III, 1; see Appendix II, "Temple Worship," pp. 252-253.
4. Yoma VII, 1 and Soṭah VII, 7-8. Extensive references to this office both in Palestine and the Diaspora are listed in Schürer, op. cit., p. 63.
5. Mk. 5.22, 35, 36, 38; Lk. 13.14; Acts 18.8, 17.
6. Cf. Acts 13.15, "rulers of the synagogue." In the Epistle to the Philippians 5.3, Polycarp groups himself as bishop with the body of elders.
7. Yoma VII, 1; Soṭah VII, 7-8.
The hazzan, or minister, seems to have been the regular attendant at the synagogue in charge of the building, the furniture and the scrolls.\(^1\) In the worship service he delivered the scrolls to the reader and received them back.\(^2\) He indicated to the priest when it was time to pronounce the priestly benediction.\(^3\) He enforced synagogue discipline, and even instructed children in reading.\(^4\) He gave the signal to stop work on the approach of the Sabbath.\(^5\) At feasts he told the priests when to blow the trumpets.\(^6\)

The **Sheliah Zibbur** ("apostle," or "representative of the congregation"), whose duty it was to lead in the prayers,\(^7\) and the ᾳναγγέλλων ("reader"), who read the scripture,\(^8\) were probably not officials, but rather terms designating functionary offices filled by various members of the congregation appointed by the head of the synagogue.\(^9\)

The Palestinian synagogues were built facing Jerusalem, as was the tendency also in the Diaspora,\(^10\) a practice

---

2. Yoma VII, 1; Sotah VII, 7-8; Lk. 4.20. The Greek term here is ἀναγγελλων.
4. Makkoth, II, 8; Shabbath I, 3; 13a.
5. Tosephtha Sukkah IV, 11; Shabbath 35b.
which perhaps originated with prayer customs. They seem to have taken the shape either of a basilica or a rectangle, with a nave and two aisles. Benches lined the walls, and the rest of the congregation sat on the floor. The door lintels and pillars of earlier synagogues were often engraved with inscriptions. Perhaps the best known from the first century is that of Theodotus of Jerusalem, already mentioned. Later archaeological remains reflect a certain amount of ornamentation, the usual motifs of which are either biblical, astral or geometric. This sort of thing seems to have had its ups and downs among the Jews, and we cannot speak with any certainty as to its use in the first century. Philo's interpretation of the twelve stones of the High Priest's breastplate as symbols of the twelve signs of the zodiac and Josephus' similar explanation of the twelve loaves of bread in the Tabernacle might indicate that this practice did obtain at that time.

The sources for our knowledge of synagogue furniture are late. We can say with certainty that there was a tebah, or ark of the Torah, which was a portable chest kept

1. Cf. I Kings 8.44,48; Dan. 6.11; Tosephta Berakoth III.
3. p. 274. It contains three references to the head of the synagogue, as well as mentioning the and of the Torah and the of the Commandments as the purpose for building the synagogue.
4. Referred to in Sukenik, op. cit., p. 66. No source is given.
in a closet or chamber and transported into the main hall for services. The scrolls were wrapped in linen cloths and lay in rows on shelves inside. There was also an elevated platform, the βηπα, and a lightweight portable reading desk. The "Seat of Moses" was probably a special chair reserved for the most distinguished elders, usually facing the congregation.

After the destruction of the Temple the synagogue increasingly tended to assimilate the Temple furniture, and it is likely that lamps, candelabra and a laver for ceremonial ablutions were in use toward the end of the century.

D. FORMS AND PRACTICES

Eric Werner has pointed out that the study of Jewish liturgical forms is more valuable in tracing the influence of Jewish worship on Christian worship than the study of texts. The Christians would naturally have altered the texts (or composed new ones) while still being influenced by the forms. The difficulty encountered in attempting to reconstruct fluid first century texts is another reason for

1. Nedarim V, 5; Ta'anith II, 1.
2. Kil'ayim IX, 3; Shabbath IX, 6; Kelim XXVIII, 4; Nega'im XI, 11.
5. Mt. 23.2, 57, 61. See the discussion in Sukenik, op.cit., pp. 57-59.
7. Terumoth XI, 10; Pesaḥim IV, 3. See also Levertoff, op.cit., p. 562.
concentrating on forms. Therefore this section is devoted to the study of the forms and practices of first century synagogue worship. Nevertheless, for our purposes the study of texts is also valuable, and a limited attempt in that direction is made below.¹ That the forms of synagogue worship were essentially the same before the destruction of the Temple as after is confirmed by Philo's descriptions.²

We shall discuss the various forms under the following categories: (1) the Shema and its Blessings; (2) the prayers; (3) the reading and exposition of Scripture; (4) other benedictions and doxologies; (5) acclamations; and (6) music and psalmody.

(1) The Shema and Its Blessings. In the present liturgy the Shema consists of Deut. 6.4-9, Deut. 11.13-21 and Numbers 15.37-41. It is preceded by two blessings, referred to as Yotzer and Ahabah. It is followed in the morning by one blessing, the Geullah (sometimes called 'Emeth we-Yatzib,) and in the evening by two, the Geullah and Hashkibenu.³

That the Shema was recited in the first century is well attested.⁴ The question remains, however, as to its

1. See pp. 306-316.
4. The schools of Hillel and Shammai debated over its manner of recitation (Berakoth I, 4.) Josephus assumed that Moses commanded it to be read twice daily (Antiquities IV, viii, 13). Jesus alluded to it according to Mark 12.29. By that time of R. Judah (c. 150 A.D.) its sections are referred to by their liturgical titles. (Contd.)
first century form, and whether or not the accompanying blessings were in use.

The first question is not difficult to answer. All three sections were said to have been recited in the Temple liturgy. All three sections are referred to by their liturgical titles by R. Judah (c. 150 A.D.), indicating an earlier tradition. Josephus refers to the first and third sections. The consensus of modern scholarship agrees that by the first century the full biblical text was in use.

Apparently the Decalogue formed an integral part of the Shema, being recited just before Deut. 6.4 in the Temple service. The Nash Papyrus seems to corroborate its use in the synagogues of the Diaspora as well. Its use was

Contd.) (Berakoth II, 2), a fact which reflects a long-standing practice. It formed an integral part of the Temple liturgy (Tamid V, 1), from which, apparently, it was taken over early by the synagogue. Further evidence is discussed in Oesterley, The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy, pp. 44-46.

1. Tamid V, 1.
2. Berakoth II, 2.
4. Cf. Elbogen, op.cit., p. 250; Oesterley, The Jewish Background, pp. 44 ff., C.W. Dugmore, The Influence of the Synagogue upon the Divine Office (London: Oxford University Press, 1944), pp. 19-20; See Blau, op.cit., for an interesting and perhaps correct account of the development of the Shema and its blessings. Blau also concludes that the Shema was recited in full by the first century, pp. 187-190. Liebrich, op.cit., maintains that the Shema was patterned after Neh. 9.5 ff.
5. Tamid V, 1; Berakoth 12a.
6. As pointed out by Jacob Mann, "Genizah Fragments of the Palestinian Order of Service,"HUCA, II (1925), pp. 283-284; although cf. possible evidence to the contrary in Berakoth 12a.
discontinued after the destruction of the Temple because the "heretics" (Jewish Christians or gnostics?) were insinuating that it was the only valid part of the Torah.\(^1\)

The first of the blessings, Yotzer, has been lengthened to its present form, which contains two alphabetical acrostics which had not yet been incorporated at the beginning of the Gaonic period (c. 600 A.D.).\(^2\) Its first century text is discussed below. Levertoff maintains that it can hardly be first century at all; in fact it shows evidence of a definite Christian influence.\(^3\) This is seen in its reflection of Mt. 5.45 and Jn. 5.10-18, in which Jesus speaks of the Father's continual work in creation. Against this we would argue that it is more likely that Jesus (and the gospel tradition) would reflect Jewish worship than the other way around. Furthermore, it is very doubtful that we can assume that the Yotzer phrase, "who renews every day, continually, the work of 'in the beginning'" should arise out of reaction to Jesus' teaching. Levertoff also argues that "the work of 'in the beginning'" is the genuine Rabbinic phrase for the work of creation, and is not found in pre-Christian Jewish literature. But how much pre-Christian Jewish literature do we have, especially Rabbinic? If there were more the historian's task would not be so difficult! The argument from silence is unconvincing.

---

2. Elbogen, op.cit., p. 18.
3. Levertoff, op.cit., p. 68.
There are three strong arguments, in fact, in favour of its first century use. Rather than reflecting a Christian influence, it represents a definite reaction to Persian dualism in its emphasis on God as the Creator of both light and darkness. The Mishnah refers to two blessings before the Shema, according to R. Judah (c. 150 A.D.), and the Gemara interprets the first to be Yotzer. Josephus and Philo refer to the practice of the Essenes of praying at dawn. Kohler and Blau hold that the Yotzer was certainly one of these prayers. This is supported by the fact that the Rabbinic traditions held that the Essenes concluded the Shema just at sunrise, for which the Yotzer would be most appropriate. Thus we can assert with some assurance that the Yotzer formed a part of the Shema service in the first century.

The second blessing, Ahabah, is regarded by all scholars as quite early. It is referred to in the Mishnah, and the Rabbis concluded that the Mishnah reference in Tamid V, 1, to one blessing in the Temple could have been either Yotzer or Ahabah. Levertoff suggests that it may reflect

1. Berakoth I, 4; II, 1.
2. Berakoth IIb.
4. Ibid., p. 56; Blau, op.cit., p. 192.
5. Berakoth 9b. Cf. references to similar practices in the Wisdom of Solomon 16.28, the Third Book of the Sibyllines 591 ff., and Qumran Scroll 1QS X.
7. Berakoth IIb-12a.
an anti-Pauline polemic, but this is unlikely. On the contrary, Eph. 1.5 seems to reflect the longstanding use of the Ahabah. First century Judaism believed in the love of God for Israel and the centrality of the Law, entirely apart from an anti-Pauline reaction.

The third blessing, Geullah, which immediately follows the Shema, is referred to by name in the Mishnah by R. Judah (c. 150 A.D.). It is understood by the Rabbis as a biblical ordinance as opposed to the Shema itself, which is acknowledged as only a Rabbinic ordinance. The language also seems to be reflected in IV Esdras 8.22. This would certainly argue for its antiquity. Blau holds that it reflects a period of foreign domination, and attributes it to the first century of the Roman occupation of Palestine. Even Levertoff, while arguing for a later date, places it between the Crucifixion and the destruction of the Temple.

The Hashkibenu is referred to in the Mishnah as the blessing added to the evening service. It would seem to reflect conditions before expulsion from Palestine, and therefore can be considered as in use in the first century.

The Shema service, then, consisted of the Yotzer and Ahabah; then Deut. 6.4 was recited. At this point the Reader exclaimed in a soft voice, "Blessed be the name of

2. Berakoth II, 1.
his glorious kingdom forever and ever" (Pesahim 56a). Then Deut. 6.5-9, 11.13-21 and Num. 15.37-41 followed. The morning Shema concluded with the Geullah, to which was added the Hashkibenu in the evening.

The Shema itself amounts to a confession of faith. It is enclosed in blessings as follows:

1. God is blessed for his creative work (Yotzer).
2. God is blessed for his love and faithfulness in his elective work (Ahabah).
3. The Decalogue is recited.
4. God is confessed as One, and his Covenant is repeated (Shema).
5. God's Word is acknowledged as true and firm, and he is blessed for his redemptive work (Geullah).
6. In the evening, God is blessed for his protective work, and entreated for peace (Hashkibenu).

The blessings all contain several notable features:

1. They recite the acts of God.
2. They describe attributes of God.
3. They render praise to God.
4. All except Yotzer contain a related petition to God.
5. They end with the formula, "Blessed art thou, O Lord" ("יְהֹוָה יִרְצָה"), followed by a participle describing his work.

A word must be said about the wearing of the tefillin, or phylacteries. These were parchment cases containing scrolls of the Shema, worn on the arm and forehead during the recitation of the Shema. This was done in literal response to Deut. 6.8,11. R. Eliezer ben Hyrcanus (first century) understood Deut. 28.10 to refer to the tefillin on the forehead.

---

2. Berakoth 6a.
The Shema was recited in Hebrew in Palestine, but the Mishnah tells us that it could be recited in any language.\(^1\) It is reasonable to assume, then, that it was recited in Greek in the Diaspora.\(^2\)

2. **The Prayers.** The synagogue is referred to as a place of prayer in the New Testament and Philo.\(^3\) Thus it is clear that for some time prayer had formed an integral part of the liturgy. In the present liturgy the prayer service consists of the Shemoneh Esreh, interspersed with various occasional prayers. The full Eighteen are said in the daily service. The Sabbath service consists of occasional and Sabbath prayers, enclosed by the first three and last three prayers of the Shemoneh Esreh. What can we say about the first century prayer service?

The Talmudic evidence is as follows: The Mishnah states that R. Gamaliel II (c. 100 A.D.), R. Joshua ben Hananiah (c. 100 A.D.), R. Eliezer (c. 100 A.D.), R. Eleazar ben Azariah (c. 130 A.D.) and R. Akiba (d. 132 A.D.) all commented on the daily recitation of the Eighteen Benedictions.\(^4\) R. Joshua, R. Eliezer and R. Akiba mention Benedictions 2, 4, and 9 by name.\(^5\) Special procedures for saying the Benedictions on fast days and Rosh Hashanah are

---

3. Mt. 6.5; Philo, *In Flacc.* 7,14.
5. *Berakoth* V, 2; *Ta'anith* I, 1.
set forth,\textsuperscript{1} indicating a practice in existence for some time. The Rabbis ascribe the institution of the prayers to the Men of the Great Synagogue.\textsuperscript{2} This is probably unhistorical, but it reflects their antiquity. By the time of R. Eleazar ben Pedat (c. 300 A.D.) Psalm 63.5, "So will I bless thee as long as I live; in thy name I will life up my hands," was interpreted as referring to the Shema and prayer services of the liturgy.\textsuperscript{3} In fact, the Rabbinic tradition that the Eighteen were set in order under R. Gamaliel is probably accurate. According to the Rabbis one "Simeon ha-Pakuli arranged the Eighteen Benedictions in order before Rabban Gamaliel in Jabneh."\textsuperscript{4} There was also a tradition that they had been formulated earlier by one hundred and twenty elders (the Men of the Great Synagogue?), and that Simeon only reformulated and re-arranged them.\textsuperscript{5} This tradition undoubtedly seeks to account for the fact that the Benedictions had been in use before Simeon set them in order. In fact, they must have already existed for him to have done so.\textsuperscript{6}

This view is confirmed by the fact that it was also at this time that the last of the Benedictions (of the

\textsuperscript{1} Ta'anith II, 2; Rosh Hashanah IV, 5; Berakoth 29a.
\textsuperscript{2} Berakoth 33a.
\textsuperscript{3} Berakoth 16b.
\textsuperscript{4} Berakoth 28b. The order and biblical basis of each is given in Megilla 17b.
\textsuperscript{5} Megilla 18a.
Palestinian Amidah, "Standing," or prayers), the twelfth, was composed by one Samuel the Lesser under R. Gamaliel's supervision.1 Apparently Christian Jews were still worshipping in the synagogues, and had even infiltrated into positions of leadership, both permanent and functionary. They were probably in the habit of inserting Christian phrases into the Shema and the Amidah.2 To counteract this the twelfth Benediction against heretics, which specifically mentions Christians in the older, Palestinian recension, was composed. The effect was that any Christian who participated in the service would be cursing himself—the reader by repeating the benediction, the congregation by responding "Amen." There is already a reference to this benediction in Justin.3

Further evidence of the existence of the Amidah in the first century is seen in their reflection of Persian influence4 and the apparent acquaintance of the author of the Wisdom of Ben Sirach (c. 175 B.C.) with them. In Ben Sirach 51.2-14 he uses the key phrases of no less than nine of the benedictions with the formula, "Give thanks unto."5

1. Berakoth 28b; Megilla 17b. See Oesterley, The Jewish Background, p. 55.
2. So Elbogen, op.cit., p. 252. The Sheliah would repeat the first three and last three in a loud voice according to tradition, and therefore correctly; but he could Christianize the softly spoken prayers in the middle, to which Christianized prayers the whole Jewish congregation would respond in affirmation with "Amen." Cf. Pesaḥim 56a. Some examples of such Christianized Jewish formulae may be seen in Didache IX, 2, 3; X, 2-6; and the Apostolic Constitutions, Books VII and VIII, especially Ch. 26-27, 33-35 of Book VII.
3. Dialog. cum Trypho 16.
4. As pointed out by Kohler, op.cit., p. 97.
5. See the comparison in Oesterley, The Jewish Background, pp. 55-57.
It seems to us that this is unlikely to be mere coincidence.

