

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen
zum Neuen Testament 76

Anton Fridrichsen

Exegetical Writings



Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen
zum Neuen Testament

Herausgegeben von
Martin Hengel und Otfried Hofius

76

Anton Fridrichsen

Exegetical Writings

A Selection

Translated and Edited by
Chrys C. Caragounis and Tord Fornberg



J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck) Tübingen

Die Deutsche Bibliothek – CIP-Einheitsaufnahme

Fridrichsen, Anton:

Exegetical writings: a selection/Anton Fridrichsen. Transl. and ed. by
Chrys C. Caragounis and Tord Fornberg. – Tübingen: Mohr, 1994

(Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament; 76)

ISBN 3-16-146268-8 978-3-16-157446-7 Unveränderte eBook-Ausgabe 2019

NE: Caragounis, Chrys C. [Hrsg.]; Fridrichsen, Anton: [Sammlung]: GT

© 1994 by J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), P.O. Box 2040, D-72010 Tübingen.

This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, in any form (beyond that permitted by copyright law) without the publisher's written permission. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations, microfilms and storage and processing in electronic systems.

The book was typeset by Gulde-Druck in Tübingen using Times typeface, printed by Gulde-Druck in Tübingen on acid-free paper from Papierfabrik Buhl in Ettlingen and bound by Heinr. Koch in Tübingen.

ISSN 0512-1604

This Book
is Dedicated to

the Theological Faculty
of the University of Uppsala
Scene of A. Fridrichsen's
Exegetical Labours
and Alma Mater
of the Editors

Table of Contents

<i>Preface</i>	XI
--------------------------	----

Introductory

Anton Fridrichsen as Academic Teacher in the Service of the Church by ERIK BEJER.	3
Realistic Interpretation of the Bible. A Scientific Demand and a Practical Desideratum (1936)	21

Part One

The Synoptic Gospels

The Logion concerning "to carry one's cross". A Critical-exegetical Study (1922)	33
The Tripartite Formula in Matt 28:19 and Baptism in the Three Names (1922)	46
The Parables in Recent Research (1929)	58
The Conflict of Jesus with the Unclean Spirits	71
Who Did Jesus Claim to Be? The Historical Foundation of Faith in Christ According to Present Bibli- cal Research (1931)	84
Excepta fornicationis causa (1944)	116
Neutestamentliche Wortforschung. Zu Matth. 11.11–15 (1946)	120

Part Two
The Fourth Gospel

Jesus' Farewell Discourse in the Fourth Gospel. An Introduction to the Johannine Question (1938)	125
Bemerkungen zur Fußwaschung Joh 13 (1939)	138
The Shepherd Chapter. Jn 10 (1943)	141

Part Three
Paul

Zur Auslegung von Röm 1. 19 f. (1916)	159
Die Apologie des Paulus Gal. 1 (1922)	168
Der wahre Jude und sein Lob. Röm 2,28 f. (1922)	186
Zum Stil des paulinischen Peristasenkatalogs 2 Cor 11,23 ff. (1928)	195
Peristasenkatalog und <i>res gestae</i> . Nachtrag zu 2 Cor 11,23 ff. (1929)	199
Exegetisches zu den Paulusbriefen (1930)	203
Paulus <i>abortivus</i> . Zu 1 Kor 15,8 (1932)	211
Epikureisches im Neuen Testament? (1933)	217
ἰσόψυχος = ebenbürtig, solidarisch (1938)	221
Neutestamentliche Wortforschung. <i>Themelios</i> , 1 Kor. 3,11 (1946)	228
Neutestamentliche Wortforschung. 'Nicht für Raub achten', Phil 2,6 (1946)	231
The Apostle and His Message (1947)	233

Part Four
Varia

The New Testament and Hellas (1930)	253
“Sich selbst verleugnen” (1936)	264
Acts 26,28 (1938)	270
The Unity of the New Testament (1938)	273
Sprachliches und Stilistisches zum Neuen Testament (1943)	282
<i>Bibliographical Notes</i>	292
<i>Index of Passages</i>	295
<i>Index of Modern Authors</i>	311

Preface

The origins of this book go back to the last week of May 1992. In the relaxed atmosphere of the living-room of his Tübingen home Prof. Martin Hengel approached Chrys C. Caragounis with his long-cherished idea of seeing the widely-scattered and thus little known exegetical writings of Anton Fridrichsen made available in book form. To this intent he made available the series of *WUNT*, which he and Prof. Otfried Hofius edit together, and provided Caragounis with a list of Fridrichsen's writings.

On his return to Sweden Caragounis contacted Docent Dr. Tord Fornberg (Uppsala) inviting him to become co-editor of the volume. Together we worked through Fridrichsen's writings in the difficult task of choosing a mere ten per cent of what was available to be included in the present volume.

As we look back, we are happy and grateful that Professor Hengel took this fine initiative, gave his encouragement and made it possible through the *WUNT* series to publish some of the exegetical writings of Anton Fridrichsen – undoubtedly the greatest Scandinavian New Testament scholar of this century. We are also happy that at a somewhat later stage also Herr Georg Siebeck embraced the project with good-will and enthusiasm and did all that was necessary by way of practical arrangements to see the book through the press.

The writings of Anton Fridrichsen have been published in many languages (in his native Norwegian as well as in Swedish, German, English, French, and Latin) and in many journals, some of which are little known to New Testament scholars. At first we decided on a trilingual book: we would use material published by Fridrichsen in German, English and French, and would, moreover, translate a number of Swedish and Norwegian studies into English. We were then planning a larger book. Owing to the economical recession of the times Herr Siebeck requested of us to reduce the size of the proposed volume to no more than 350 pages, and this compelled us reluctantly to excise the French material.

Our choice of material has been guided by several principles and concerns. First, we have included an evaluation of Fridrichsen's person and work, setting him in the theological context of Uppsala at the time of his appointment, and of his significance for Swedish scholarship, written by his pupil, the late Erik

Beijer, in 1988.¹ In this way Fridrichsen's contribution is placed in its proper context. Second, to present Fridrichsen's particular approach to biblical interpretation we have included his programmatic essay, "Realistic Interpretation of the Bible", which sets forth his method, hermeneutical principles, and his particular angle of approach. Third, we have included a number of articles that he had published in English and German as well as a number of his studies, originally published in Norwegian and Swedish. Our selection has been motivated by our desire to give an adequate picture of the man, his theological achievement, and the way in which his own work fitted in the context of the international debate.