Thus we conclude that the Eighteen were in use in the first century, although their order may have been irregular. The latest one was composed toward the end of the century. The question of their text is still open, however, and will be discussed below.

How were the Amidah used in the liturgy? The Mishnah tells us that there were prayer services daily, in the morning, afternoon and evening.\(^1\) From Gamaliel's time the full Eighteen were recited in the daily liturgy, although R. Akiba suggested that four through fifteen could be abbreviated.\(^2\) On Sabbaths and the New Year the first and last three benedictions enclosed special and Sabbath prayers, four to fifteen being omitted.\(^3\) On fast days all eighteen were recited, plus six other special prayers.\(^4\) These traditions reach back at least to Gamaliel II (c. 90-100 A.D.); but what of the first century use of the Amidah?

Some help is gained from further Talmudic evidence. The Mishnah states that women, slaves and children were exempt from saying the prayers, as were others on special occasions.\(^5\) The Gemara reflects a tradition that at one time the prayers were not arbitrary; "he who joins tefillah to the Geullah" is commended.\(^6\) In fact, the prayers seem

---

1. Berakoth IV, 1.
2. Berakoth IV, 3; see also Berakoth 29a.
3. Rosh Hashanah IV, 5; see also Berakoth 29a.
4. Ta'anith II, 2; cf. Berakoth 29a.
6. Berakoth 9b. Perhaps the pause between the Shema and tefillah service taken by the "pious men of old" mentioned in Berakoth IV, 1 reflects an earlier practice which allowed people to leave after the Shema.
to have been said daily by individuals quite apart from the synagogue. ¹

In the light of all this evidence we would suggest the following explanation as a probable hypothesis:

In the first century the Shema formed the essential part of the daily liturgy. After a pause, the tefilloth were said. These consisted of the first and last three benedictions in their present order, recited aloud, and forming a frame for personally recited prayers, said quietly. These personal prayers were often recited by individuals outside the synagogue (cf. Mt. 6.5). By the first century they had assumed stereotyped forms (cf. Mt. 6.7), the best known of which formed the corpus of Benedictions four to fifteen. These were finally set in uniform order at Jabne under R. Gamaliel II by Simeon ha-Pakuli. Thus the basic prayer service in the first century corresponded quite closely with that reflected in the Mishnah, the chief difference being in the order of the Benedictions four to fifteen and their usage on Sabbaths and holy days.

In Amoraic times the prayer service began with the reader's recitation of Psalm 51.15, and closed with the recitation of Psalm 19.14.² There must have been an introduction and conclusion in the first century, and there is no reason why these verses should not have been used then.

The Talmud also records prayers of various Rabbis which were repeated at the conclusion of Psalm 19.14.³

¹ Berakoth 16a.
² As in the present liturgy; Berakoth 4b, 9b.
³ Berakoth.16-17a...
Their common characteristic was a petition for deliverance from sin, introduced by the formula, "May it be thy will." This is still practiced today, and it seems not unreasonable to assume that some similar prayers were in use in the first century.

That the prayers were said standing is obvious from the title "Amidah," which means "Standing." The prayers seem to have been recited by a reader, or Sheliah, who stood in front of the ark. The first and last three were repeated in a loud voice and the rest softly. The congregation responded to each prayer with "Amen." They could be recited in the local tongue.

The Amidah resemble the Shema blessings. They all conclude with the same formula, "Blessed art thou, O Lord," followed by a brief description of the act or attribute of God around which the benediction centres. They recite the acts of God, describe the attributes of God, and offer up praise, thanksgiving, intercession, confession and petition.

The first three are dominated by a note of praise. Benedictions four to fifteen are petitions, intercessions, and confessions as follows:

- Petition: for knowledge (4), repentance (5), comfort (7), healing (8), prosperity (9), acceptance of prayer (15).

---

1. Berakoth V, 1 explicitly mentions standing for prayer. It is probable also that some, at least, lifted their hands in the ancient manner of prayer. Berakoth 16b; cf. I Clement 29.1.
Intercession: for the exiles (10), judges and rulers (11), against apostates (12), for proselytes (13), Jerusalem and the Temple (14).

Confession: of sin and prayer for mercy (6).

The last three benedictions are petitions for acceptance, guidance and general well-being, and peace (see texts below).

3. The Reading and Exposition of Scripture. The high point of the synagogue worship was still the reading and exposition of Scripture. Josephus and Philo both refer to it as a place of instruction in the Law.¹ The New Testament speaks of it as a place of Scripture reading,² teaching,³ preaching,⁴ study of scripture,⁵ and disputation.⁶

The Mishnah reckons the order of importance of the property of the synagogue in the ascending order: synagogue, ark, wrappings, scrolls, Torah.⁷ According to R. Johanan (d. 279 A.D.) the reading of the Torah was more important than the Temple sacrifices.⁸

We do not know with certainty when and how the public reading of the Scriptures originated, but it may well go back to Ezra and the time of the Return.⁹ At any rate, by

---

1. See the references above, p. 272, fn. 3.
2. Acts 15.21 (Law); Lk. 4.16-30 (the Prophets); and Acts 13.14-15 (Law and Prophets).
3. Mt. 4.23, 9.35, 13.54; Mk. 1.21, 6.2; Lk. 4.15,31, 6.6, 13.10; Jn. 6.59, 18.20; Acts 17.2ff., 26, 19.8.
5. Acts 17. 10,11.
7. Megillah IV, 1.
8. Megillah 3b.
the first century it was considered an ancient and universal practice. Blau suggests the following phases of development of the public reading of the Torah: first it was read on feast days, then on new moons, then on the Sabbath, then on Monday and Thursday. Once it had become a custom the need was felt for it to be read daily; but this would have placed too great a burden on the people, so the Shema was chosen instead. This may be accurate in the main, although the conjecture about the Shema is somewhat questionable.

The origin of the exposition is also uncertain. The Rabbis understood Neh. 8.8 to refer to a targum, which would indicate great antiquity for the practice of spoken interpretations. They may well be correct. The references above (p. 290, fn. 3-6) indicate that the exposition was a widespread custom in the first century.

The procedure for the reading and exposition of Scripture, according to the Mishnah, was as follows: the Torah was read on Monday, Thursday and Sabbath mornings, and on Sabbath minhah (afternoon service). On Sabbath morning a haftarah (addition) from the Prophets was read as well. The procedure outlined for the Yom Kippur service was undoubtedly the usual one for the synagogue:

the attendant would take the scroll from the ark and hand it to the head of the synagogue, who would hand it to the first of the three readers whom he had summoned from the congregation. The first reader would then pronounce a blessing, and standing in front of the ark, he read one verse at a time, in Hebrew, pausing in between each verse until it had been translated into the local dialect. This procedure would continue throughout the Torah lesson, which had to contain a minimum of three verses, until it was concluded. The third reader would then pronounce a benediction.

On days when the prophets were read, another reader was called, who usually led in the Shema, the Amidah and the Priestly Blessing as well. He also pronounced benedictions before and after the lesson, which was also in Hebrew. He could read three verses at a time, pausing in between for translation. No skipping from place to place was allowed in the Torah lesson, but the reader could read from various passages in the Prophets, as long as he was ready to read again by the conclusion of the translation.

1. Three readers were required to read from the Torah; cf. Megillah III, 1. Precedence for the honour of reading was given first to priests, then Levites, then Israelites, Gitim V, 8.
2. Megillah III, 1. For a more detailed discussion of these blessings see below, pp. 296–297.
4. Megillah III, 3. Certain portions were forbidden to be translated, Megillah III, 7.
Having returned the scroll to the ark, either the reader or someone else summoned by the head of the synagogue could deliver an exposition.

That this procedure was essentially the same in New Testament times is evident from two key passages. Luke 4. 16-21 tells us that in the Palestinian synagogues the Prophets were read on the Sabbath; Jesus was handed the scroll by the attendant; he stood to read; he gave it back to the attendant; he sat down and delivered an exposition. Acts 13.14-16 tells us that in the Diaspora the Law and Prophets were read on the Sabbath; Paul was summoned by the rulers to give an exposition after the reading of Scripture; someone other than the reader could deliver the address; and he stood while expounding. All of these procedures coincide with those found in the Mishnah one hundred and fifty years later, which would indicate that in the main the procedure for the reading and exposition of Scripture was essentially the same. That similar blessings were used is seen partly from the allusion Jesus makes in Jn. 5.39 to the first blessing after the reading of the Torah.¹

A final word must be said about the use of a lectionary. The Mishnah states that certain portions of Scripture were assigned to be read for the great festivals, New Year, Day of Atonement, all eight days of Tabernacles, Feast of Dedication, Purim, new moons, fast days, and four Sabbaths out of the five or six preceding the first day of Nisan. Aside from these, the "usual order" is to be resumed.² Thus

¹ See the text infra, p. 315.
² Megillah IV, 5-6.
a Pentateuchal lectionary was in use at the time of the composition of the Mishnah.

But what was the usual order, and was it used in the first century? R. Meir (c. 150 A.D.) ruled that a continuing cycle of lessons should be read on Monday–Thursday–Sabbath. His contemporary, R. Judah ben Ila'i, taught that it was continued only from Sabbath to Sabbath. ¹ Elbogen has calculated that this would require approximately two and one-third years under R. Meir's plan, and five and one-half under R. Judah's.² This would seem to indicate that authorities recognized no standard cycle of lessons to be finished within a fixed period of time.³

But this does not necessarily follow. Elbogen's calculations are based on his assumption that each lesson averaged twenty-one verses, and is not intended to be authoritative. Furthermore, it is not at all clear that R. Meir and R. Judah differed over the overall length of the cycle; on the contrary, a closer examination of the passage in question reveals that they differed over whether the prescribed lesson should be divided into four sections to be read at the four Torah services in the week (Sabbath morning, Sabbath minḥah, Monday and Thursday morning), or whether the whole lesson should be read each time. We know that a triennial cycle was later followed in Palestine.⁴

---

¹ Megillah 31b.
² Elbogen, op.cit., p. 160.
³ So Moore, op.cit., p. 299.
⁴ Megillah 29b.
Under R. Meir's plan this would mean an average of twelve verses each lesson; R. Judah's average would be forty-eight, not an unthinkable number. In fact, the latter view prevailed.\(^1\) From this we conclude that a triennial Pentateuchal cycle was probably followed in the middle of the second century. A haftarah cycle had not yet developed, as is evident from the provision that the reader could skip from place to place in the Prophets.\(^2\) Undoubtedly the reason for the prohibition of skipping from place to place in the Torah was that it would not follow the lectionary cycle.

But the question remains as to its first century use. We do not have any definite evidence, so we cannot be certain. Two arguments do favour its use, however. (1) A developed cycle that was in use around 150 A.D. would probably have been in use for some time. Since it had been the tradition long before New Testament times to read from the Law every Sabbath,\(^3\) there is good reason to suppose that the cycle extended back well into the first century, and perhaps earlier. (2) This conclusion is supported by the interesting study of E.G. King in which he argues that the Psalter was arranged in a triennial cycle corresponding to that of the Pentateuch, for use in the Temple liturgy.\(^4\) He is

1. Megillah 31b-32a.
4. Edward G. King, "The Influence of the Triennial Cycle upon the Psalter," JTS, V (1903-04), pp. 203-213. King gives an interesting account of the possible influence of the Pentateuchal cycle on the New Testament. One example is that the first year of the cycle would have the story of Babel occurring at the season of Pentecost. The possible influence on Luke's account in Acts 1-2 is obvious. Abrahams, op.cit., pp. 10-12, gives additional examples. This interesting suggestion would bear further investigation.
supported by Abrahams, who thus concludes that the triennial cycle must have been in use during New Testament times. While we would hesitate to state any conclusion as certain, we would agree with Abrahams that this was probably the case.1

4. Benedictions and Doxologies. It is somewhat difficult to classify the material here designated as "Benedictions and Doxologies." It consists of various short liturgical formulae inserted into the service in much the same manner as similar material in Christian liturgies. These formulae are very important for our study, however, as they tend to be the most familiar and therefore the most easily remembered parts of the liturgy, and would be most likely to influence the forms and language of Christian liturgy.

(1) There are numerous short blessings prescribed in the Mishnah for all sorts of things, from meals2 to earthquakes.3 They are all short and begin with similar formulae: "Blessed be he who..."4 "Let us bless the Lord our God, the God of Israel, the God of hosts, who dwells among

2. See Berakoth VI-VIII where the subject is dealt with in considerable detail.
3. Berakoth IX, 1. Cf. Berakoth 60b, which mentions by name most of the short blessings in the present liturgy.
the cherubim..."\(^1\) "Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the Ages, who..."\(^2\) The latter formula is used to introduce blessings in the liturgy at three points: when putting on the phylacteries; as the first sentence of the Yotzer prayer, and just before and after the reading of the Torah. There is no way of knowing for certain if the first usage is first century, though phylacteries were worn. We know the Yotzer prayer is, and the blessings of the Torah seem to be,\(^3\) especially in that the language of the concluding Torah blessing seems to be reflected in Jn. 5.39. The texts are given below.

(2) The Priestly Benediction (Num. 6.22-28) undoubtedly originated in the Temple service. It was taken over by the synagogues and pronounced in Hebrew\(^4\) at the conclusion of the Amidah.\(^5\) The priest lifted his hands to his shoulders\(^6\) and uttered the benediction in three parts, the congregation responding "Amen" to each.\(^7\)

(3) The Baruk Shem, "Blessed be the name of his glorious Kingdom forever and ever," also goes back to Temple usage. We find its prototype in Psalm 72.19. On the Day of Atonement, when the High Priest mentioned the Divine Name, the congregation in the Temple would bend their knees, bow

---

1. This is the formula for meals, Berakoth VIII, 2.
2. Berakoth 32a, 40b.
5. Megillah III, 2; Soṭah 38b.
7. Tamid VII, 2; Soṭah VII, 2.
down, fall on their faces and call out the Baruk Shem.¹ It was also repeated after every blessing.² It was taken over by the synagogue and inserted in the Shema as an exclamation of praise to be recited immediately after the opening phrase (Deut. 6.4).³ Originally it was recited softly, but later the Rabbis ruled that it be recited loudly. According to R. Abbahu (3rd century) this had been done on account of the heretics.⁴ At R. Abbahu's time it was still recited softly in Nehardea, where there were no heretics. This raises the interesting question of who the heretics were. If, as seems likely, they were Jewish Christians, then we must ask what they were doing that should have caused it to be changed. A possible explanation is that perhaps they were "Christianizing" it by adding a Christian phrase to it, such as "and of his Christ," as apparently they were doing in the Amidah benedictions,⁵ and that this change was enacted at about the same time as the anti-Christian benediction in an attempt to expurgate the Christians from the synagogues.