Our objective to make available particularly material that was inaccessible or not easily accessible for scholars has led us to include on the one hand a number of studies in German, published in internationally rather unknown journals like the *Symbolae Osloenses*, and on the other hand to translate into English several of Fridrichsen's most important studies that were published in Norwegian and Swedish. Accordingly our translated material from Norwegian and Swedish comprises more than fifty per cent of the book.

Although we have looked into each other's work and inspected together the entire manuscript in its final stage, our respective responsibilities have been as follows: Fornberg has translated the Norwegian material and Caragounis the Swedish material into English. To avoid different styles and format by reproducing photomechanically the existing German and English material, Caragounis scanned this material carrying it over to his computer. One German article, written in old German characters, was typed by Fornberg into his computer. The scanning proved to be more problematic than anticipated and Caragounis had to restore the German and English material by comparison with the originals. He also typed in the Greek for the entire manuscript. Fornberg and Caragounis each read the proofs of the German and English material. The page lay-out has been preserved in as far as this was possible, but a number of editorial changes – as e. g. the use of the same quotation marks in all articles, the consecutive numbering of footnotes throughout each article, as well as the same type for all article titles – had to be made, changes which do not affect the wording or the punctuation of the original. The material published originally in German and English has been left as it was even where syntactical errors were discovered, with the exception of the minimal correction of a few quite obvious inadvertently committed typographical errors.

¹ For a fuller account of A. Fridrichsen's significance as an exegete and theologian of the Church, see A. Smith, *Anton Fridrichsens kristendomsforståelse*, Oslo 1976. For a brief introduction to the life and work of A. Fridrichsen in English as well as a complete bibliography, see the recent booklet by Erik Heen, *Anton Fridrichsen (1888–1953). A Bibliography*, University of Oslo. Faculty of Theology. Bibliography Series 5, Oslo 1993.

Our thanks are due to Mr. Douglas Jackson, M.Th., for his valuable suggestions to improve the English of our translations. Docent Curt Dahlgren, Lund, kindly made available the Theological Faculty's scanner and his expertise to Caragounis for scanning the German and English material. Caragounis' former student, Mr. Per Holmberg, B.D., now a research student at the University of Göteborg, prepared the indices. Last but not least we owe a debt of gratitude to Professor Jan Bergman of Uppsala. He knows why.

As this book leaves our hands, it is our wish that, besides giving all its readers the pleasure of being acquainted with the perspicacious and sober thinking of one of the great New Testament scholars of this century, it may also challenge and inspire particularly the younger scholars with the true nature of their task: to make the meaning and life of the New Testament transparent and relevant for modern man. It was Fridrichsen's deepest concern to put theology and exegesis in the service of the Church.

Lund 20 February 1994

Chrys C. Caragounis and Tord Fornberg

Introductory

Anton Fridrichsen as Academic Teacher in the Service of the Church

by

ERIK BEIJER

Few academic teachers in recent years have had such a significance within their province of research as *Anton Fridrichsen*. During a period of more than twenty years from his appointment in 1928 to his retirement in 1953, he left his mark on the teaching of New Testament exegesis at the University of Uppsala. When he commenced his professorship at Uppsala he was already well-known and respected in academic circles on the continent. At Fridrichsen's invitation a whole array of scholars, chiefly from German universities visited and lectured at Uppsala. This gave the students the opportunity to come in personal contact with international scholarship – it is difficult for us today to understand how isolated the academic milieu at this northern Swedish university was, at least with regards to theological studies. For students and younger scholars to travel abroad before the Second World War was quite simply an exception. Later the War put a stop to all travel. But international winds blew around Anton Fridrichsen, and he generously shared his wide outlook. At his research seminar a number of young scholars were bred, many of whom later came to hold chairs in various foreign universities, both in Europe and the U. S. A. But even for the usual students who, following their graduation, went out as priests or teachers, he had a decisive significance. Even to the church life of Sweden in general he gave stimulating and decisive impulses through his teaching ministry. I believe, therefore that this year – 100 years after his birth on the 4th January 1888 – it would be appropriate to give a few indications in the *Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok* of the significance, which Anton Fridrichsen has had for Swedish church life through his teaching.

Anton Fridrichsen entered his office as academic teacher at a time, when students came as a rule to the study of New Testament Exegesis, with a solid preparatory education. Most of them had taken the classical course of study in high school, which meant that they had had Greek for two academic years. If at the time of the commencement of their theological studies, they had not already taken a Bachelor of Philosophy degree in Classical Languages, they had, at any

rate, taken the theological-philosophical examination, “teofilen”, which was an obligatory entrance requirement, in which *inter alia* the study of Koine-Greek formed a part. This was the starting point, at which the study of the New Testament was embarked upon. Anton Fridrichsen was a demanding teacher. From the *Study Manual of the Theological Faculty*, the 1931 edition, it emerges that for the mark of *Pass* “an intimate knowledge of the writings of the New Testament and their contents was demanded, and an ability to translate the entire New Testament in such a way that the text was comprehensible both linguistically and materially”. Fridrichsen gives a few reflections on this basic demand: “The requisite familiarity with the Greek NT cannot be acquired in any other way than through an assiduous and protracted study of the text”. “A Lexicon and Grammar must be constantly consulted. One should not shun the labor of writing lists of words and learning them by heart. An emphatic warning is hereby given against taking refuge in a translation and learning it by rote”. Those were unequivocal words. Consequently, the New Testament was regarded by Fridrichsen’s students as a difficult subject. At the Priests’ conference in the Archdiocese in 1941 Fridrichsen delivered his oration on “Nya Testamentets enhet”.¹ In it he speaks of the narrow road that leads to life: “Only by engaging one’s whole being seriously in the search can one discover the path that leads to life. This is the way in which the New Testament, too, in all its parts discloses its inner unity of life only to those who apply themselves to the study of Scriptures with all seriousness and energy . . . The task is already large and heavy when one reads the wretched elements that are demanded for getting the first courses in the B.D. degree . . . No one can be spared the hours of discouragement in the scientific study of the Bible”.² Fridrichsen demanded much of his students, but he also gave them much.

In order that we might understand today what significance Fridrichsen’s teaching at Uppsala came to have, we need to place ourselves in the situation which prevailed at this northern Swedish university at the time Fridrichsen entered upon his office in the 1920’s. One might say an exegetical vacuum prevailed. During the years of 1909–1920 the exegetical chair had been occupied by Adolf Kolmodin. With all his erudition he represented an exegetical conservatism similar to that of Theodor Zahn. Kolmodin had acquired the professorial chair by defeating S. A. Fries, who represented the growing scholarship that was coloured by liberalism. This type of scholarship, therefore, never made itself felt in the exegetical teaching at Uppsala. The break became still greater when Kolmodin was succeeded by Gillis Persson Wetter in 1923.³

¹ Anton Fridrichsen, “Nya Testamentets enhet”, *SEÅ* 6 (1941), pp. 43ff. [This essay is included in the present volume under the title “The Unity of the New Testament” (Tr.).]