(4) The Bareku consists of a command and a response:

"Bless ye the Lord who is to be blessed."

"Blessed be the Lord who is to be blessed forever and ever."

This is also a very early formula, based on Neh. 9.5. The phrase "who is to be blessed" was still not universally

1. Yoma III, 5; IV, 1, VI, 2.
2. Berakoth IX.
3. Pesahim 56a, where it is discussed by R. Meir and R. Jüdah (c. 150 A.D.).
4. Ibid.
5. See above, p. 286.
accepted in the time of R. Akiba (d. 132 A.D.), but was in widespread use. It was used as a call to worship before the Shema, and probably as a brief call to praise before the first blessing of the Torah.

(5) The Kaddish is an ancient doxology, originally recited by teachers at the conclusion of a discourse. This is reflected in its language, which is the Aramaic dialect of the Targums. This alone indicates its antiquity. Other evidences of its antiquity are the short and simple character of its eschatological petitions, in which there is no reference to a personal Messiah; its lack of reference to the destruction of the Temple; and its similarity to the first three petitions of the Lord's Prayer. It is frequently referred to in the Babylonian Gemara. It begins with the phrase, "Magnified and sanctified be his great name," and the nucleus is found in the congregational response, "Let his great name be blessed forever and to all eternity." The keynotes are the glory of God and the speedy expectation of his Kingdom. Three different Kaddishes are used in the present liturgy, plus the "Half-Kaddish," which is simply the first part, common to all. It is this Half-Kaddish which is written in the Aramaic dialect of the Targums, and is therefore first century. It was used as a liturgical framework, being recited at the beginning and end of the

2. It was definitely used this way by the time of Raba (d. 352 A.D.), Berakoth 50b.
4. Berakoth 3a; Sotah 49a; Shabbath 119b.
service, and as a transition between the main parts of the service. (See full text below).

(6) The Kedushah is an ancient doxology, the nucleus of which consists of Isaiah 6.3 coupled with Ezek. 3.12 and Ps. 146.10. Its antiquity is attested by the fact that there is no debate over it in the Talmud. R. Judah (c. 150 A.D.) is mentioned in the Toseftah as repeating it after the third of the Eighteen Benedictions.\(^1\) It is still used so today, and undoubtedly was repeated during the prayer service of the first century liturgy. The nucleus of Isa. 6.3 and Ezek. 3.12 is also repeated as the conclusion to the Yotzer prayer in the present liturgy; authorities generally acknowledge this use as first century as well.\(^2\) It is undoubtedly the forerunner of the Trisagion found in Christian liturgies. (See text below)

(7) There were several short, biblical doxologies which had their origin in Temple worship and which were incorporated into the synagogue liturgy at various places. Their liturgical function was to arouse the congregation to an affirmation of their faith, through the response, "Amen." According to Werner the primary ones were Ps. 72.19, 89.53, 41.14, 106.48, 115.18, 146.10; I Chron. 16.36; and Exod. 15.18.\(^3\) Their chief emphases are the glory and sovereignty of God in space and time.

---

1. Toseftah Berakoth I, 9. Blau maintains that it was earlier than the Amidah, op. cit., p. 196.
The primary formal characteristics of all these blessings and doxologies are:

1. God is always the object, being either addressed in the formula, "Blessed art thou," or referred to, "Blessed is he who..."
2. God's glory and sovereignty is always stressed.
3. It is always a praise into infinity.
4. Almost all follow the reader-congregational response pattern.

Two more liturgical elements must be mentioned in this section, the 'Alenu prayer and the Kiddush.

The 'Alenu prayer is now found at the conclusion of the daily morning service. Originally it was part of the New Year liturgy, and was only incorporated into the daily service after the first century. Nevertheless it seems to have formed a basic part of the New Year liturgy as early as the first century, as Kohler has vigorously argued. The prayer is essentially a proclamation of God's kingship, both over Israel and the whole creation, and a prayer for the glorious consummation of his Kingdom. Like the Kaddish, it bears certain resemblances to the Lord's Prayer, which also argues for its first century use. (See the text below)

The Kiddush was a ceremony ushering in the Sabbath and the great festivals. Its first century use is almost universally recognized. Today it is observed in the synagogue; in New Testament times, however, it took place

3. See the numerous arguments adduced by Oesterley, The Jewish Background, pp. 79-80.
in private homes after a quasi-religious meal. It is of special interest to Christian historians as a possible antecedent of the Eucharist, especially as it included a ceremonial blessing and partaking of the cup and bread. There were additions to the Kiddush for the festivals and New Year. The basic text is given below.

5. **Acclamations.** There were four basic acclamations in the liturgy which require brief discussion, the Amen, Hallelujah, Hosanna, and Selah. The Amen, as has already been mentioned, is a congregational affirmation of faith in response to a prayer, blessing or doxology.

The Hallelujah ("Praise God") was usually juxtaposed to "Amen" as in Ps. 106.48, as an exultant ending to a doxology or blessing. It has always been understood in connection with singing performed by men or angels. It was used as a call to praise as well as a response, often in connection with the singing of Psalms.

The Hosanna ("Save now") was originally both a plea for salvation and royal acclaim. Its use in the synagogue was confined to the Hallel, and so was chanted at festivals.

The Selah is an obscure acclamation, perhaps having some original connection with music. In the synagogue liturgy it came to mean "forever," as in the Yotzer prayer.

The acclamations served three liturgical functions:

1. Ibid., pp. 167-171.
2. See the excellent and thorough discussion in Werner, op.cit., pp. 263-268.
3. Ibid., pp. 301-303.
4. Cf. Mt. 21.9; Mk. 11.9-10.
as demonstrations of the active participation of the community in worship; as loud confirmations and professions of faith; and as outlets for spontaneous outbursts of religious emotion.

6. Music and Psalmody. It is clear that the Psalms were used in the Temple. They eventually came into use in the synagogue, especially after the destruction of the Temple. It is unclear as to the extent of their use in the first century, as it was a period of transition and development. Certainly after the destruction of the Temple they came into more widespread use.

It is evident from contemporary sources that singing formed some part of synagogue worship. The evidence from the Talmud is quite late, although it is reasonable to assume that since the synagogue worship approximated other parts of the Temple liturgy, it made use of music as well. This is also supported by the fact that the early Christians sang at their assemblies. The authorities generally acknowledge that it was the custom to sing Psalms in the first-century synagogue, at least after 70 A.D.

1. Werner, op. cit., p. 265.
2. Ta'anith VII, 3,4; Sukkah IV, 5; cf. I Chron. 6.31.
3. Philo refers to "chants, hymns and songs" being sung, In Flacc. 14.
4. I Cor. 14.26; Eph. 5.19, Col. 3.16.
It is impossible with the present sources to ascertain the exact use of Psalms and music in the synagogue. Apparently it did not form a prominent part, although with the lack of evidence one cannot make any assertion. The Hallel was probably used, as perhaps other Psalms were, especially on feast days.

To what extent the ancient Jewish canticles were used in the first century is also unclear. That some or all were used is probable from the fact that those which were capable of Christological interpretation were rejected and dropped from synagogal use, a fact which would seem to reflect their use during the period of so-called "Jewish Christianity." Only the first two of the original ten remain in use today. The Ten Canticles are:

1. The Song of Moses and Miriam (Exodus 15)
2. The Prayer of Moses (Deut. 32)
3. The prayer of Hannah (1 Samuel 2).
4. The song of Habakkuk (Hab. 3)
5. Isaiah 26
6. Jonah 2.3
7. The prayer of the three men (Daniel 3)
8. Azariah's prayer (Daniel 3)
9. Hezekiah's prayer (Isaiah 38)
10. The apocryphal Hymn of Manasseh


2. Ta'anith VII, 4 lists Psalms to be said for each day of the week: 24, 48, 82, 94, 81, 93, and 92. Besides the Hallel other Psalms used were 19, 33, 34, 91, 95, 100, 134, 136. See the extensive discussions in Werner, op.cit., pp. 145ff; Kohler, op.cit., p. 91; Oesterley, The Psalms in the Jewish Church (London: Skeffington and Son, 1910) pp. 129-151.

3. Werner, op.cit., pp. 139-140.
We stated earlier that it is possible to ascertain the first century forms and practices with some assurance, and the order of service with probability. On the basis of having determined the forms and practices, the order of service in the first century, at least toward the end, can be reconstructed somewhat as follows:

**Kaddish**

**Call to Worship (Bareku)**

**Shema Service**
- Yotzer (with Kedushah)
- Ahabah
- Decalogue
- Shema (with Baruk Shem)
- Geullah
  (Hashkibenu added here in the evening)

**Kaddish**

**Tefillah Service**
- Psalm 51.15
- Amidah 1-3 (recited aloud)
- Kedushah
  (Weekdays: Amidah 4-15, recited quietly)
  (Fast days: added six other prayers)
  (Sabbaths and New Year: substituted special and occasional prayers)
- Amidah 16-18 (recited aloud)
- Psalm 19.14
- Prayer of Dedication ("May it be thy will, our Father...")

**Priestly Blessing**

**Kaddish**

**Reading and Exposition of Scripture (Monday, Thursday and Sabbath morning, Sabbath afternoon)**
- Bareku
- Torah Benediction
- Torah Lesson
- Torah Benediction
  (On Sabbath morning a lesson from the Prophets was added as follows:-
  - Prophets Benediction
  - Prophets Lesson
  - Prophets Benediction
- Exposition

**Kaddish**
Special prayers and benedictions were inserted on holy days. It is difficult to determine when Psalms were sung, if they were, but it is probable that they were used in connection with the reading of the Torah and with the Kaddish as liturgical framework. 1

F. TEXTS

The exact texts of the first century Jewish liturgical formulae would be most helpful for our purposes of analyzing Jewish liturgical influences in Christian worship. It is very difficult to ascertain their textual forms, however, not only because of the scarcity of sources, but also because of the apparent fluidity of Jewish liturgy in the transitional period of the first century. Nevertheless, we shall attempt reconstructions of liturgical texts which may be considered with relative probability as essentially those which were in use in the first century. The texts are given in the order in which they appear in the liturgy as reconstructed above.

Kaddish: (Reader.) - Magnified and sanctified be his great name in the world which he hath created according to his will. May he establish his kingdom during your life and during your days, and during the life of all the house of Israel, even speedily and at a near time, and say ye, Amen.

(Cong. and Reader.) - Let his great name be blessed for ever and to all eternity.

(Reader.) - Blessed, praised and glorified, exalted, extolled and honored, magnified and lauded be the name of the Holy One, blessed

1. A very helpful summary of all the liturgies for holy days and festivals as well as regular worship may be found in Werner, op. cit., pp. 6-14.
be he; though he be high above all the blessings and hymns, praises and consolations, which are uttered in the world; and say ye, Amen.1

Bareku: (Reader.) - Bless ye the Lord who is to be blessed.

(Cong. and Reader.) - Blessed is the Lord who is to be blessed forever and ever.

Shema Service

Yotzer. Oesterley follows Zunz2 in his reconstruction of the Yotzer, and there is a strong probability that its first century text was somewhat as follows:

Blessed art thou, 0 Lord our God, King of the Age, who formest light and createst darkness, who makest peace and createst all things:

Who in mercy givest light to the earth and to them that dwell thereon, and in thy goodness renewest the creation everyday continually.

Be thou blessed, 0 Lord our God, for the excellency of thy handiwork, and for the bright luminaries which thou has made: they glorify thee forever. (Selah.)

Blessed art thou, 0 Lord, Creator of the luminaries.3

The Kedushah text, which was added on to the Yotzer, is given in the Amidah below.

Ahabah. There is universal agreement as to the text of the original Ahabah. The text, following Zunz,4 is as follows:

1. Unless otherwise indicated, the translations are those of the Daily Prayer Book, except for minor alterations to bring out more clearly the literal meaning of the Hebrew texts, which may also be found in the Daily Prayer Book.


3. Elbogen, op.cit., p. 18 does not feel that the third paragraph is as early as the rest, but it may well be first century.

With abounding love hast thou loved us, O Lord our God, with great and exceeding pity hast thou pitied us. O our Father, our King, for our fathers' sake, who trusted in thee, and whom thou didst teach the statutes of life, be also gracious unto us and teach us. Enlighten our eyes in thy Law, and let our hearts cleave to thy commandments, and unite our hearts to love and fear thy name, so that we may never be put to shame. For thou art a God who worketh salvation. Thou hast chosen us from all peoples and tongues, and hast brought us near unto thy great name forever in faithfulness, that we might in love give thanks unto thee and proclaim thy unity. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who hast chosen thy people in love.

Shema: Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God, the Lord is One.

(Baruk Shem) Blessed be the name of his glorious kingdom forever and ever.

Then follow Deut. 6.5-9; 11.13-21; and Num. 15.37-41.

Geullah. It is more difficult to reconstruct the early form of the Geullah. Blau holds that originally it consisted of only the last five words: "Blessed art thou, O Lord, who has redeemed Israel." Zunz maintains that it contained forty-five words. Levertoff tentatively accepts the first two paragraphs. Oesterley agrees with Zunz, but maintains that by the first century most of it was in use. There is little reason to reject most of it as distinctly post-Christian. Furthermore, the Mishnah refers to a long blessing after the Shema, which accords well with the Geullah. Thus we present here the text according to Oesterley as that which was probably in use in the first century:

2. Quoted in Oesterley, The Jewish Background, p. 49.
3. Levertoff, op.cit., p. 70.
5. Berakoth 14a.
True and firm, established and enduring, right and faithful, beloved and precious, desirable and pleasant, revered and mighty, well-ordered and acceptable, good and beautiful is this thy word unto us forever and ever. It is true, the God of the universe is our King, the Rock of Jacob, the Shield of our salvation: throughout all generations he endureth and his name endureth; his throne is established and his kingdom and his faithfulness endure forever. And his words live and endure; they are faithful and desirable forever and to all eternity, as for our fathers, so also for us, our children, our generations, and for all the generations of the seed of Israel thy servants.

True it is that thou art the Lord our God, and the God of our fathers, our King, the King of our fathers, our Redeemer, the Redeemer of our fathers, our maker, the rock of our salvation; our Deliverer and Rescuer from everlasting, that is thy name; there is no God beside thee.

From Egypt thou didst redeem us, O Lord our God, and from the house of bondmen thou didst deliver us; all their firstborn thou didst slay, but thy firstborn thou didst redeem; thou didst divide the Red Sea, and drown the proud; but thou madest the beloved to pass through, while the waters covered their adversaries, not one of whom was left. Wherefore the beloved praised and extolled God, and offered hymns, songs, praises, blessings and thanksgivings to the King and God, who liveth and endureth; who is high and exalted, great and awe-inspiring; who bringeth low the haughty, and raiseth up the lowly, leadeth forth the prisoners, delivereth the meek, helpeth the poor, and answereth his people when they cry unto him. Praises to God most high, blessed is he, who even is to be blessed.

With a new song the redeemed people offered praise unto thy name on the sea-shore; with one accord did they give thanks and acknowledged thy kingship, and said, The Lord shall reign forever and ever.

O Rock of Israel, arise to the help of Israel, and deliver, according to thy promise, Judah and Israel. Our Redeemer, the Lord of Hosts is his name, the Holy One of Israel. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who has redeemed Israel.

Hashkibenu. The present text of the Hashkibenu would seem to go right back to antiquity.¹ Levertoff points

¹ Oesterley, The Jewish Background, p. 51.
out that the last sentence has been altered in the Palestinian rite in such a way as to suggest a change due to the destruction of the Temple.\textsuperscript{1} The probable original and present text is as follows:

Cause us, O Lord our God, to lie down in peace, and cause us to rise, O our King, to life. Spread over us the tabernacle of thy peace; guide us by thine own good counsel; save us for thy name's sake; be a shield about us; remove from us every enemy, pestilence, sword, hunger and sorrow; drive away the evil one from before us and behind us. Shelter us beneath the shadow of thy wings; for thou, O God, art our Guardian and Deliverer; for thou, O God, art a gracious and merciful King. Guard our going out and our coming in unto life and unto peace from henceforth and forevermore. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who guardest thy people Israel forever.

Tefillah Service
Psalm 51.15 - O Lord, open thou my lips, and my mouth shall show forth thy praise.

The Amidah found in the present Daily Prayer Book is that of the so-called Babylonian recension, which developed in the Diaspora and took final shape during the post-biblical era. Until modern times it was impossible to ascertain the first century text. With the discovery of the papyri at the Cairo Genizah at the turn of the century, however, scholars have been able to reconstruct the so-called Palestinian recension, which is the older and approximates that which was "put in the proper order" by R. Gamaliel II at Jabne around 90–100 A.D.

Finkelstein, in a thorough study of the fragments, has authoritatively demonstrated that all of the Palestinian Amidah were in use by the end of the first century.\textsuperscript{2} The

\textsuperscript{1} Levertoff, \textit{op.cit.}, p. 70.
\textsuperscript{2} Finkelstein, \textit{op.cit.}, p. 140.
question remains, however, as to the extent of their use, and whether or not the Babylonian Amidah were also in use.

In fact, since there was no early, authoritative, coordinating recension for the Babylonian Amidah, there are numerous early versions in the Diaspora. They are all recognizable forms of the same prayer, however, in both recensions.¹ The Cairo Genizah contained fragments of both recensions, which indicates that the Palestinian recension was in use both in Palestine and the Diaspora.² This conclusion is borne out by the fact that the church Fathers refer to Benediction twelve as specifically mentioning the Nazarenes,³ which is true only of the Palestinian recension. This would indicate that the Palestinian recension is widely known. The Palestinian recension would seem to be the older in that it was shorter, and reflects a first century Sitz im Leben. Benediction thirteen shows no indication of the reaction of Judaism to proselytization after the spread of Christianity in the Palestinian text, but does in the Babylonian. Palestinian benedictions fourteen and sixteen reflect the existence of the Temple; their Babylonian equivalents reflect its destruction. Babylonian benedictions five and eighteen contain a stronger emphasis on the Torah than their Palestinian counterparts, which is indicative of later Rabbinic influence. Thus we

¹. Ibid., pp. 43, 131.
². Ibid., pp. 2 fn. 4, 135-6.
³. Epiphanius, Haer., 29, 9; Jerome on Isaiah 5.18ff., 49.7, and 52.4ff.
conclude that the earlier Palestinian recension is that which was most familiar in the first century, and it is presented here. It must be remembered, however, that benediction twelve was composed toward the end of the century, and four through fifteen were not necessarily in their present order. The text of the Palestinian recension is as follows:  

Benediction 1: Blessed art thou, O Lord our God and God of our fathers, God of Abraham, God of Isaac, and God of Jacob, the great mighty and revered God. God Most High, who art the Possessor (or Creator) of heaven and earth, our shield and the shield of our fathers, our confidence from generation to generation: Blessed art thou, O Lord, the Shield of Abraham.

Benediction 2: Thou art mighty, who bringest low the proud, strong, and who judgesth the ruthless, who liveth forever, who raiseth the dead, who maketh the wind to blow, who sendeth down the dew, who sustaineth the living, who quickeneth the dead; in the twinkling of an eye Thou makest salvation to spring forth for us. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who quickenest the dead.

Benediction 3: Holy art thou and thy name is to be feared, and there is no God beside thee; Blessed art thou, O Lord, the holy God.

Benediction 4: O favor us, our Father, with knowledge from thyself, and understanding and discernment from thy Torah. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who vouchsafest knowledge.

Benediction 5: Cause us to return, O Lord, unto thee, and let us return anew in our days as in the former time. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who delightest in repentance.

Benediction 6: Forgive us, our Father, for we have sinned against thee; blot out and cause our transgressions to pass from before thine eyes, for great is thy mercy. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who dost abundantly forgive.

1. The translation is based on that of Dugmore, op. cit., pp. 114-125. The Hebrew text is also published in Dugmore. See above, p. 265, fn. 2.
Benediction 7: Look upon our affliction and plead our cause, and redeem us for the sake of thy name. Blessed art thou, O Lord, the Redeemer of Israel.

Benediction 8: Heal us, O Lord our God, from the pain of our heart: and weariness and sighing do thou cause to pass away from us; and cause healing to rise up for our wounds. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who healest the sick of his people Israel.

Benediction 9: Bless for us, O Lord our God, this year for welfare, with every kind of the produce thereof, and speedily bring the year of the end of our redemption near; and give dew and rain upon the face of the earth and satisfy the world from the treasuries of thy goodness, and do thou give a blessing upon the work of our hands. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who blessest the years.

Benediction 10: Blow the great horn for our liberation, and lift a banner to gather our exiles. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who gatherest the dispersed of his people Israel.

Benediction 11: Restore our judges as at the first, and our counsellors as at the beginning; and reign over us, thou alone. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who loveth judgment.

Benediction 12: For apostates let there be no hope, and the dominion of arrogance do thou speedily root out in our days; and let Christians and heretics perish as in a moment, let them be blotted out of the book of the living and let them not be written with the righteous. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who humblest the arrogant.

Benediction 13: Towards the righteous proselytes may thy tender mercies be stirred; and bestow a good reward upon us together with those that do thy will. Blessed art thou, O Lord, the trust of the righteous.

Benediction 14: Be merciful, O Lord our God, in thy great mercy, towards Israel thy people, and towards Jerusalem thy city, and towards Zion the abiding place of thy glory, and towards thy Temple and thy habitation, and towards the kingdom of the house of David, thy righteous anointed one. Blessed art thou, O Lord God of David, the builder of Jerusalem.

Benediction 15: Hear, O Lord our God, the sound of our prayer and have mercy upon us, for thou art a gracious and merciful God. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who hearest prayer.
Benediction 16: Accept, O Lord our God, and dwell in Zion; and may thy servants serve thee in Jerusalem. Blessed art thou, O Lord, whom in reverent fear we serve.

Benediction 17: We give thanks to thee who art the Lord our God and the God of our fathers, for all the good things, the lovingkindness, and the mercy which thou hast wrought and done with us and with our fathers before us: and if we said, Our feet slip, thy lovingkindness, O Lord, upheld us. Blessed art thou, O Lord, unto whom it is good to give thanks.

Benediction 18: Bestow thy peace upon Israel thy people and upon thy city and upon thine inheritance, and bless us, all of us together. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who makest peace.

Psalm 19.14 - Let the words of my mouth and the meditation of my heart be acceptable in thy sight, O Lord my rock and my redeemer.

The Kedushah was inserted and recited by the Reader after benediction three as follows:

(Reader) - We will sanctify thy name in the world even as they sanctify it in the highest heavens, as it is written by the hand of the prophet:

And they called one unto the other and said,

(Cong.) - Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of hosts: the whole earth is full of his glory.

(Reader) - Those over against them say,

(Cong.) - Blessed be the glory of the Lord from his place.

(Reader) - And in thy Holy Words it is written, saying,

(Cong.) - The Lord shall reign forever, thy God, O Zion, unto all generations. Praise ye the Lord.

Torah Benedictions

Before the lesson: Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who hast chosen us from all people, and hast given us thy Law. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who givest the Law.

1. The final call and response may have been omitted from the Yotzer-Kedushah immediately preceding the Shema, see Pirke de Rabbi Elizer, 4.
After the lesson: Blessed art thou, 0 Lord our God, King of the universe, who hast given us the Law of truth, and hast planted eternal life in our midst. Blessed art thou, 0 Lord, who givest the Law.

Prophets Benedictions

Before the lesson: Blessed art thou, 0 Lord our God, King of the universe, who hast chosen good prophets, and hast found pleasure in their words which were spoken in truth.

After the lesson: Blessed art thou, 0 Lord our God, King of the universe, Rock of all worlds, righteous through all generations, 0 faithful God, who sayest and doest, who speakest and fulfilllest, all whose words are truth and righteousness. Faithful art thou, 0 Lord our God, and faithful are thy words, and not one of thy words shall return void, for thou art a faithful and merciful God and King. Blessed art thou, 0 Lord our God, who art faithful in all thy words. Have mercy upon Zion, for it is the home of our life, and save her that is grieved in spirit speedily, even in our days. Blessed art thou, 0 Lord, who makest Zion joyful through her children.

Gladden us, 0 Lord our God, with Elijah the prophet, thy servant. Soon may he come and rejoice our hearts. (The following added c. 50-70 A.D.) - Gladden us with the kingdom of the house of David, thine anointed. Suffer not a stranger to sit upon his throne (Christ?), nor let any others any longer inherit his glory; for by thy holy name thou didst swear unto him, that his light should not be quenched forever. Blessed art thou, 0 Lord, the Shield of David.

The 'Alenu Prayer

It is meet that we should praise the Lord of all; that we should ascribe greatness to him who formed (the world) from the beginning. He made us not as the nations of other lands; he placed us not as all the (other) families of the earth. He hath not assigned unto us a portion as unto them; nor our lot like unto (that of) all their multitude. They worship vain things and emptiness; they pray unto that which profiteth not. We worship before the King of the king of kings; that stretcheth out the heavens and layeth the foundation of the earth. The seat of his glory is in the heavens above; and the abode of his strength is in the far off heights. He is our God, and there is none other beside; truly our king, and there is none but he.

1. As reconstructed by Finkelstein, op. cit., pp. 127-128.
2. The translation is from Oesterley, The Jewish Background, pp. 69-70.
Therefore we hope in thee, O Lord our God; that we may speedily see the glory of thy might, when thou removest the abominations from the earth, and the idols shall be utterly cut off; when the world shall be set right in the Kingdom of the Almighty; and all the children of flesh shall call upon thy name. When thou wilt return unto thyself all the wicked of the earth, that all the inhabitants of the world may perceive and know that to thee every knee must bow, every tongue swear.

Before thee, O Lord our God, let them bow and fall down; and to the glory of thy great name let them give honor. And let them take upon themselves the yoke of thy Kingdom, and do thou reign over them forever and ever, For thine is the Kingdom, and forever and ever shalt thou reign in glory.

Kiddush

And it was evening and it was morning, - the sixth day.

And the heaven and the earth were finished and all their host. And on the seventh day God had finished his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made. And God blessed the seventh day, and he hallowed it, because he rested thereon from all his work which God had created and made.

(The words said over the cup) Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who createst the fruit of the vine.

(The following section varies for Sabbaths, festivals and New Year. We present here the Sabbath Kiddush.)

Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who hast sanctified us by thy commandments and hast taken pleasure in us, and in love and favor hast given us thy holy Sabbath as an inheritance, a memorial of the creation - that day being also the first of the holy convocations, in remembrance of the departure from Egypt. For thou hast chosen us and sanctified us above all nations, and in love and favor hast given us thy holy Sabbath as an inheritance. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who hallowest the Sabbath.

(The words said over the bread) Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who bringest forth bread from the earth.

G. CIRCUMCISION AND BAPTISM

Two other significant Jewish rites need only be mentioned: a. Circumcision was performed on all male infants...
on the eighth day after birth as a sign of the Covenant with Abraham.

Baptism, or the ritual washing by one person of another, was required of all Gentile proselytes. The baptism of John, however, was performed upon Jews, as an eschatological sacrament of repentance and the forgiveness of sins, and entrance into (or preparation for) the Kingdom of Heaven.
APPENDIX IV

WORSHIP AMONG THE QUMRAN SECTARIANS

Although the manuscript evidence of liturgical practices among the sectarians of Qumran is scanty, the literature on certain aspects of the subject is voluminous. This is due to the external evidence supplied by Josephus and Philo, archaeological remains, and possible connections with other phenomena in the ancient world suggested by modern scholars. The subjects of the calendar, sacrifice, ritual baths and meals, and the entry liturgy have been much discussed, and we shall endeavour to express an opinion in the debate over each. We shall also attempt several suggestions with regard to liturgical organization, times of worship, and the liturgical forms of praise, prayer, instruction and music.

We accept as a basic presupposition the identification of the Qumran sectarians with the so-called "Essenes" as proven.¹

A. THE CALENDAR

The sect placed a great importance on the correct observance of the calendar. God has appointed the times

¹ With John Strugnell, "Flavius Josephus and the Essenes: Antiquities XVIII. 18-22," JBL LXXVII (1958), p. 107, and many others. Cf., however, the argument of J. Massingberd Ford, "Can We Exclude Samaritan Influence from Qumran?" RQ, 6 (1967-1968), that the Qumran sectarians may also have been strongly influenced by Samaritan thought, and represent an Essenism "predating Philo and Josephus." (p. 109).
and seasons forever, and has revealed to the faithful remnant of the Covenant his "holy Sabbaths and glorious feasts." The community was to keep the Sabbath according to its exact interpretation, and keep the feasts and the Day of Fasting according to the New Covenant "in the land of Damascus." This sacred calendar is that found in the Book of Jubilees.

Mlle. Annie Jaubert has reconstructed this ancient calendar. Building on the suggestion of D. Barthélemy that the calendar consisted of 364 days, she arrived at the following reconstruction: the calendar followed the solar year and consists of twelve months of thirty days each. An intercalary day is added to the third, sixth, ninth, and twelfth month, thus totalling 364 days for the year. It is then divided into four seasons of thirteen weeks (ninety-one days) each. The first day of each season was

1. IQ M XIV, 13.
3. CD VI, 18-19.
4. CD XVI, 2-4.
a day of remembrance.¹

Since there are exactly fifty-two weeks in the year, every date of the year always falls on the same day of the week, emphasizing the unchanging stability of God's creation and the Creator himself. Thus the holy days and Sabbaths are immovable.² Mlle. Jaubert has shown that the year began on Wednesday, sometime during the Julian month of March.³ This leads to the further interesting observation that all the feasts and holy days consistently fall on Wednesday, Friday, or Sunday. Not only so, but a careful analysis of the great historical events of Israel show that they always fall on these days also, at least according to the tradition of Jubilees and Enoch. Thus Wednesday, Friday and Sunday stand out as the days of liturgical importance, entirely apart from the Sabbath itself.

Milik reports that this reconstructed calendar has been definitely identified as that used by the Essenes by the discovery of fragments of a liturgical calendar found in Cave 4 at Qumran.⁴ It is now widely recognized by

2. Cf. IQ S I, 15-16.
3. Morgenstern has contested this, contending that it began on Tuesday. "The Calendar of the Book of Jubilees, Its Origin and Character," VT, V (1955), p. 60. He also maintains that the intercalary day was added to the first, fourth, seventh and tenth months. His arguments are somewhat strained, however, and most scholars accept Jaubert's thesis.
scholars. According to these fragments, the yearly cycle includes seven festivals, held at intervals every seven weeks.

The origin of this calendar is obscure. According to Jubilees and the Qumran documents it was given to Moses himself. This at least reflects its antiquity. Jaubert and Milik maintain, probably correctly, that it preserves the calendar used by the Priestly school of the post-Exilic period. Jaubert is certainly correct in asserting that the origin of Wednesday, Friday and Sunday as liturgical days is linked to the question of the origin of the sabbatical week and the creation narrative.