² *Ibid.* p. 52f. [in original edition (Tr.).]

³ Anton Friedrichsen, Olof Linton, Gösta Lindeskog, *Gillis Wetter in Memoriam, Arbeiten und Mitteilungen aus dem neutestamentlichen Seminar zu Uppsala V*, printed in Helsinki 1937.

Wetter was an out-and-out representative of the religio-historical school. For him the great names were *Reitzenstein* and *Bousset*. Early Christianity belonged together with the Hellenistic mystery religions. A great chasm separated the early Christian churches growing on Hellenistic soil from the early Church within the Palestinian context. Wetter came to the professorial chair of the New Testament at Uppsala from the Stockholm *Högskola*⁴, where he was professor in the History of Religions. He was a frequent contributor to the daily press, and presented also his views to the educated public through a number of popular-scientific works.⁵ In circles close to the Stockholm *Högskola* Wetter was a respected name. In Uppsala, where he was to educate priests, it would appear that he became quite isolated. Since his teaching-labours came to an abrupt end by a humanly speaking early death in 1926, his work as an academic teacher turned out to be a mere parenthesis. There never was enough time to create a continuity. The chasm between Kolmodin and Wetter was too wide and too deep. Kolmodin was a conservative. Wetter was a radical. This caused a great uncertainty within such a central subject for theological studies as New Testament exegesis.

Such was the situation, when Anton Fridrichsen appeared on the scene at Uppsala. He was made professor on the 27th of April 1928 and delivered his inaugural lecture on the 15th of September the same year. Thereby a new chapter in the history of Uppsala exegesis had begun. The man who was thus installed was a mature man with his eye open to what the hour demanded. He was familiar with all aspects of his subject and had an open mind for new views and ideas. Some professors are strangely finished when they are installed on their chairs. Anton Fridrichsen definitely did not belong to this category.⁶

Among the factors which contributed to the feeling of disorientation among the students, and their difficulty in understanding any inner connection within exegesis, was their difficulty in finding an organic connection between the two Testaments. The study of Old Testament exegesis had been dominated for decades by Erik Stave. During the long period between 1899 and 1922 he occupied the chair of biblical exegesis with the center of gravity in the Old Testament. At Uppsala Stave had performed a pioneer's work by his introduction of the new exegesis, whose foremost representative was Julius Wellhausen. The acceptance of this new kind of exegesis had not taken place without a bitter struggle. Together with Nathan Söderblom and Einar Billing, Stave had tried to show that the scientific study of the Bible was no threat to the Christian faith.⁷

⁴ [I.e. a university-level institution (Tr.).]

⁵ Gillis Persson Wetter, *Det urkristna gudstjänstlivet och Nya testamentet*, 1923; Idem, *Kristendomen och hellenismen*, 1923; Idem, *Johannes' Uppenbarelse*, 1924; Idem, *Innanför Herakles' stoder. En resa i Nya Testamentets värld*, 1926.

⁶ Harald Riesenfeld, "Anton Fridrichsen 4/1 1888–16/11 1953," *SEÅ* 18–19 (1953–1954), pp. 7ff. Axel Smith, *Anton Fridrichsens kristendomsförståelse*, Oslo 1976.

⁷ Sven Linder, *Domprostsen Erik Stave. En minnesteckning*, *SEÅ* 5 (1940), pp. 224ff.

The new radical scholarship which Stave represented, was also in some way easier to apply to the Old Testament than to the New. The center of gravity in Old Testament piety had come to rest with the prophets. These could be seen as representatives for a religious development, which placed ethics before cult, and could therefore be seen as heralds of a portrait of Jesus characterized by ethical ideals – the portrait of Jesus represented by liberal theology. Once Stave sat securely in the saddle, he was untiring in writing manuals and popular writings on Old Testament themes. He was still in his best years when “the young men of the Church”⁸ studied. They were ambitious, and in the Swedish countryside many lectures have been given about Israel’s prophets. With regards to the New Testament, Stave was pretty conservative. One has the feeling that once he had attained the position of professor he no longer developed appreciably. It is characteristic of the exegetical scholarly situation, that following Stave’s departure from the professorship in 1922 that there was no competent successor – it was not until 1927 that the Old Testament chair was occupied.

The new occupant of the chair was Sven Linder. Linder was a competent orientalist, he spoke Arabic fluently and had a deep interest in archeology – he lectured gladly on the archeological investigation of Palestine. On the other hand, biblical theology was not his line. This made it difficult for students to get any grasp of the unity of the Bible, what it was that connected the Old Testament with the New – and yet both Testaments were part of the Christian Church’s Bible! To be sure, the prophets could be understood as preachers of an ethically-coloured religion of personalities, but the Messianic prophecies seemed to be an illusion which ended in disappointment and emptiness. That the cult played an important role in Old Testament piety the student learned purely religio-historically – in the course on the Old Testament there was no biblical-theological work. Rudolf Kittel’s *Israel’s Religious History* was read. When Sven Linder lectured on the Psalms, he referred most dutifully to Sigmund Mowinckel’s *Psalmstudien*, but what the cult – when at the New Year’s festival the cultic cry *Yahweh is King!* was sounded – meant as a bridge to the New Testament, no one had the slightest idea of. The whole thing was a “bold theory” – “bold” was one of Linder’s favorite expressions, though he himself as a scholar was anything but bold. For the students entirely new perspectives were opened up when Anton Fridrichsen lectured during his early Uppsala years on “Jesus’ preaching according to the Synoptics”. I remember myself what an aha-experience it was, when Fridrichsen drew the line from the Old Israelite New Year’s Festival, the enthronement, with its cultic cry *Yahweh*

⁸ [The “young men of the Church” were members of a revival movement within the Church of Sweden in the early 1900’s to mobilize young people to influence society towards a Christian life-style (Tr.)].