But whence comes this calendar in the first place? The number fifty was very important in the calendar, as evidenced by the prominence of the Feast of Pentecost and the fifty-day interval between feasts. On this basis Morgenstern has attempted to link it up with an ancient pentecontadal calendar. On the same basis Dupont-Sommer


2. G. Vermes, The Dead Sea Scrolls in English, Rev. Ed., (Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1965) p. 44. Cf. the report of Yigael Yadin, "The Temple Scroll," The Biblical Archaeologist, XXX, (Dec. 1967) that the new "Temple Scroll" confirms the use of this calendar, and includes a description of the festivals, including two extrabiblical ones, the Feasts of New Wine and New Oil, held also at fifty-day intervals (138).

4. Ibid., p. 38; Milik, op. cit., p. 110.
has argued for Pythagorean influence.¹

On the other hand, the concept of twelve months of thirty days each is equally central to the calendar. On this basis Strobel has argued very eruditely² for a connection with a widespread ancient calendar of 360 days, also based on twelve months of thirty days, with five or six intercalary days added. He traces this calendar back to Egypt, but gives evidence of its use as the basic calendric principle in the whole Hellenistic milieu, especially in Syria and Arabia. Of special significance is the dating of this calendar from the Spring, as at Qumran, as opposed to January (Julian) or Autumn (Babylonian). The intercalary days were added to the Egyptian calendar at the end of the year, and had the "odium of unholiness."³ Strobel claims that this solar calendar formed the basis for the Qumran parallel, whose only uniqueness lies in its sabbatical principle, which results in the 364 day calendar with the intercalary days added seasonally as liturgical days of remembrance.

Strobel's theory alone, however, does not account for the role of the pentecontad in the calendar, and neither theory attempts to account for the sabbatical principle. In fact, the Essene calendar uniquely brings together all three calendric principles (pentecontadal, sabbatical, solar), and this is probably evidence that all the sources

² Strobel, op. cit., especially pp. 405-412.
³ Ibid., p. 408:3.
suggested (pentecontadal calendar, Pythagoreans, Egyptian solar calendar, and sabbatical principle) influenced its formation.\(^1\)

A 364 day calendar immediately raises the question of its correspondence with reality. In only a few years anyone could see that it did not correspond to the rotational year. There is no apparent evidence of any attempt at intercalation in the texts. Some conclude that this indicates its theoretical nature, and that it was not a functional calendar.\(^2\)

There is some evidence that it was used, however. Burrows points out that there were twenty-six orders of priests according to the War Scroll, which figure differs from the twenty-four in orthodox Judaism. But according to the Mishmaroth of Cave 4 the lunar calendar was coordinated with the solar calendar of the sect every three years, so that the two cycles of priestly courses come out

1. The Samaritans also followed this solar calendar, and this may well argue for Samaritan influence at Qumran, Ford, op.cit., p. 123. This still does not fully explain the origin of a 364 day calendar. Reference may be made in passing to the highly controversial and increasingly debated work of Immanuel Velikovsky, in which he argues from scientific and literary evidence that, among other things, for a period of several hundred years before the middle of the eighth century B.C. the year actually consisted of 364 days. See Immanuel Velikovsky, Worlds in Collision (New York: MacMillan, 1950); Ages in Chaos (New York: Doubleday, 1952); and Earth in Upheaval (New York: Doubleday, 1955).

2. So Jaubert, "Aperçus sur le calendrier de Qumran," p. 19; Morgenstern, op.cit., p. 64, says that in all non-religious matters the Essenes followed the calendar of normative Judaism. But it is difficult to conceive of these Covenanters as making any distinction in the modern sense between "religous" and "secular."
together every six years. The solar calendar was in serious conflict with the Babylonian lunar calendar followed by normative Judaism, and Milik suggests that it may have been an attempt by Jonathan to suppress the older, priestly calendar and enforce the new, lunar one in an attempt at "Hellenization" which constituted the main cause of the schism that drove the Covenanters into separation. ² 

Jaubert gives evidence of the vestige among post-biblical Jews of a twenty-eight year solar cycle in which a month of thirty-five days was intercalated.³ This would keep the calendar in exact correspondence with the rotational year. She admits of no pre-Christian or Qumran evidence, however.

Strobel takes up this suggestion and gives further evidence of important calendric events and changes in the ancient world, all of which are dated in years the intervals of which are divisible by twenty-eight, and which, in fact, correspond to the years of the renewal of the twenty-eight year solar cycle. He shows, furthermore, that every eighty-four years (three solar cycles) the lunar and solar cycles correlate. This is especially significant in that, according to Strobel, the important calendric events took place in 234 B.C., 150 B.C., 66 B.C., and 19 A.D., all of which are separated by eighty-four

years and in fact are the years of the correlation between the lunar and solar cycles.¹

It may well be that there is something to the suggestion of a thirty-five day month intercalated every twenty-eight years, although the evidence so far is entirely external and circumstantial.

We would suggest another possible solution, arising out of the texts themselves, for further inquiry. Dupont-Sommer has called attention to the strange passage in IQ S X, 6, which he reads as "the supreme sanctity of the sign N."² In Hebrew nun stands for fifty. Dupont-Sommer amasses evidence from Philo that fifty was considered the perfect number, largely because it is the sum of all the sides of the right-angled triangle, which according to Philo is the most elemental and venerable of existing things, raised to the second power. The right-angled triangle, as well as the origin of the four seasons, is attributed to the Pythagoreans. Josephus compares the Essenes to the Pythagoreans. Therefore, concludes Dupont-Sommer, the Essenes were influenced by the Pythagoreans.

He may well be right, but he has overlooked the broader context of the passage and its possible wider meaning. Building on Brownlee's detection of an acrostic in IQ S X, 1-6, formed by the letters aleph, mem, and nun (Amen), Barthélemy has pointed out³ that they signify,

¹ Strobel, op. cit., especially pp. 405-412.
² Dupont-Sommer, op. cit., pp. 111-117.
respectively, one, forty, and fifty, which, when added together, total ninety-one, which is the number of days in each season of the calendar. This observation would reinforce Dupont-Sommer's argument, since the Pythagoreans are reputed to have originated the four seasons.

While acknowledging Barthélemy's observation, we would suggest the possibility of an even deeper meaning. One plus forty plus fifty do total ninety-one days, and this might indeed constitute an "Amen" to the Essenes. But an even greater "Amen" might be forthcoming if the acrostic "Amen" also signified that one month every forty years of fifty days was to be intercalated. This would also correlate the calendar with the rotational year. The intercalary period would have the added significance of being a pentecontad, which was basic to their calendric thinking. Furthermore, the one plus forty plus fifty formula, totalling the number of days in a season, would appeal to a sect so concerned with the calendar.

Certain problems can immediately be seen, such as that created by the insertion of an extra day into the sabbatical system. This could have given rise to a special day of remembrance, however, which would not have been considered as part of the week, just as the yearly intercalary days were not considered part of the month. In any case, we offer this suggestion as a possible hint of intercalation in the texts themselves, for further investigation.

1. There may be a possible reference to this intercalary period in IQ. S X, 8 where the Mashkil vows to bless God "at the beginning of their weeks" for the time of liberty, (or Jubilee.)"
Mention should also be made of the recent discovery of astrological manuscripts at Qumran. These finds corroborate the evidence in Philo and Josephus that the zodiac and corresponding astrological ideas, which were widespread in the ancient world, had also some influence within Judaism.

B. SACRIFICE

This variant calendar was in direct conflict with that of the orthodox Judaism of the Temple, which followed the Babylonian calendar based on the lunar cycle. The Temple priesthood was considered corrupt and the Temple sacrifice defiled. The Covenanters were enjoined to "spearate from the sons of the Pit," referring apparently to the illegitimate administrators of the Temple who became rich by robbing from its treasury.

It is by no means clear, however, just what the practice of the Covenanters was with regard to sacrifice. Modern scholars are divided into three camps: (1) those who hold that they practiced no sacrifice, temporarily substituting prayer, righteousness, the study of the Law and common worship until the last days, when true Temple sacrifice would be restored; (2) those who maintain that they practiced sacrifice at the Temple, but separately and on their own terms; and (3) those who argue that they

2. IQ pHab XII, 6-9.
3. CD VI, 14-15.
4. IQ pHab VIII-XIII.
practiced sacrifice at Qumran itself.

Those who hold the first viewpoint point out the antagonism toward the Temple which existed among the Covenants. CD VI, 11-16 contains an injunction against entering the Temple "to light His altar in vain," based on Mal. 1.10. It goes on to enjoin separation from the "wealth of the Sanctuary."¹ IQ S IX, 3-5 is interpreted so as to read that atonement is effected "without the flesh of holocausts and the fat of sacrifice. (For) and prayer rightly offered shall be as an acceptable fragrance of righteousness, and perfection of way as a delectable free-will offering."² This is understood to mean that sacrifice was not practiced by the Covenants. It is usually acknowledged that they were not opposed to sacrifice in principle, and that they may even have participated in it at one time; but they finally broke with the Temple sacrifice.³

The War Scroll, however, shows that they were not opposed to sacrifice.⁴ On the contrary, the Covenants represented a conservative, priestly school, and would probably not have overthrown or suspended the sacrificial

2. So Vermes, op.cit., p. 87.
4. IQ M II, 5.
system. The passage in CD VI is not at all clear; it could just as easily be an injunction against the vain use of the altar rather than the use of an altar at all. Carmignac has pointed out that the Hebrew preposition in IQ S IX, 3 can mean either "by means of" or "more than," but hardly "without." He goes on to argue that the passage is quoted in IQ M II, 6 in such a way as to indicate that the author could not have understood the IQ S passage as a renunciation of expiation by sacrifice. Milik adds a post-scriptum to Carmignac's article in which he notes that a fragment from Cave 4 omits יָד before "and the fats of sacrifice," thus governing the reference to "prayer rightly offered." According to Milik this proves that the author (or scribe) understood יָד in the sense of "by means of" and thus affirms the efficacy of sacrifice.

The Damascus Document, which seems to have been composed a little later than IQ S, contains several provisions governing sacrifice. They include references to the sin-offering, the burnt- and cereal-offerings, and the free-will-offering. The sect was founded by a High Priest of the legitimate line and would not easily have given up sacrifice.

3. CD IX, 14.
5. CD XVI, 13.
6. IQ pHab II, 8; 4Q pPs. 37 II, 15; IQ M XVII, 2-3.
To be sure, Philo says that their devotion is shown "not by any cult of animal sacrifice, but in their resolve to maintain the sanctity of their minds." But Philo's tendency toward Hellenistic apologetics is well known, and this may only reflect the Essenes' insistence on "perfection of way" as a prerequisite to valid sacrifice, in the same way as it was to entering the ritual baths.

Josephus says that the Essenes send offerings to the Temple. The following statement is disputed. He either says they do or they do not offer sacrifices. Black points out that the negative reading is found only in manuscripts based on the sixth century translation of Cassiodorus, which he says has been misunderstood. Josephus goes on to say that they refrain from the common enclosure, and offer sacrifices among themselves. Strugnell maintains that Josephus definitely says they offered sacrifice, but that the text admits of either (a) elsewhere in the Temple, or (b) somewhere else entirely.

Black argues that they participated in the Temple sacrifice, but separately and on their own conditions.

1. Quod omnis probus liber, XII.
2. So Cross, op.cit., p. 75. Cf. the discussion of baths below, pp. 344-345.
3. Antiquities XVIII, 18-22.
Strugnell prefers the view that they offered sacrifice at Qumran. Adherents of this view again call attention to the fact that, although they were a priestly sect, the Covenanters held the Temple to be defiled and the priesthood false. Strugnell points out that the concept of a heavenly sacrificial cult at this early date shows their antagonism toward the Jerusalem Temple.

Several areas have yielded the bones of animals which had been slaughtered and eaten, and then neatly placed in jars, or between large sherds of jars and buried. The cultic hall (Loc. 77) was oriented toward the west, as was the Jerusalem Temple. Baumgärtel has shown the similarity between the Entry Liturgy (CD I-II) and several Old Testament passages which von Rad as early as 1938 had argued on form-critical grounds belonged to some cultic ceremony, probably Pentecost. This would suggest that the Qumran liturgy was definitely based on the Temple liturgy. This is further corroborated by the arguments of Lehmann that several manuscripts belonged to the Yom Kippur liturgy.

2. So Cross, _op. cit._, p. 75; cf. IQ pHab VIII, 8-13, XII, 7-9; CD VI, 11-14.
5. Milik, _op. cit._, p. 104.
6. Friedrich Baumgärtel, "Zur Liturgie in der 'Sektenrolle' vom Toten Meer," _ZAW_, LXV (1953), pp. 263-265. The Old Testament references are Deut. 32; Ps. 78, 105, 106; Ezra 9.6ff.; Neh. 9.6ff.; and Dan. 9.4ff.
Cross argues that the Essenes had a separate calendar, so why not a separate sacrifice? They could get their rationale from the Mosaic camp in the wilderness, where sacrifice was offered. He also draws a parallel to the Temple and cultus established by Onias at Leontopolis in Egypt during the Maccabean period.

S.H. Steckoll has recently argued extensively for a sacrificial cultus at Qumran. We cannot list all of his arguments here, but his chief ones are as follows:

1. Bones were also found buried in jars at Leontopolis in connection with the consecration of the Temple. Since Ezra 6.17 mentions the same animals (bullocks, lambs, rams and goats) as being sacrificed at the consecration of the restored Jerusalem Temple, Steckoll concludes that the bones at Qumran were those of animals sacrificed at the consecration of a Temple there.

2. An altar has been discovered at Qumran.

3. He points out detailed correspondence between the cultic hall and buildings at Qumran and the Temple at Leontopolis, as well as the Zadokite connection.

4. CD XI, 21 - XII, 2 mentions a "house of prostration" and the "city of the Sanctuary." Steckoll points out that Mishnah Shekalim VI, 1-13 mentions prostrations in the Temple, and he refers to R.H. Charles' view that the "house of prostration" must be a Temple. The "city of the Sanctuary" immediately following must refer to Qumran itself.

1. Cross, op.cit., p. 76.
and not Jerusalem, for the injunction to celibacy would hardly apply to the latter. Thus the "house of prostration" must be the "Sanctuary" which is at Qumran.

(5) He draws attention to several liturgical parallels to the Temple. He also adduces several other circumstantial arguments.

Steckoll concludes that there was a definite relationship of some sort between Qumran and Leontopolis, and that this argues in favour of sacrifice at Qumran.

Steckoll's article is persuasive, but several items require comment. According to de Vaux, the bones at Qumran were not found imbedded in the walls themselves, as at Leontopolis, but were buried beneath the surface of the ground, and sometimes not even buried at all. Furthermore, the remains are found in seven different locations, only one of which is even near the cultic hall (which Steckoll claims was the Temple), and in both Periods I and II.¹ Steckoll's source for the evidence at Leontopolis is W.M. Flinders Petrie.² Petrie does not say, however, that the practice of burying bones in a foundation was confined to the consecration of temples; on the contrary, it was usual in Palestine, dating back to an original infant sacrifice, at the foundation of any public construction. If the bones found at Qumran are the remains of a consecration sacrifice (which is by no means certain), they do not necessarily therefore indicate the consecration of a

1. de Vaux, op.cit., p. 10.
Temple (although they could).

Steckoll has a photograph and sketch of the "altar" which he himself discovered at Qumran. Dr. Moir and Dr. Watkins of the University of Edinburgh, in a verbal consultation, have indicated that this is by no means definite. The stone article mentioned is rather small for an altar (10" x 10"), and may be a watering trough, wash basin or any number of things. On the other hand, it is exactly the shape, with the dimensions scaled down by half, of the hollow bottom (₽' ⏯) or central basin of the altar in Ezekiel's Temple (Ex. 43.13-17). It seems to us, therefore, that it may well be the ₪' ⏯ of an altar at Qumran.

"The house of prostration" may be the Temple, but it may just as well refer to the cultic hall as a local synagogue. The Hebrew can also be translated "house of worship." Its orientation toward Jerusalem is in accordance with contemporary synagogue architecture. L. Ginzberg understands the "house of prostration" as the central synagogue in "Damascus," which had adopted Temple rituals.

Furthermore, Sutcliffe has pointed out that sacrifice away from the Temple would have violated Deut. 12.5ff, 11, 14. The apostasy of the Temple would have provided a rationale for separate sacrifice, however.

That the Essenes were not totally separate from the life of the Jerusalem Temple is seen in Josephus. They sent offerings to the Temple; \(^1\) Judas, "of Essene extraction," was observing along with his disciples as Antigonus passed through the court of the Temple; \(^2\) the "Gate of the Essenes" on the Wall of Jerusalem \(^3\) may indicate Essene usage of the Temple.

The final word is yet to be given. The evidence so far inclines us to the view that sacrifice was offered at Qumran. The community was no mere re-established priestly community, however. The Covenanterst may have been more influenced by Pharisaism than Sadduceeeism, as Driver suggests. \(^4\) This is seen in their insistence on the importance and efficacy of prayer, righteousness and the study of the Law. Gärtner has convincingly argued for the use of Temple symbolism among the Covenanters as basic to their self-understanding. \(^5\) Thus their worship would be an

---

1. *Antiquities* XVIII, 18.
4. G.R. Driver, *The Judaean Scrolls* (Oxford, 1965), p. 94. The suggestion that there was a strong Samaritan influence at Qumran (Ford, *op. cit.*) may counter this. The Samaritans also strongly emphasized study of the Law, however (Ford, *op. cit.*, p. 122). Samaritan influence might explain the origin of a cultic sect at Qumran, separate from Leontopolis. Their connection would be in the Zadokite priesthood, which Qumran and Leontopolis supported, as did the Samaritans (Ford, *op. cit.*, p. 116). Samaritan influence and antipathy toward the Jerusalem Temple may well argue in favour of a sacrificial cultus at Qumran. Cf., however, the new Temple Scroll, as yet unpublished, which, according to Yadin, *op. cit.*, p. 139, locates the Temple in Jerusalem.

5. Bertil Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament*, (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1965). According to Gärtner, they considered themselves... to constitute the foundation of truth... the house of truth... (Contd.)
intensification of the daily liturgy of both the Temple and the synagogue. We know that the two institutions were closely linked in Judaism, and that there was even a synagogue maintained in the precincts of the Temple itself. Thus we may use the liturgies of both institutions as parallels with

Contd.) and the true Temple," (pp. 23-24), in lieu of the defiled Temple in Jerusalem. Their lives of obedience to the Law, praise and prayer are the true spiritual sacrifices of this Temple (p. 47). They did look forward to the re-establishment of Jerusalem as the centre of the world and the dwelling place of God (p. 24).

Gärtner assumes that the Covenanters, therefore, did not practice bloody sacrifice at all, but considered their "spiritual" sacrifices to be real sacrifices and the fulfilment of the Law. He points out their insistence on holiness and justice as acceptable offerings, coupled with their criticism of the Temple and its cultus, and asserts a link with the prophetic tradition of the Old Testament (pp. 42-46).

His main thesis, the use of Temple symbolism by the Covenanters to describe themselves, is convincingly argued. His sub-thesis, that they practiced no sacrifice at all, has several weaknesses. It is based in part on his exegesis of four passages (IQ S V.5ff., IX.3ff., CD XI. 19ff., and 4Q Flor. I.6-7) which are quite capable of variant interpretations. He ignores several passages to which we have alluded which assume the practice of sacrifice among the Covenanters. He also takes no account of the fact that the prophetic tradition of the Old Testament, while castigating impure sacrifice and insisting on personal holiness, by no means derogates or repudiates the Temple sacrifice itself. Finally, he does not speak to the problem of how a Zadokite community could actually do away with sacrifice and still be obedient to the Torah.

It would seem to us that the Community could well consider itself the interim Temple in the wilderness during the days of Belial until the restoration of the Jerusalem Temple and still offer sacrifice. Indeed, the very concept of the Community constituting the Temple could provide further rationale for so doing. If Yahweh were no longer dwelling in the Jerusalem Temple but among the Covenanters, then it would seem plausible that they should offer up sacrifice where they were.

As Gärtner points out, however, it is important to recognize that although the distinction between priests and laymen is maintained, the requirements for the priesthood are extended to cover the whole community, (pp. 4-8) thereby making it a special priestly community, and not just a miniature version of a pure Israel in the desert.
which we may compare liturgical references in the Qumran literature.

Mention should be made of the passage in IQ M II, 1-7, according to which the cultus will be re-organized in the last days at the time of the Release as follows: first in rank is the High Priest and his vicar; next comes the twelve chief priests, who shall minister at the daily sacrifice. Below them are the leaders of the twenty-six priestly divisions who shall minister "in their divisions." Next come the twelve chiefs of the Levites, one for each tribe, ministering "in their own places;" below them are the chiefs of the tribes and heads of family of the congregation, who attend daily at the gates of the Sanctuary. The leaders of their divisions, men over fifty years of age, are to attend at their appointed times, on new moons, Sabbaths, and appointed days.

This is interesting chiefly because of the apparent references to the Ma'amadot service in the Temple, in which the sect may have participated. The chiefs of the tribes and heads of family, as well as the elders, "attend" at the gates of the Sanctuary. That the setting is Jerusalem is clear from the context of the War Scroll (I, VII, XII). The gates of the Sanctuary is the place where the Ma'amadot service was probably held.¹ It was a sort of synagogue service in the Temple, conducted and attended by leaders and representatives of Israel, and served as a vital connecting

link between Temple and synagogue un-Judaism.

Participation in the Ma'amadot service of the Jerusalem Temple may explain Josephus' reference to the Essenes' sending of offerings to the Temple, although conducting their own sacrifice elsewhere. It would also have provided a link between the Covenanters and the Temple, while not necessitating their participation in the "vain use of the altar."

It is interesting that the leaders of the "divisions" (the same term, נְרָם וּדָר, by which the Mishnah refers to the Ma'amadot divisions) are over fifty years, i.e., "elders". In IQ S VI, 8 "elders" are mentioned as taking the second seats in the assembly behind the priests. Levites are not mentioned at all, even though the reference is usually to "priests, Levites and all the rest of the people." But that "elders" are not to be equated with "Levites" is clear from the War Scroll text which we have been considering. It is only in the seating for the assembly that elders are mentioned; otherwise the distinction is made between priests, Levites, and Men of the Community.

We have suggested in the appendix on "Synagogue Worship" that the "elders" may be those selected to belong to the Ma'amadot, who attend at the synagogue service in the Temple on a rotation basis to represent the people.¹ These Ma'amadot could be priests, Levites or laymen. If the "elders" were the men of the Ma'amadot, it would explain

¹. See Appendix III, "Synagogue Worship," p. 274, fn. 3.
this peculiar reference to them here in IQ S VI, 8. The "elders" at Qumran would probably include all the Levites as well as certain men of the community elected (or selected) for the Ma'amadot office. The lay elders would enjoy a seat of honour at the assemblies, but in order of rank would still be classed as Men of the Community.

C. THE RITUAL MEAL

Much has been written about the eating habits of the Covenanters of Qumran. It has been asserted that there were cultic meals of bread and wine in which only the initiated could participate. The meals were supposed to have been a "cultic action or drama concerned with the celebration of the mighty acts of deliverance of Israel by her God" which looked forward to the eschatological Messianic banquet as well. Dupont-Sommer goes so far as to say that the baths and meals are the principal rites and basic sacraments of the sect. Kuhn has even worked out an elaborate theory that the cultic meal not only included the regular Jewish blessings, but a special one of their own, so that there was first a blessing over the bread, then one over the bread and wine, then the meal, then

2. Black, op. cit., p. 104; Dupont-Sommer, The Jewish Sect of Qumran, p. 100.
4. Ibid., p. 112; Milik, op. cit., p. 106; Vermes, op. cit., p. 47; Cross, op. cit., p. 65; Dupont-Sommer, The Essene Writings from Qumran, pp. 50 ff.
a blessing over the wine! He goes on to tie in the meal with the Jewish Egyptian writing Joseph and Asenath, arriving at the "conclusion" that the meal was probably sacramental, mediating life and immortality, as the ritual baptism mediated forgiveness. All of this is a prelude to his further "conclusion" that the Lord's Supper was based on the cultic meal of the Essenes.

The evidence itself is not as clear as some of modern scholarship. Josephus says that the Essenes work in the morning, return at noon, wash, put on white garments and partake of a meal together, which was accompanied by the usual Jewish blessings. There is no reason to suppose from Josephus that it partook of the character of a "sacramental" meal any more than any other Jewish meal. Its uniqueness lay in its communal character, and the white garments worn by the men of the Community. Josephus goes on to say that if there be any stranger, they sit down with them. This hardly squares with the idea that only the "fully initiated" can participate.

The evidence in the scrolls is scanty as well. There are only three clear references to the communal meals.

2. Ibid., p. 77.
4. Wars, II, viii, 5; Antiquities, XVIII, 22.
IQ S VI, 2-3 says that they shall "eat in common and pray in common and deliberate in common." This only indicates the communal character of their life. The following passage, VI, 4-5, says that when the table has been prepared for eating and drinking the Priest (one of whom must always be present) shall be the first to "stretch out his hand to bless the first-fruits of the bread and wine." This only indicates that the priests held priority in the offering of blessings, as they did in other matters as well.

IQ Sa II, 17-22 contains a rubric for the blessing of the bread and wine when the Messiah of Israel has come: first the Priest, then the Messiah of Israel, then the whole congregation shall bless. This is basically the same rubric as that in IQ S VI, 4-5.

The Manual of Discipline contains seven references to the "purification of the Many"\(^1\) and two to the "drink of the Many."\(^2\) These have been interpreted by many scholars as references to the "sacramental meal" of the Community. Careful investigation does not bear out this conclusion.

The Hebrew formula in the rubrics concerning the "purification of the Many" is מַעַלְכַּת מַעַלְכָּת הַלְוַי הַלֶּאֶב, "to touch (or reach) the purification." The word מַעַלְכַּת, which some scholars interpret as meaning the "pure Meal," is the construct form of מַעַלְכַּת, which is used twelve times in the Old Testament.\(^3\) In every instance it signifies "ritual purification," not "purity," or "pure things," and

1. IQ S V, 13; VI, 16, 22, 25; VII, 3, 16, 19.
2. IQ S VI, 20; VII, 20.
hardly a "pure Meal." \( \gamma \alpha \) is a common verb, meaning to touch, strike, reach or arrive. Thus it is by no means clear that these are references to the communal meals or any other meals. On the contrary, the rubric in IQ S VI, 25 calls for the exclusion of one who has lied about property matters from the "purification of the Many" for one year, and "he shall do penance with respect to one-fourth of his bread." If the "purification of the Many" referred to the communal meal the additional penance would not make sense. The argument that the "pure Meal" was a cultic ceremony involving only bread and wine is in our view a weak argument, fabricated solely on Christian eisegesis.¹

It is argued that the two parallel references to the "drink of the Many" indicate that the text is speaking of a cultic meal. The Hebrew formula in these two rubrics is \( \pi \rho \psi \alpha \gamma \gamma \), "to touch (or reach) the 'drink'." Again, a careful investigation shows otherwise. The word \( \pi \rho \psi \alpha \) is a derivative (probably the Hiphil participle) of the verb \( \pi \rho \psi \), which is always used in the Old Testament in the Hiphil form, meaning "cause to drink" or "give to drink." The form \( \pi \rho \psi \alpha \) is used eighteen times in the Old Testament. Only once does it clearly indicate "drink."² Three times it is used with the possible meaning "drink," although "watering" is just as plausible.³ Once it is used in the absolute sense of "well-watered"

2. Lev. 11.34 speaks of "drink" from an unclean vessel.
3. Isa. 32.6; I Kings 10.21 = II Chron. 9.20.
land. It is used twelve times to refer to a cup-bearer, or one who gives to drink, and once to refer to the cup-bearing office or function. Again, it is by no means clear that the references are to a "sacramental meal" of the Essenes.

We agree with Burrows that "no text clearly attests any special meal of a clearly sacred character." It is probable that the white garments and communal meals indicate that the community fashioned their meals after the priestly Temple meals accompanying the sacrifice. This is especially probable if the Covenanters practiced sacrifice at Qumran, as we indicated above. In this sense, then, the communal meals would enjoy a cultic status above that of an ordinary Jewish meal; but it would be that of the Temple cult, not some new, esoteric sort of sacramental meal in any later Christian sense. The passage in IQ Sa II, 17-22 may indicate that the meals were eschatological in character, but this is by no means certain.

We are inclined toward Sutcliffe's view that these rubrics in the Manual of Discipline refer to what the Hebrew would indicate: the rites of purification and the office of cup-bearer. Sutcliffe understands this, however, to refer only to the ritual preparation of the

2. Gen. 40.1, 2, 5, 9, 13, 20, 21, 25; 41.9; I Kings 10.5 - II. Chron. 9.4; Neh. 1.11.
5. So Baugarten, op.cit., p. 157; Burrows, op.cit., pp. 369; Black, op.cit., p. 169; Richardson, op.cit., p. 351.
bread and wine. We would argue that is a more
general term referring to all the rites of purification.
I Chron. 23.28 assigns the "purification of all that is
holy" to the Levites. According to our interpretation,
then, this would mean that the novitiate (or reprobate)
was excluded from the Levitical office of purification, not
only in the preparation of bread and wine, but ritual
purification in general. Thus, as ritually impure, he
would not be allowed to bear the purified vessels to others,
lest he render them impure by his touch.

D. THE RITUAL BATHS

It follows from what has been said that the most
likely parallel for the ritual washings at Qumran would be
the Temple lustrations. All that the scrolls themselves
say is that the ritual washings are not efficacious for the
unrepentant or reprobate, but are for those who are
cleansed by the spirit of holiness, uprightness and humility.
The Damascus Document contains regulations governing purifi-
cation by water which seem to reflect daily or frequent
lustrations. The only other reference is in the Manual of
Discipline, which reads, "he shall not enter the water(s) to

2. Cf. the Temple Scroll, which, according to Yadin, op. cit.,
p. 137, contains Halakoth even more extreme than
"normative Judaism" in matters pertaining to rules of
cleanness and uncleanness.
3. So Kuhn, op. cit., pp. 67-68; Joachim Gnilka, "Die
essenischen Tauchbäder und die Johannestaufe," RQ, 3
4. IQ S III, 4-5.
5. IQ S III, 9.
touch (reach) the purification of the men of holiness, for they shall not be pure (clean) unless they turn from their wickedness." This may imply a ritual washing at the time of entry, but it is by no means clear. The archaeological evidence of baths is very much debated and open to question. Josephus speaks of ritual washings, but they are performed daily before every meal.5

Sutcliffe observes that there is no mention of baptism (a lustral act of one person upon another) but only ritual lustrations. We are inclined to agree with his view that there is no mention of baptism in connection with the "entry liturgy," and that the ritual washings were probably an extension of both Temple and common Jewish lustrations more strictly defined and observed.6

1. IQ S V, 13-14.
5. Wars, II, viii, 5.
6. Sutcliffe, op.cit., pp. 108-109. It follows that we reject such notions as that of an annual "re-baptism," Cross, op.cit., p. 70, fn. 96a; or that the baths, meals and prayer replaced the Temple worship, Baumgarten, op.cit., pp. 154, 157; or that the baths and meals were the basic rites and sacraments of the sect, Dupont-Sommer, The Jewish Sect of Qumran, pp. 97-98; or that the baths were baptisms administered for the repentance of sins in preparation for the impending eschatological judgment, Black, op.cit., pp. 96-97; or that the baths had the "sacramental function of mediating the divine forgiveness of sins," Kuhn, op.cit., p. 68. Cf. above, p. 344, fn. 2.
E. THE ENTRY LITURGY

The Manual of Discipline says that "all those who embrace the Community Rule shall enter into the Covenant before God to obey all commandments so that they may not abandon Him during the dominion of Satan because of fear or terror or affliction."¹ There follows a lengthy rubric for a liturgy of "entering the Covenant."²

The Community's order of rank is reflected in the order of entry: first Priests, then Levites, then all the people. The order of service is as follows:

- Praise of God (Priests and Levites)
  (Congregational Response - "Amen, Amen!")
- Recital of the Mighty Deeds and Merciful Grace of God (Priests)
- Recital of the Rebellions of Israel (Levites)
- Confession of Wickedness (Congregation)
- Blessing of the Faithful (Priests)
  (Congregational Response - "Amen, Amen!")
- Curse of the Wicked (Levites)
  (Congregational Response - "Amen, Amen!")
- Curse of the Rebellious (Priests and Levites)
  (Congregational Response - "Amen, Amen!")