is king!, to Jesus' message: "The time has come, the kingdom of God is near", so near that it is present in Jesus and with its power it works in and through him. Suddenly, one began to picture the prophetic Messianic line with its roots in the message brought at the time of the kings of the struggle and victory of the King, and how from this the trajectory of thought passed over to the New Testament. Fridrichsen has treated this issue in an exposition of the text for the Annunciation of the Virgin Mary (which, to be sure, is from 1946, however the thoughts had already begun to take form early in the 1930's). He writes: What we find in Lk 1:26–38 is "*the renewal and actualization* of the promise. The message of the angel is conveyed in that style. 'The throne of David', 'the king over the house of David everlastingly', 'The Son of the Most High', – all of this connects back to the old prophetic word, which resounded once, when David's scions ruled over Zion ... What the king meant to the old, classical Israel and Judah nationally, religiously, morally, all this in indissoluble unity, we have begun to understand more and more. The King was the Saviour and the Reconciler. It is this aspect of the kingship, which now appears in its eschatological realization ... We see here the organic connection between prophecy and fulfilment, between pre-formation and realization. The person and work of Jesus are incomprehensible without this background".⁹

This understanding of the relation between promise and fulfilment is for Fridrichsen important for understanding the New Testament presentation of Jesus. Time and time again he comes back to this subject. In an exposition of Lk 18:31–43 (1946): he writes "The teaching about that fatal Easter concentrated in a few pregnant sayings, which the Apostles – and through them the Church – receives here is placed under the perspective of fulfilment. All that the prophets have written about the Son of Man must be fulfilled. This concerns both his humiliation and his exaltation. The words about humiliation and death obviously connect back to Isa 53 and related texts. The word about resurrection has its roots in Hos 6:2. These old prophecies become reality through the Son of Man's death and resurrection from the dead. The cultic realities which peer out from behind the prophecies of Hosea and Isaiah, found their fulfilment in the historical Jesus and the risen Lord of the Church, who is one and the same person. For the Church, as for Jesus as well, the perspective of Scripture is of the greatest significance (1 Cor 15:3–4). Prophecy is the cornerstone in the foundation of the Christian faith, and it is shown that the more unreservedly one allows the New Testament witness of Christ to come to its right place, the deeper one is drawn into the Old Testament. The theological and homiletical indispensability of the Old Testament as well as its fundamentality for faith and preaching becomes clearer and clearer, and the time must come again, when

⁹ Anton Fridrichsen, *Fyrahanda sädesåker*, 1958, p. 523.

the Church once again dares and is able to connect its witness of Jesus to the prophetic word".¹⁰

This does not mean – and I believe it is important to point this out – simply an uncritical reproduction of the Old Testament prophets' words. Fridrichsen was too knowledgeable a scholar and well oriented in history to allow himself to come to such a simple conclusion. When he is able to speak of the New Testament word as a fulfilment, in this word there lies just as much of a new creativity in a radically new situation. Characteristic for Fridrichsen's way of seeing the problem are a few words in an examination of Mt 17:9–13 about the disciples on their way down from the Mount of Transfiguration, in which they raise the question of Elijah's place in the context of eschatology. Fridrichsen expounds on how Jesus interprets the situation from the perspective of John the Baptist's appearance, and continues thus: "With superb certainty Jesus expounded the prophecy, unfettered by the letter, in inner harmony with the prophetic intuition. Thereby the position of the Church on prophecy is also given, whether it is concerned with Old Testament or New Testament prophecy. All interpretation, that goes above the purely religio-historical interest, must start with the historical fact of Jesus Christ. But note well: from the *transfigured* Jesus Christ. It was on the way down from the Mount of Transfiguration that Jesus expounded the prophecy to his disciples . . . The transfiguration on the Mount received its fulfilment and perfection in the eternal radiance of the resurrection. For us the light that falls on prophecy comes from this light-source. We know that what the old Spirit-filled men of God said ultimately referred to the Son of Man's suffering, death and entrance into glory (Lk 24:25, 27). There prevails there a hidden connection that is revealed in the resurrection of Christ. The 'historical element' of prophecy should not be overcome through false allegorization or through unhistorical literal application. History is a creative act of God, which does not occur in accordance with a detailed program, communicated beforehand. History is full of surprises. But it has an inner connection, which the prophetic spirits are aware of and behold in their own way. That is why the prophetic word of the Old Testament becomes a confirmation for the Church, which has experienced the fulfilment".¹¹

The atmosphere in the Theological Faculty at Uppsala at the time of Fridrichsen's assumption of his professorial duties, did not only exhibit the vacuum which prevailed within New Testament scholarship and the difficulty which Old Testament exegesis experienced in finding usable bridges between the Old and the New Testament, but also the difficulty that liberal theology in refined form was represented in the faculty. This theology had a convinced and energetic advocate in the professor of Church History, Emanuel Linderholm, who was

¹⁰ Ibid., pp. 198 f.

¹¹ Ibid., p. 403.

active in the years 1919–1937.¹² His piety towards Jesus, inherited from childhood had found a foothold in the picture of Jesus of liberal theology. Linderholm had received decisive impressions from Adolf von Harnack and his “Das Wesen des Christentums”.¹³ The formula according to which Linderholm, in imitation of Harnack, solved the problem of early Christianity, was the double gospel, *Jesus’ gospel about the kingdom of God* on the one hand and *early Christianity’s gospel about Jesus Christ* on the other. This differentiation was decisively important for Linderholm personally, and in his preaching of this Linderholm felt himself called to be a reformer of the Church. We encounter his thought in his programmatic writing “From dogma to the Gospel”.¹⁴ He founded “Sveriges Religiösa Reformförbund”¹⁵ with its journal “Religion och Kultur” and prepared proposals for new Church rituals.¹⁶ Linderholm communicated his ideas to his pupils, one obligatory work in the first year courses being his work “*Evangeliets värld*”.¹⁷ This was a kind of a compendium, which was not based on personal research, but which presented uncritically the religio-historical school’s view of Christianity. It was the first part of a work which had the same fortune as many other works in Swedish scholarship – the second part was never published. In his preface and his epilogue, however, Linderholm sketched an outline of the whole work: “As soon as time and strength allow, the two above-mentioned parts about *Jesu evangelium om Gud och Guds rike* and *Urkristendomens evangelium om Jesus Kristus* as well as the Church life of the early Christian times will be published.”¹⁸ The concluding words are typical of Linderholm’s views. In his work he has painted the world of Hellenism and the Jewish background of Primitive Christianity. He writes: “However, the time was now at last fulfilled. He who would bring the new revelation with its inimitable loftiness and simplicity, with its perfect wisdom and gentle power, divine love and wonderful peace, already stood at the door”.¹⁹

I have tried to sketch in some considerable detail the atmosphere at the Theological Faculty of Uppsala at the close of the 1920’s in order that we might

¹² Anders Jarlert, *Emanuel Linderholm som kyrkohistoriker*, Bibliotheca historico-ecclesiastica lundensis XV, 1987.

¹³ To be sure Linderholm tried to distance himself from Harnack underlining his dependence upon Rud Eucken, *Der Wahrheitsgehalt der Religion*, 1901. See Em. Linderholm, *Från dogma till evangeliet*, 3rd ed., 1926, p. 5.

¹⁴ Originally a lecture given at a Sigtuna conference in November 1918, which was first published in the collection *Det andliga nutidsläget och kyrkan*. The lecture was published separately with a foreword typical of Linderholm in a third edition in 1926.

¹⁵ [I.e. “The Religious Reform Covenant of Sweden” [Tr.]].

¹⁶ Emanuel Linderholm, *Svensk Högmässa*, Stockholm 1926. Idem, *Högmässa, dop och nattvard. Några reformtankar*, Stockholm 1927.

¹⁷ Idem, *Evangeliets värld*, Stockholm 1918.

¹⁸ *Ib.* p. VII.

¹⁹ *Ib.* p. 299.

be able to understand the real significance of Anton Fridrichsen's appearance on the scene. At the time of his inauguration as professor he was a mature scholar with a long development behind him and always open to new questions and perspectives. He was at home in the university cities of Europe. He had studied with *Ernst von Dobschütz* at Breslau and with *Paul Wendland* at Göttingen. He was a good friend of Rudolf Bultmann's and had defended his doctoral thesis *Le problème du Miracle dans le Christianisme primitif* at Strasbourg.²⁰ As I have implied, he was not a scholar who had stopped maturing, during his whole life he was open to new ideas. On one point, however, he had come to a result which was to determine his view of early Christianity and its literature in a decisive way. He had learned the approach of the form-critical school and he handled its methods superbly. The Gospels were no biographies of Jesus, but documents of faith, where we meet the early Church's faith in Christ, sprung up from its spiritual reality and characterized by its view of life. Fridrichsen was by this time through with the portrait of Jesus painted by liberal theology. It was an illusion which did not measure up to the demands of a radical research. The Jesus of liberal theology was inspired by the cultural presuppositions of the Germany of Wilhelm, but such a Jesus had never existed. The understanding of Jesus at which Fridrichsen arrived, is met with in a booklet, which was published in 1931. It was one of Fridrichsen's peculiarities that he did not publish big, voluminous books. From his pen flowed small booklets and essays, but behind the flowing presentation the discerning reader could not fail but notice a depth of erudition and reading. The booklet bore the title *Vem ville Jesus vara?*²¹ It had an important sub-title, which indicated its concerns: *The Historical Foundation of Faith in Christ according to Present Biblical Research*. For Fridrichsen the matter was clear. The faith of early Christianity in Jesus as Lord had its roots in Jesus' own Messianic self-consciousness. One did not need to look away from dogma to the Gospel. The road to Early Christian dogma led directly from Jesus. "Christian dogma thus has its roots in Jesus' own consciousness and the disciples' personal experience in following him".²² Jesus made his appearance with clearly Messianic claims and was understood in that way – he was executed by the Romans on account of his Messianic claims. But he avoided using the title of Messiah. It was first during the decisive hearing before the high priest that he admitted clearly and verbally his Messiahship. Earlier this idea had made its appearance more in symbolic actions, as with Jesus' entrance to Jerusalem. The reason for that was that the

²⁰ The dissertation was published in Paris in 1925. ET: *The Problem of Miracle in Primitive Christianity*, 1972.

²¹ A. Fridrichsen, *Vem ville Jesus vara?* Studentföreningen Verdandis småskrifter, Nr 346, Stockholm 1931. [This booklet is included in the present volume under the title *Who did Jesus Claim to Be?* (Tr.).]

²² Id. p.58 [See section under "The Lord" (Tr.).]

title of Messiah was charged with a national-political content. "An old theocratic cliché like the title of Messiah did not fit his idea of the kingdom of God, or his task and personal relationship to it. He needed a new self-designation, and he found it in 'The Son of Man'".²³

One can come thus far on the road of scholarship, a scholarship which Fridrichsen carried out with all the radicalism to which his many years of research had led him. In other words, this had nothing to do with some type of uncritical reproduction of old conservative ideas. The title of the booklet, which I do not hesitate to characterize as one of the most important works published during the thirties, was surely, *Who did Jesus Claim to Be?* Scholarship can try to evaluate this claim with all the methods which it has at its disposal. A critical scrutiny of the sources by the methods of the form-critical school can establish the faith of early Christianity in Jesus as Lord and then find its way back to Jesus himself. Does such a faith have any connection with him? It is this question which Fridrichsen wants to answer affirmatively. As a scientist he cannot say more. "The secret of this person is great and unfathomable. We can only establish the fact and elucidate the historical presuppositions. The deepest foundations of Jesus' conviction of his high calling lay hidden from our sight; they rest in the inaccessible sanctuary of personal fellowship with God".²⁴

The views which Fridrichsen put forward in this booklet, and which characterized his teaching, came to have a liberating effect on the generation of students, who gathered around his Teaching desk in the 1930's. In other words, it was possible to draw a scientifically tenable connecting line from gospel to dogma with a clear distinction between faith and science, when approaching the NT writings as historical sources for the faith of the early Church.

But Fridrichsen's firm conviction that "the historical Jesus" made his appearance with a Messianic self-consciousness, which he clothed in the title "Son of Man", had an important consequence, which Fridrichsen himself also drew as a conclusion. If Jesus regarded himself as the Messiah in any form, this demanded as its correlate a holy people, the people of the Messiah. Thus Fridrichsen was able to take the concept of the Church back to Jesus himself with his Messianic consciousness. When Jesus chose twelve disciples, the figure twelve corresponded to the twelve tribes of Israel, they represented the people of God gathered around its King. Thus, the Church existed before the early Christian mission. Through it new persons were incorporated into the Church, which already existed, where the Lord, who was exalted to heaven, was sacramentally present in the Last Supper and where his word was still sounded in the kerygma. In this Church the common meal stood side by side with the Word. There in a direct connection goes a straight line from Jesus' Messianic

²³ Id. p. 45 [See section under "The Son of Man" (Tr.)].

²⁴ Ib. p. 48 [See section under "The Son of Man" (Tr.)].

table-fellowship with his disciples to table-fellowship with other groups of people, as for example, the meal with the crowds out in the desert, which is narrated by all four evangelists. Thus, the Church and the sacraments have their roots in Jesus. I think that people today, half a century later, find it difficult to understand how liberating these thoughts were in the thirties. The student generation of the twenties had learned from Wetter and Linderholm that the Last Supper was a Hellenistic cultic meal with its roots in the mystery religions. The uncertainty about the Last Supper which this created, had had disastrous consequences for the celebration of the Lord's Supper in the Church of Sweden, in which the twenties proved to be its low-water mark.