Three items of interest call for comment. The initial blessing or praise of God with the recital of His mighty deeds and merciful grace is not spelled out, and it seems to be well known. It is not unreasonable to conjecture that this may have been the recital of the Kaddish and Shema service, which opened every synagogue service, and was recited daily in the Temple.³

---

¹. IQ S I, 16-18; the translation is Vermes', op.cit., p. 72.
². IQ S I, 18 - II, 25.
Secondly, after the initial praise of God and recitation of his deeds and grace, the children of Israel are dealt with. This section forms a neat chiastic pattern, as follows:

A' Recital of Rebellions
B Recital of Wickedness
C Blessing of the Faithful
B' Curse of the Wicked
A' Curse of the Rebellious

As in other chiastic patterns there is an inverted parallelism, with the climax coming in the centre of the structure, and forming the turning point. Here is an interesting example of chiasmus as a liturgical form.¹

Thirdly, the liturgy was to be performed "year by year." This has been interpreted by most scholars as indicating an annual ceremony, probably held at Pentecost as a feast of renewal of the Covenant.² This may well be the case. It seems equally possible to us that this was part of the daily prayer liturgy. The only other reference to "entering the Covenant" is in the Prayer of Preparation in which the mashkil vows to "enter the Covenant of God" every morning and evening.³ The rubric calls for the entry liturgy to be performed "year by year."⁴ This phrase,

¹ Cf. the discussion of chiasmus in Chapter III, "Liturgical Patterns," pp. 141-149.
² So Vermes, op. cit., pp. 31, 44; Dupont-Sommer, The Jewish Sect of Qumran, p. 96; Milik, op. cit., p. 103; Black, op. cit., p. 92.
³ IQ S X, 10. It should be noticed, however, that the verb translated "to enter" in I, 18 is יָרֵא, "pass over, into," whereas the verb in X, 10 is יָרֵא, "to enter."
⁴ IQ S II, 19.
does not necessarily signify an annual event, to be held only once a year (although it may do so). In Old Testament usage it may also mean simply "year in and year out," or throughout the years. The passage quoted above enjoins the Covenanters to enter the Covenant "so that they may not abandon him during the dominion of Belial because of fear or terror or affliction." It is difficult to see how an initial entry ceremony, or even an annual renewal liturgy, would be insurance against such apostasy. The regulation makes better sense if it is referring to a daily liturgy. The meaning of the rubric would then be "thus shall they do, throughout the years, every (one of the) days of the dominion of Belial." We would not insist on this interpretation, but it seems to us that the discussion is not closed.

F. ORGANIZATION FOR WORSHIP

The community had its own peculiar organization which seemed to apply also to liturgical functions. A quorum of

1. As in I Sam. 1.7.

2. Mention should also be made of Baumgärtel's article referred to above (p. 331) in which he argues that the similarity between the entry liturgy and certain Old Testament passages which belong to some cultic ceremony indicates that it was part of a Temple liturgy, perhaps for Pentecost. This would seem to reinforce the view that it was an annual event, but it could also be argued that these biblical passages are based on an older daily Temple liturgy. Ford, op.cit., p. 121 argues for a close connection with the Samaritan Passover pilgrimage up Mt. Gerizim, which is still performed. This is an annual event, and if Ford's suggestion is correct, would lend weight to the view that the Entry Liturgy was an annual ceremony.
ten men was required for any meeting.\(^1\) There was a ruling assembly, called The Many. It is unclear whether this was an executive council of the whole Community. We tend toward the position that it referred to the Community when assembled. Within The Many was a higher council composed of twelve men, perhaps representing the twelve princes of the Mosaic tribal assembly, and three priests, perhaps representing the three clans of Levi.\(^2\) Administrative oversight was given to the Mebaqqer, or Overseer.\(^3\) He was also known as the Mashkil in his role as instructor.\(^4\) He was to be a Levite, and as such, in charge of all the non-priestly religious functions. The priests carried out the duties of "sacrifice, the care of most holy things, and atonement."\(^5\)

We have already argued that the worship of the community was an intensification and interweaving of both the Temple and synagogue. The priests would then handle those functions primarily connected with the Temple liturgy, and the Overseer would have been in charge of those functions primarily connected with the synagogue. The distinction between Temple and synagogue liturgy must not be made too sharply, however.

In addition to morning and evening sacrifice, assemblies were held for worship, administrative business or

---

1. IQ S VI, 3; CD XIII, 1.
judicial concerns. As in the rest of Judaism, no sharp division was made between "secular" and "sacred" assemblies. Everyone sat in his place in the assembly according to rank. The Overseer had the final word on who should speak, and probably fulfilled a liturgical function comparable to that of the "Ruler of the Synagogue." 2

The "house of prostration" may have referred to a temple (see the discussion above, pp. 331-334). Whether it was used as such or not, the cultic hall was also used as an assembly hall, and was considered a place of holiness when worship was being conducted. 3 No one could enter it unclean, nor were they to be late. 4 Sleeping, spitting and leaving during the service were penal offences. 5 No one with human uncleanness could hold office. 6 This implies that there were functional offices, probably comparable to those of the synagogue: the attendant and the reader, or Sheliach.

G. TIMES OF WORSHIP

As in the rest of Judaism, prayers were conducted daily in the morning and evening, corresponding to the

1. IQ S VI, 8-9.
3. CD XI, 21- XII, 1; IQ Sa II, 3-4.
4. CD XI, 22-23.
5. IQ S VI, 10-13.
6. IQ Sa II, 4-5.
Temple sacrifices. The Covenanters held evening prayer at dusk, and morning prayer just as dawn was breaking, as Josephus and Philo also report.

There were seven festivals, held at fifty-day intervals (see p.321 above). Special services were also held on Sabbaths, at the beginning of the month, at seasonal changes, and on New Year. Another deviation from ordinary Judaism was the custom of assembling for the reading of the Book and the study of the Law and prayer every night for one-third of the night. This was probably done in a manner similar to that of the Sabbath morning synagogue service.

H. LITURGICAL FORMS

We do not have sufficient evidence as yet to analyze the liturgy for daily worship in detail. Prayers and the reading of scripture probably differed little from current synagogue practice.

1. IQ S X, 1-3,10; IQ M XIV, 12-13.
2. Ibid.; see also IQ H XII, 4-6.
4. De Vita Contemplativa, II, 475, 485. Cf. also references to this practice in the Wisdom of Solomon 16.28 and the third Book of the Sibyllines 591 ff. The reference in Berakoth 9b to the watikin may be to the Essenes.
5. IQ S X, 3-8.
6. IQ S VI, 7-8. Burrows maintains that this passage means that they studied the Law every night in three shifts, so that it was read and studied continuously, op.cit., pp. 366, 371. This is possible, but the simpler interpretation which we have adopted seems more plausible. So also Milik, op.cit., p. 104.
1. Praise. Praise formed a definite part of the liturgy. In the Heavenly Liturgy a sound of joyful praise is followed by a small voice of blessing "in all the camp of God," followed by another resounding voice of praise. This bears a striking similarity to the current liturgical manner of reciting the Shema. Moreover, the second fragment of the Liturgical Prayer reflects the influence of both the Yotzer and Ahabah, blessings preceding the Shema. It would seem most likely that the Shema service formed an integral part of daily prayer. If the Covenanters were Essenes, then this is confirmed by Josephus, Philo and the Talmud. This may be what is meant by the Mashkils "entering the Covenant" morning and evening, for the Shema is the recital of God's Covenant with Israel. The same passage also mentions the recitation of God's decrees at the same time. This could refer to the Decalogue, which formed an integral part of the Temple Shema service in the first century.

2. Prayer. Not only praise, but prayer was also offered morning and evening. This is also in conformity with Jewish practice. At the time of the composition of the scrolls - indeed, at the time of the destruction of Qumran - the Jewish daily prayers had not yet been fixed in

1. IQ Serek.
3. IQ 34 and 34 bis II.
4. See the references on p. 351, fn. 4.
5. IQ S X, 10.
6. Tamid V, 1. We would accept the judgment of Vermes that the Hymns (IQH) are all hymns of thanksgiving intended for private use and not corporate worship, op.cit., p. 149.
7. IQ H XII, 4-6.
their final liturgical form and order. The Qumran period was the period in which the Amidah were being developed. Therefore we would not expect to find any fragments of the Palestinian Amidah. It is significant, however, that we do find a few prayers with similarities to the Jewish prayers as they were finalized toward the end of the first century. IQ H VI, 8-9 contains a blessing similar to Amidah 1, and IQ H XI, 27-28 bears a resemblance to Amidah 4. The Entry Liturgy contains a prayer of confession, a blessing of the faithful, and a curse of the heretics, corresponding to Amidah 6, 13, and 12 respectively.¹

Even more striking is the use of the formula, "Blessed art Thou, 0 Lord, who..." followed by a participle, seven times in the Hodayot and once in the Liturgical Prayer.² This formula is not used once in the Psalms. But it is the very formula which concludes every one of the Jewish Amidah, as well as being used in the Shema blessings. This would seem to us to indicate, contrary to the view that the Hodayot were all individual prayers not intended for common worship,³ that some of the Hodayot fragments contain liturgical prayers. This is further borne out by the fact that the obviously individual formula, "I thank Thee, 0 Lord," used fourteen times, occurs for the most part in the earlier fragments,⁴ whereas the liturgical formula is confined to

---

1. IQ S I-II. See the texts in Appendix III, "Synagogue Worship," pp. 312-314.
2. IQH X, 14; XI, 27, 29, 32; (XIV, 8; ) XVI, 8; IQ 34 and 34 bis I, 8.
columns X, XI, (XIV, XV,) and XVI.

That there were set liturgical prayers is further borne out by the probable reference to six of them by name, in the manner of the Talmud, in what appears to be the Mashkil's daily liturgical Prayer of Preparation.\footnote{IQ S X, 11-12. Cf. "My Righteousness," "Fountain of Knowledge," "Source of Holiness," "Summit of Glory," "Author of Goodness," and "Almighty Eternal Majesty."} This is confirmed by the discovery of three hundred fragments of a manuscript in Cave 4 which gives set morning and evening prayers for each day of the month.\footnote{"Communication de C.-H. Huntzinger," \textit{RB}, LXIII (1956), p. 67.}

Other prayers of interest are the prayer at the point of victory in IQ M XIII, and the prayer of blessing in the same scroll, XVIII, reciting the final apocalyptic acts of God.

The congregation responded to the prayers with "Amen, Amen."\footnote{IQ S. I-II; Words of the Heavenly Lights, I.}

The Blessing of the High Priest\footnote{IQ S 110 2-4; cf. also IQ Sb.1, III.} is clearly based on the Aaronic Benediction, Num. 6.24-26, which was pronounced daily in the Jewish synagogue services, by a priest if available, at the conclusion of the prayer service.

3. Reading and Exposition of Scripture. The climax of the synagogue service was instruction in the Torah. This is not without mention in the scrolls. The Overseer was to instruct the congregation in the works of God.\footnote{IQ S III, 13; CD XIII, 7-8.} In every
council of ten men or more there was to be at least one who studied the Law continually.\(^1\) In the last day every man born in Israel would be instructed in the Book of Meditation and precepts of the Covenant.\(^2\) The Covenanters considered themselves as fulfilling Isa. 40.3 by studying the Law in the wilderness by the Dead Sea.\(^3\) That study of the Law was an integral part of worship is seen from the fact that they assembled every night, for a third of the night, "to read the Book and to study Law and to pray together."\(^4\)

**I. MUSIC**

As in Judaism, music played a role in worship, although it is still obscure as to how it was used in the synagogue liturgy.\(^5\) In the Mashkil's liturgical Prayer of Preparation he vows to sound lyre, harp and voice to the glory of God in songs of thanksgiving.\(^6\) In the Heavenly Liturgy all the numbered ones sing hymns of praise,\(^7\) a description which probably reflects the liturgical practice of the Community. Perhaps some of the Hodayot were sung at the time of the Entry Liturgy.

---

1. IQ S VI, 6-7.
2. IQ Sa I, 4-7.
3. IQ S VIII, 15.
4. See above, p. 351, fn. 6.
5. As regards the Hymns (IQH), see above, p. 352, fn. 6.
7. 4Q Serek.
I CORINTHIANS III. 10–15
AND THE TESTAMENT OF ABRAHAM

In I Cor. iii. 10–15 Paul describes the Corinthian church as God’s building, whose foundation he has laid, and whose superstructure is being built by others. The passage comprises the second part of a dual metaphor, the first being the church as God’s plant, which he introduces to reinforce his argument against factiousness.

The central point of the passage is that although Paul has laid the foundation of the church, which is Christ, and others are building upon it, they are all fellow-workmen together and not antagonists or competitors for whom the members of the congregation should declare themselves. He does issue a warning, however, to any successor of his who by disruptive teaching and goading to factiousness may build a faulty ‘superstructure’. At this point he introduces a peculiar idea: that each man’s work will be tested by fire when ‘the Day will make it manifest’ to determine reward or loss. Against what sort of background is the Apostle speaking?

Commentators have pointed out that fire as an agent of God’s judgement is a commonplace in Jewish apocalyptic. None of the passages usually mentioned, however, really offers any parallel, or forms a definite referent for our passage in I Cor. iii. Isaiah xxxi. 9 and xliii. 2 speak of the fire of the Lord in judgement, but only as a vague and general metaphor. Malachi iii. 2 and iv. 1 have a definite eschatological orientation, but refer in the first instance to the refining purgation of the sons of Levi, and in the second to the fire which will consume the evildoers themselves (not their works). A similar image of fire as the agent of God’s punitive wrath is envisaged in Psalms of Solomon xv. 6–8. A closer parallel is found in II Baruch xlviii. 39, in which the fire of judgement will consume the thoughts and meditations of the wicked, but even this is far removed from the concept of testing works by fiery judgement for reward or loss. The unfruitful trees and the chaff which, according to the tradition attributed to the Baptist (Matt. iii. 10–12, Luke iii. 9), will be burned with fire, would seem to apply to people who are already condemned rather than works to be tried.