With respect to the concept of the Church the situation was somewhat different. Within the Church of Sweden there was a lively concept of the Church. At the turn of the century the growing free-Church movement had spoken with great pathos of "the New Testament Church principle". In that light a church type like the Church of Sweden was a sheer incongruity, with no support in the Bible. Here Einar Billing had cleared a new road and opened up fruitful perspectives with his national church concept motivated by centrally religious concerns. The Church is "the remission of sins to the Swedish People". But though Billing was a biblical theologian – "the last Swedish systematician who had some exegetical training" (Harald Eklund)²⁵ – his concept of the Church had not originated in his study of the Bible, but was a result of his systematic thought. In an essay Oscar Krook has depicted with great congeniality Einar Billing's view of the Church in its *status nascendi*.²⁶ Billing's point of departure for his view of the Church was quite literally the parish church. The Word has been carried over the world and has come to it. There the message of prevenient grace is proclaimed. "As it now stands, it proclaims not only the Gospel of God's forgiveness in word, but it is, or it represents itself in reality God's offer of forgiveness to the whole Swedish People".²⁷ We note here that as far as the history of ideas goes, both Einar Billing and J. A. Eklund ("Stenkyrkan", "Fädernas kyrka"), belong together with the national romanticism of the turn of the century. We get a glimpse of Harald Hjärnes' contribution here. With this religiously motivated national church concept in their theological baggage the men of the Young People's Church Movement²⁸ went off to the countryside. But in the thirties new winds had begun to blow. The ecumenical movement had begun to take form. New inter-church contacts were made and thereby wholly new ecclesiastical perspectives were opened up, where to speak

²⁵ Harald Eklund, "Nyttestamentlig och modern verklighetssyn", *SEÅ* 13, (1948), p. 1. On Einar Billing's biblical theology see Erik Beijer, "Einar Billings bibelteologi" *SEÅ* 4 (1939), p. 119ff.

²⁶ Oscar Krook, "Kyrkobergrets förnyelse i svensk teologi", *En bok om Kyrkan*, Lund 1942, pp. 248ff.

²⁷ *Ib.* p. 254. Krook is here quoting Billing's *Herdabrev*, p. 68.

²⁸ [On this movement, see note 8, above (Tr.)].

of "the Church of the Fathers" might sound a little provincial. The Universal Church was beginning to be felt. We experienced a growing high ecclesiasticism, which received its inspiration from the Church of England (Gunnar Rosendal, Albert Lysander). Within church life a new interest in liturgy took shape, inspired by such men as Arthur Adell and Knut Peters. In this area Fridrichsen's ideas acted as a thaw. We received a Church concept that was based on Jesus and early Christianity, which could be transformed into a church outlook functioning in practical church life.²⁹

On these matters, too, Anton Fridrichsen was at first more or less alone at the theological faculty. In the early thirties the professor of Dogmatics was Torsten Bohlin. He had strong cultural interests and participated whole-heartedly in the public debate, *inter alia* with Torsten Fogelqvist about Christian morals. But he lacked a deeper interest for the exegetical and biblico-theological problems. Arvid Runestam, who had succeeded Billing as professor of Ethics, had been brought up in the free-church tradition and had a strongly individualistic ideal of piety, which was deepened, when in the second half of the thirties he came under the influence of the Oxford Movement. Runestam was drawn early into the work of the ecumenical movement. In Germany, Nazism put theology before a whole series of questions of socio-ethical nature. Much of the Swedish preliminary work for the great Life and Work-conference held at Oxford in 1937 was done at Runestam's seminar.³⁰ But faced with a Church concept based on the New Testament, where the Church existed before the individual, Runestam was in doubt, a doubt also that followed him during his years as bishop of Karlstad. Torsten Bohlin became bishop in Härnosand in 1936 and was succeeded by Hjalmar Lindroth. This scholar had shown deep sympathy with Fridrichsen's view of the Church, see his work *Tankar om Kyrkan och sakramenten*.³¹ I have a feeling, however, that Fridrichsen and Lindroth were so different as persons, that there never was any deeper contact between them. Linderholm had been succeeded by Gunnar Westin, who with his orientation to free-churchmanship in the Swedish Free-Churches saw a dynamic power at work in the history of churches. He showed no understanding for Fridrichsen's biblically oriented Church concept.

The Swedish systematician, to whom Fridrichsen came to stand closest, both ideologically and personally, was *Gustaf Aulén*. One of Fridrichsen's first works to be published in Sweden was his essay in the *Svensk Teologisk Kvartalskrift* in 1929; "Jesu kamp mot de urene ånder", where Fridrichsen paints Jesus' works of power, especially his driving out of demons, as an element in the

²⁹ Anton Fridrichsen, "Messias och Kyrkan", *En bok om Kyrkan*, pp. 26ff.; "Nytestamentlig församling" *En bok om Kyrkan*, pp. 45ff.; "Försoningen och Kyrkan i Nya Testamentet" in *Den nya kyrkosynen*, Lund 1945, pp. 41ff.

³⁰ Nils Karlström (ed.), *Oxford och Edinburgh*, Stockholm 1938.

³¹ Hjalmar Lindroth, *Tankar om Kyrkan och Sakramenten*, Stockholm 1948.

restoration of creation which takes place where Jesus passes by and where the powers of the kingdom of God work in and through him.³² In 1930 Gustaf Aulén held his famous Olaus Petri lectures on the Christian idea of reconciliation.³³ There Aulén outlines what he calls “the classical reconciliation motive”, oriented to a dualistic fundamental view, where Christ appears as victor, *Christus Victor*. When the lectures were published in printed form the work had no bibliography and the footnotes were few and sporadic, but there should be no doubt that Aulén had read the above quoted essay. In the *Festschrift* which was published on Aulén’s 60th birthday in 1939, Fridrichsen was one of the contributors with his essay on “Människosonen och Israel”, where he dealt with ideas, which he already had touched upon in his inauguration lecture on “Det nya testamentets tanker om religiös mottagelighet og uimottagelighet”.³⁴ Following Aulén’s installation as bishop in the diocese of Strängnäs in 1933, Fridrichsen was often invited to speak in priests’ meetings and seminars. A number of such lectures have been published in *Södermanlands Bibelsällskaps Årsbok*.³⁵ During such days of study Fridrichsen often encouraged the priests to apply themselves to renewed and deeper exegetical study, and it can be said confidently that Fridrichsen inspired many a priest to take up his *Novum Testamentum* and go deeper into the Greek text, something that set its mark on their preaching.

At this juncture I have reached a point, where I think, we could summarize Anton Fridrichsen’s significance for Swedish church life. I believe that in the first place we could and should state that Anton Fridrichsen was impelled by a deep consciousness that he in his capacity of teacher at a theological faculty, whose task was to educate priests and teachers of Christianity, had to also make a contribution to the service of the Church. In an obituary on Anton Fridrichsen in the Christmas Book of the Archdiocese for 1954³⁶ Gösta Lindeskog related that one of Fridrichsen’s Norwegian friends had stated that at first Fridrichsen had no intention of staying in Sweden, but was toying with the thought of settling down in a Norwegian parsonage. The Norwegian parsonage was, to be sure, the environment of his childhood. But nothing came of it. Fridrichsen was quite happy with his academic life in Uppsala, where he soon had interested students and large numbers of friends – Fridrichsen was by nature a master at

³² Anton Fridrichsen, “Jesu kamp mot de urene ånder”, *STK*, 5, 1929, pp. 199ff. [in Norwegian; i.e. “The Conflict of Jesus with the Unclean Spirits”, included in the present volume. (Tr.)].

³³ Gustaf Aulén, *Den kristna försoningstanken*, Lund 1930.

³⁴ Anton Fridrichsen, *Det nye testamentets tanker om religiøs mottagelighet og uimottagelighet*, *NTT* (1929), pp. 1ff.

³⁵ E.g. Anton Fridrichsen, “Bibelns verklighetsåskådning och livssyn”, *Södermanlands Bibelsällskaps Årsskrift* 1936, pp. 3ff.

³⁶ Gösta Lindeskog, “Anton Fridrichsen”, *Julhälsning till församlingarna i Årkestiftet* 1954, pp. 23ff.

making friends. But even as professor he regarded himself as being in the service of the Church. He has given us his own account of how he looked upon his own work in the “Epilogue” which he wrote in the *Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok* 1948, when he relinquished the office of editor to other hands – this, by the way, actually turned out to be the very last of Fridrichsen’s publications in this series, which to such a high degree bore his insignia.³⁷ There he sketched out his plans – Fridrichsen always had plans! – for his last years as professor. He was going to write commentaries on the Gospel of Mark and on the Acts of the Apostles. His foremost project was going to be a commentary on *Den Svenska Evangelieboken*.³⁸ His ambitious plan with this work is ascertained by the “Sample Booklet” which he published. In this he speaks of his interest in the relation between theology and church, and writes: “These works I wish to leave as a valedictory gift to the Church of Sweden, which ultimately I have sought to serve with my work in the Theological Faculty of Uppsala”.³⁹

These plans never materialized. Illness broke Fridrichsen down in his last years as professor, and he died soon after his retirement. Of the planned commentary on Mark only the Introduction was published⁴⁰ and the Sample Booklet on the commentary on the Svenska Evangelieboken was the only one that saw the light of day. Birger Gerhardsson, however, gathered together all of Fridrichsen’s expositional treatments of [biblical] texts with great diligence and published them in the large collection volume *Fyrhanda sädesåker*.⁴¹ Through this collection we get a good idea of how to interpret texts, which Fridrichsen considered should be the basis of preaching. It would seem that few books have been studied as intensively as this in Swedish parsonages.

There we sat, therefore – we, Fridrichsen’s students – in our parsonages. What had we taken with us of his teaching? We had learned a basic requirement. When we wrote our sermons we would have *Novum Testamentum* open before us. Every treatment of a New Testament problem, not least of all when it concerned the sermon, must have its point of departure in a careful study of the text. What stands in the text? The text we had read, we had also learned to place in the larger context of the entire Bible. We had learned that the Bible – in spite of the plural form *Biblia* – made up *one* book. That which had created this unity of the Bible was Jesus and his Messianic consciousness. The Old Testament pointed forward to Jesus, who is the fulfilment. We learned that when we studied the Old Testament we were to take Jesus as the point of departure, to read the Scriptures as he read them and as the early Church read them, cf. Lk 24:25–27. In the light which fell from Jesus we could read the Old Testament

³⁷ Anton Fridrichsen, “Epilogue”, *SEÅ* 13 (1948), pp. 116ff.

³⁸ [I.e. *The Swedish Gospel Book*, (Tr.)].

³⁹ *SEÅ* 13 (1948), p. 117.

⁴⁰ Anton Fridrichsen, *Markusevangeliet*, Lund 1952.

⁴¹ Anton Fridrichsen, *Fyrhanda sädesåker*, Motala 1958.

with its multifarious aspects and perspectives. The words of the prophets were not static utterances, but were joined in the dynamic context of revelation, where God's actions constantly open new vistas and give new keys of interpretation. I believe that the priests of the Church of Sweden not least of all now, when we have a complete series of Old Testament texts, have every reason to actualize those impulses, which came from Fridrichsen's teaching and biblical interpretation.

This experience of the unity of Scriptures, however, had to do primarily with the New Testament. When we commenced our studies – this applied at any rate to those of us who were older – we felt that we stood helpless before the gap, which seemed to go through the New Testament itself. On the one hand, there was Jesus' Gospel concerning the kingdom of God, and on the other, the early Christian Gospel concerning Christ. The gap between Jesus and Paul seemed to be so wide that it was impossible to bridge. In early Christianity we met the Hellenization of the Christian message and far out in that wing stood John. What made the matter very difficult was that John's portrait of Christ came to us in the form of a Gospel – and from this Gospel a whole array of church sermon texts were chosen. In comparison with the Synoptic portrait of Jesus, the Johannine portrait seemed to lack a historical basis. This created a difficult homiletical problem. What we learned from Anton Fridrichsen, which was felt as a great liberation, was that the whole New Testament with its witness to Christ is a living unity, having originated in the Church's living faith in Christ. "The early Church lived on and in a tradition, a narrative, liturgical, catechetical substance, which in various forms and shapes saturated and gave nourishment to the whole Church. The written fixed forms of the New Testament books represent, of course, only a part of the mass of tradition, and this only in some of the forms, which took shape in the great, leading churches. This insight is of great consequence for the study of the New Testament writings, especially in understanding the internal relationship between them. But even the picture of early Christianity itself is transformed and becomes alive, when one is freed from the rigid, literary idea regarding the creation of the New Testament"⁴².

So, there we sat with our *Novum Testamentum*. We had the text before us. Fridrichsen had taught us how to read it. It would seem that there are few theological essays, which have been studied so intensively and been discussed in such detail in priests' meetings as the programmatic article which Fridrichsen wrote in the first issue of the *Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok*.⁴³ In order to understand

⁴² Anton Fridrichsen, "Epilog", *SEÅ* 13 (1948), p. 123. On the question of the unity of the New Testament, see Anton Fridrichsen, "Jesus, Johannes och Paulus." *En bok om Bibeln*, Lund 1947, pp. 148 ff.