There is one parallel, however, which does come close to Paul’s idea, at least in basic substance. This is the passage in the Testament of Abraham, xiii, in which Michael explains to Abraham the scene of judgement which he has just witnessed. The judgement is that which is by Man, which is the first of three, the second being by the Twelve Tribes of Israel, and the third by God Himself. The souls of men appear before the judge, who is Abel the

2 Mentioned only by Hering, in a footnote, op. cit. p. 24.
brother of Cain, and an angel ‘like unto the sun’, called Dokiel, weighs the righteousnesses and sins of each soul, which are recorded in a big book. Another angel, Puruel, holds in his hand the fire, and he tests the work of men through fire. And if the fire burns up the work of any man, immediately the angel of judgement takes him and carries him away into the place of sinners, into the bitterest punishment. But if the fire tests the work of any man and does not destroy it, this man is justified, and the angel of righteousness takes him and carries him up to be saved, in the lot of the just. And thus, most righteous Abraham, all things among all men shall be tested by fire and balance.

Thus we have in the Testament of Abraham the same peculiar combination of four elements found in I Cor. iii. 10–15: (1) the testing (2) of works (3) by fire (4) on an eschatological Day of Judgement. The parallel is further borne out by a comparison of the language:

I Corinthians iii. 10–15

v. 13: καὶ ἐκάτου ὁ τὸ ἔργον ὑποίδον ἔστιν τὸ πῦρ αὐτό δοκιμάσει.

v. 14: εἰ τινος τὸ ἔργον μενεῖ

v. 15: εἰ τινος τὸ ἔργον κατακαθισται

Testament of Abraham, xiii

καὶ δοκιμάσει τὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἔργα διὰ πυρὸς.

εἰ τινος δὲ τὸ ἔργον τὸ πῦρ δοκιμάσει καὶ μὴ ἀφεται αὐτοῦ

εἰ τινος τὸ ἔργον κατακαθίσται τὸ πῦρ

The language is so similar that it is difficult not to postulate a dependence of one upon the other.

The question, however, is which one is dependent upon the other. James argued that the Testament is the work of a second century Jewish Christian. His main arguments are the use of a few late Greek forms and some seventeen references which James claims betray a Christian hand. If he is correct, then the Testament is of little value for our understanding of the New Testament, and the passage under consideration is merely an echo of Paul, rather than providing the referent for the Apostle’s thought.

James’s hypothesis, however, is unconvincing. Even the oldest and most reliable manuscripts of the Testament, A and B of the Longer Recension, have evidently been worked over in no small measure by later redactors, as James himself points out, which could easily account for the presence of a few late Greek forms.

Of the seventeen ‘Christian’ references, six are not distinctly Christian at all, and would only be identified as such by reading into the passages in question more than appears to be there. There are four clearly Christian
interpolations, including the doxology at the end. There is one other possible interpolation, although it could easily fit into a Jewish context.

There remain six references which bear a resemblance in thought or language to the New Testament. Chapter vii contains a reference to Ἴξον Ἰπτσίντος ὁ παραστάτης τοῦ Ἱωάννη τοῦ Θεοῦ, which is a near parallel to Luke i. 19 and Rev. viii. 2. The concept of an angel or angels standing before God was common enough in Judaism, however, and neither New Testament passage is sufficiently parallel to prove dependence either way. The same may be said for the parallels between chapter x and John x. 10, and between chapter iv and I Thess. v. 22. There is an important passage in chapter xi on the ‘two ways’, which bears a resemblance to Matt. vii. 13–14 and the Didache. The similarity, however, is more in thought than in language, and the Qumran literature has shown that the concept of the ‘two ways’ existed in pre-Christian Judaism. Thus it may be precarious to assume Christian influence at this point.

Consequently we can only assert that two of the passages listed by James bear a marked similarity in language to the New Testament: the passage in chapter xiii under discussion, and another parallel in the same chapter to Rev. xiv. 18, in which an angel ὁ ἐπὶ τοῦ πυρὸς ἔχων τὴν ἕξωστος, ‘having authority over the fire’ is mentioned.

It would seem to us that two probable parallels are extremely tenuous evidence on which to construct a theory of second-century Jewish Christian authorship. In fact, Kohler refutes James, and on the basis of the extreme Jewishness of the work, and the absence of any distinctly Christian concepts, argues strongly for a pre-Christian Essene authorship. Ginzberg follows Kohler, although allowing for a non-Essene authorship, and argues for a Hebrew original. Box agrees as to its Jewish authorship, and suggests that it was originally written in free Greek based on a Hebrew tradition which grew up in the early part of the first century A.D. Rowley and Russell have pointed to the absence of a background of crisis, which would indicate a period either some time before or well after the Jewish uprising of A.D. 66–70.

context, however, is quite different; the phrase in Matthew refers to the earthly jailers of the debtor servant. It would seem that nothing more than a basic Jewish concept is operating here; moreover, the verb in Matthew is πτῷος ἔχων, whereas in the Testament it is ἤξωστος. He also quotes the phrase τοῦ σωτῆρος and lists Act ii. 4 in comparison. This is a misprint; he apparently refers to Acts ii. 47. The phrase also occurs in I Cor. i. 18. But in both cases the context is entirely different, and its occurrence in the Testament can hardly be anything but the linguistic coincidence of a common term denoting the righteous who survive the final judgement. Another example is the phrase δομένων πατρός, the ‘unseen father’, in ch. xvi, which he also lists as ‘unmistakably Christian’. The context is the scene in which the angel Death is summoned by Michael, ‘and he came with great fear, and stood before the unseen father’. There is nothing here which could not be written by a thoroughly Jewish mind of the first century A.D. It seems to us that these and three other references which James lists are hardly ‘unmistakably Christian phrases’.

2 J.E. pp. 93 ff.
Nigel Turner has more recently argued for its Jewish origin, not only on the basis of the fundamental Jewishness of its doctrine, but also the Jewishness of its language. Whether translated from Hebrew or written in 'Jewish Greek', claims Turner, it is clearly of Jewish origin. The lack of Christian content, the thoroughgoing Jewishness of its thought, and the nature of its language would seem, then, to argue for a date in the first half of the first century A.D. Thus, where close parallels do appear in the New Testament it is probable that the latter is dependent upon the Testament of Abraham rather than the other way around. In fact, there are three other parallels which James has overlooked, all occurring, significantly, in the Corinthian epistles. In I Cor. ii. 9 Paul quotes from an unknown source: "But just as it is written:

Things which eye has not seen,
nor ear heard,
nor into the heart of man have entered,
What things God has prepared τοῖς ἄγαπῶσιν αὐτῶν."

Origen claimed that the passage is taken from a lost *Apocalypse of Elijah*. Robertson and Plummer, however, have argued convincingly that the latter work is considerably later than Paul. In the Ascension of Isaiah xi. 34 the angel says to Isaiah, 'Thou hast seen what no child of flesh hath seen', but this is not sufficiently similar to constitute a source for Paul's quotation. The Ascension of Isaiah is thought by many to be post-Pauline anyhow. The closest known parallel is found in the language of Isaiah lxiv. 4 and lxxv. 17. That Clement of Rome understood Paul to be quoting freely from Isaiah is evident from the fact that when Clement quotes this Pauline passage in his Epistle to the Corinthians, xxxiv, he replaces the final phrase, τοῖς ἄγαπῶσιν αὐτῶν, with the Isaianic original, τοῖς ὑπομένουσιν αὐτῶν. Most commentators conclude that Paul is quoting rather freely from the Isaianic passages mentioned.

If that is the case, whence did Paul derive the expression τοῖς ἄγαπῶσιν αὐτῶν, also found in James i. 12, which he substituted for the Isaianic original to describe the righteous? In fact, the same phrase, even in the same case, is found in chapter m of the Testament of Abraham. It appears in a similar context, namely, the eschatological state of the righteous:

Holy, holy, holy is the Lord God,
Who is summoning him (Abraham)
To be τοῖς ἄγαπῶσιν αὐτῶν (God).

---

2 Of the present recensions, Turner suggests that B is older, and dates it no later than the third century A.D., and assigns Rec. A to the fifth or sixth century. For both recensions, however, he is compelled to stipulate 'very much earlier' Greek material, possibly even pre-Christian, since the language of both is essentially 'Biblical', *ibid.* p. 222.
3 See further discussion in Robertson and Plummer, *op. cit.* pp. 41-3.
Another parallel occurs in I Cor. xv. 52, in which Paul uses the phrase ἐν ἐκατόν ὕπατοι νυκτὸς, ‘in the twinkling of an eye’. The expression does not occur elsewhere in the New Testament or the Septuagint. Although it may have been a common expression, its use in this context of translation into a heavenly state is significant, for we find it used in a very similar context in the Testament of Abraham, iv, in which Michael ascends into Heaven ἐν ἐκατόν ὕπατοι νυκτὸς. The comparison between Michael’s ascent and the Christian’s transformation into a glorious body may have been suggested to Paul by the tradition that Michael was God’s agent in Enoch’s transformation from ‘earthly garments... into the garments of my (God’s) glory’ (II Enoch xxii. 8). Thus we find a parallel between the Testament of Abraham and I Cor. xv. 52 in both language and thought.¹

A third possible parallel is found in II Cor. xi. 14 ff., in which Paul asserts that ‘even Satan disguises himself as an angel of light’. The only parallel idea in the extant literature is found in the Testament of Abraham, xvi, in which the Angel of Death disguises himself in great light and glory. It is true that in the Testament of Abraham the Angel of Death is not morally evil, but is rather ‘the personification of physical evil... not of moral evil... He is an agent, not a counterpart of God and the principle of goodness.’² For Paul, however, death was indeed the inevitable result of moral evil, and it is easy to conceive how he would have viewed this legend as an example of an evil angel disguising himself as an angel of light. In any case, it provides the only known possible source of Paul’s thought in this passage.³

That Paul was dependent on the Testament of Abraham and not vice versa is seen not only by the arguments set forth above as to the Jewishness of the work, but especially by its salvation-theology. There is no reference to any sort of saving work of another figure which could be interpreted as Christ; on the contrary, we have a very exacting doctrine of salvation by individual merit. Each soul appears before Abel, the great book is opened, and the angel Dokiel weighs the sins and righteous deeds of each individual. The angel Puruel tests his works by fire. If the righteous deeds outweigh the sins and the works survive the fire, the soul enters the narrow gate of Heaven. If they do not, he is driven through the broad gate to Hell. If they are equal, he is set in the middle, until some mercy is shown on his behalf by God or, as Abraham does, someone prays for his soul and the scales are tipped in his favour. This is diametrically opposed to Paul’s concept of salvation by grace through faith in Christ. In the Testament, Abraham is just by virtue of his righteous life; for Paul he is justified by his faith.

¹ It is possible that both passages reflect the language of the second benediction of the Palestinian Recension of the Eighteen Benedictions, the Blessing of the Resurrection from the Dead, in which the Hebrew equivalent, יי דְָּנָה יי, occurs in connection with the quickening of the dead.

² Kohler, op. cit. pp. 591 ff.

³ Neither the three parallels just discussed nor the judgement passage in ch. xiii under consideration occur in the section suggested by Turner as part of a possible incorporated Christian apocalypse, op. cit. p. 220.
It would seem much more likely that Paul, the converted Jew, would draw upon this Jewish work and alter its theology in the process, than that some Jewish Christian with a very legalistic Jewish doctrine of salvation by works would be influenced by the Pauline literature. Thus we conclude that the Testament of Abraham was written before Paul, and that Paul was familiar with it, and that it forms the background for our passage in I Cor. iii. 10–15.

Returning to that passage, then, we see that the picture in the Testament, chapter xiii, is of the angel Puruel testing the works of each man by fire. If the fire burns up the work of any man, he is carried away into the place of bitterest punishment; but if the fire tries the work of any man without consuming it, he is saved.

Paul has introduced a metaphor of the church as God’s building. He understands himself as the skilled master builder who has laid the foundation, which is Christ. Others who follow him are also skilled workmen, building under the foundation which he has laid. The point he seems to be making at first is the same as that which he made in the metaphor of the church as God’s plant: that he who plants and he who waters, he who lays the foundation and he who builds upon it, are fellow-workers, not antagonists, and that it is really God who matters.

But then the thought seems to occur to him that one of his fellow-workers may, in fact, be an antagonist; so he injects a warning to any of his successors who may have been stirring up trouble and instigating factiousness. Having introduced the metaphor of the building, he carries out the warning in terms of the metaphor, beginning in v. 10b. The image of the trial of works by fire in the Testament of Abraham provides a suitable means of so doing. Although other men are building on the foundation which he has laid, they must be careful how they build, for their work will be tested in the fire, and the Day will disclose its true quality of workmanship and material. The language which follows, as we have pointed out above, is extremely close to that of the Testament of Abraham, chapter xiii.

Paul makes two significant alterations, however, which, seen against the background of the Testament of Abraham, confirm the traditional interpretation of Paul’s soteriology. In the Testament the trial by fire is to determine the eternal destiny of a human soul: if his works withstand the fiery trial he enters into heavenly reward; if they are consumed he is sent to Hell, the place of ‘bitterest punishment’. In Paul, however, the trial of works by fire is not to determine the eternal destiny of a human soul; rather, it seems to be a test of the works of the leaders of the church, to determine whether or not they shall receive rewards within the context of salvation. They themselves are saved; that is not in question. But Paul seems here to envisage degrees of heavenly reward among the elect. This is a distinct, and significantly Pauline, shift of emphasis from the salvation-by-merit theology of the Testament of Abraham.
A second alteration occurs in v. 15, in which Paul adds the clause: ‘he will suffer loss, though he himself will be saved, but only as through fire’. If we understand the apostle to be speaking against the background of the Testament of Abraham it is clear why he is concerned to add this clause. While warning against factiousness and shoddy workmanship in the building of God’s church, he does not want to be misunderstood; he does not agree with the basic idea of his source. On the contrary, he is at pains to make clear that salvation remains a matter of grace through faith, apart from works, and that the judgement of which he speaks is that of the works of those who have responsibility for the building up of God’s church to determine their rewards or loss thereof within the context of salvation by grace.

CHARLES W. FISHBURNE
REPORTS
APPEL ET PROPOSITIONS AUX
PATROLOGUES ET AUX BIBLISTES
POUR UN INVENTAIRE GENERAL
DES CITATIONS PATRISTIQUES DE
LA BIBLE GRECQUE

Du 1 au 3 octobre 1969 s'est tenu à Strasbourg le colloque annuel du Centre de Recherches d'Histoire des Religions (Université de Strasbourg). Ce colloque international avait été organisé cette année par le Centre d'Analyse et de Documentation patristiques avec la collaboration de la Novi Testamenti graeci Editio major critica, une grande entreprise internationale créée en 1968.

Cette rencontre, qui rassemblait plusieurs dizaines de patrologues et de biblistes, avait pour thème 'La Bible et les Pères'. Les communications relatives à la littérature, à l'exégèse, à la pensée chrétienne ancienne, comme celles qui furent consacrées à l'histoire et à la critique du texte ou des versions bibliques, ont amené tous les participants du colloque à reprendre une conscience plus vive de l'intérêt considérable que présentent les citations patristiques de la Bible pour leurs domaines de recherche respectifs. Un mois plus tard, le 4 novembre 1969, à l'Institut Biblique de Rome, une autre rencontre a eu lieu, sur invitation du Comité d'édition de l'Editio major critica. Autour de divers problèmes posés par les citations, cette rencontre réunissait la majorité des patrologues qui enseignent dans les Universités d'Italie ou dans les centres internationaux d'enseignement supérieur rattachés au Saint-Siège. Ces deux colloques de Strasbourg et de Rome ainsi que de nombreux contacts personnels avec des patrologues et des biblistes de divers pays ont permis un certain nombre de constatations stimulantes.

Il est clair tout d'abord que l'ensemble des spécialistes intéressés souhaiterait vivement la réalisation d'une collection complète et définitive des citations et allusions bibliques que renferment les anciennes littératures
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