⁴³ Anton Fridrichsen, "Realistisk bibelutläggning", *SEÅ* 1 (1936), pp. 20 ff. [I.e. "Realistic Interpretation of the Bible", published in this volume (Tr.)]. On this programmatic article see Harald Riesenfeld, "En framtidssyn i backspegeln. Realistisk bibelutläggning efter 50 år". *STK* 63 (1987).

the deepest significance of what it was all about, however, one should take the sub-title of the essay seriously: "A scientific demand and a practical desideratum". Fridrichsen was educated as a classical philologist. He had had reason to ponder over the problems of interpretation in general, not only in connection with New Testament texts. The requirements which he put forward in his essay concerned the interpretation of a text from Plato just as much as of a text from Paul. The truth to which Göran Schildt gave expression in a review of a work by Henrik Zilliacus is applicable here and very much to the point: "However profitable the historical research of sources may be, and however important the demand for factual basis remains, still interpreting and relating to a living now is the historian's basic task".⁴⁴ Biblical interpretation should be *realistic*. What this demand implies has been declared by Fridrichsen himself. When in his "Epilog", he looks back on his work as professor and as editor of *Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok* and on that occasion he returns to the essay about the realistic biblical interpretation. He writes: "The program which is intimated there, I have thereafter sought to implement – I hope with growing insight in the matter (*res*)" – the Italics are Fridrichsen's.⁴⁵ This implied that Fridrichsen was not *one* person when he wrote exquisite philological essays or scientific articles, and then *another*, when he wrote expositions of texts for priestly journals.

All text-interpretation demands insight in the matter, in the text at hand and what it purports to communicate. It was self-evident to Fridrichsen that one could not be careless in the study of a text. It was important to penetrate into the text, but this also meant that one must listen to what the text had to say. I believe that in order to understand Fridrichsen's interpretation of texts it is important that this is made quite clear. In an essay in *Svensk Teologisk Kvartalskrift*, Karl Josef Sundberg has examined methodologically Fridrichsen's biblical interpretation.⁴⁶ He writes there: "The task is to get hold of the pulse of the biblical texts. What we meet there is the life of faith, and this is what needs to be taken hold of. This cannot be grasped merely in an intellectual way. What is required here is a way of acquiring understanding which in classical hermeneutics is called empathy".⁴⁷ The author distinguishes clearly between the interpretation which can be attained only intellectually, and that, in which the interpretation flows from some kind of empathy. I think that for Fridrichsen this was an absolutely foreign distinction. For him it was never a question of some kind of intuition, which, as it were, was to be found side by side with the text and by means of which one could get a better understanding into the meaning of the text. The text as such was the object of research, and when it came to interpret-

⁴⁴ *Svenska Dagbladet* 13 March 1988. [I.e. A Stockholm daily newspaper, (Tr.)].

⁴⁵ *SEÅ* 13 (1948), p. 117.

⁴⁶ Karl Josef Sundberg, "Anton Fridrichsens bibelutläggning. En metodstudie", *STK* 61 (1985), pp. 24ff.

⁴⁷ *Ib.* p. 27.

ing the text, the scholar had to use not only his philological knowledge, but also his knowledge of the historical, cultural and religious environment, in which the text had originated and which the text sought to elucidate. But all such work with the text must rest upon a strictly scientific basis, and the more knowledgeable the scholar is in that area, the greater possibility he has to experience empathy in what the text wanted to say. The text is always the object, and for Fridrichsen it was never a question of “playing the Semitist” – to quote an almost classical taunt. In addition, Fridrichsen was too deeply rooted in his own time, and the kind of text-treatment which Fridrichsen demanded sprang up from the questions raised by the times. Fridrichsen was always sensitive to whatever was happening. Especially the problem of interpretation pressed hard on him. Karl Barth’s Commentary on Romans fell like a bomb on him. Rudolf Bultmann – with whom Fridrichsen had a personal friendship – led by his results of a radically critical and skeptical research had taken his refuge in a text-interpretation characterized by the existential philosophy, which in principle was independent of historical research. On the Continent the demand was raised for a “pneumatic exegesis”. It was in this international debate, of which we were hardly conscious in Sweden, that Fridrichsen engaged with his programmatic essay, and one can only express regret that it wasn’t published in one of the major languages of culture. For him it was in no way a question of “playing the Semitist”. However, Fridrichsen posed to himself another question. One of his favourite expressions was “perception of reality”. He was aware of the fact that these texts had originated in a different perception of reality than ours, and that therefore one never arrives at their core, when one views them from our perspective, which is characterized by historicism and relativism. Here lay a great problem for Fridrichsen.

He takes up these questions in a newspaper article in 1933 on “The world-view of the resurrection faith”.⁴⁸ The Church’s proclamation of the resurrection of Christ becomes meaningful only if it is rooted in a perception of reality which corresponds with that of the New Testament. When it comes to getting to grips with that, Fridrichsen makes as his point of departure – perhaps surprisingly – the Book of Revelation and its view of reality. “The polar forces of this reality, which release their power in history, lie, according to the New Testament, outside the world of men. This is found in a power field determined by the terrible opposition between God and the Devil. We have here the mythical expression of a thousand-year long religious experience, which would have taught us to interpret history and its events in the light of faith in the living God and in the conviction of the demonic world power of evil. This is the context of the early Church’s Messianic faith and of the Gospel concerning the resurrec-

⁴⁸ Anton Fridrichsen, “Uppståndelsetrons världsåskådning”, *Svenska Dagbladet* 16 April 1933.

tion. Against this background Jesus' person grows to assume cosmic dimensions, and his death becomes the redemption of the world, his resurrection the irruption of the new Age, the triumph of the kingdom of God. Apart from this background, Jesus' person shrinks into becoming a Jewish wisdom teacher, his death becomes a Jewish martyr story, and the resurrection becomes a fanatic illusion. The Gospel then at its best can become a valuable historical contribution to the development of culture, but certainly not an immovable foundation for the Christian Church, which has stood through the centuries".

Fridrichsen has been reproached for taking the miracle texts too lightly in his realistic biblical interpretation, while pushing the question of history aside.⁴⁹ To this it must be said that according to Fridrichsen's way of looking at the matter, these texts are not "historical" texts in the sense that they seek to give actual information about a certain course of events. As we meet them in the Gospels they are part of the early Church's witness to and confession of Christ. When a priest preaches from a miracle text, the eventual demonstration of the historicity of the event can be of no help to him whatsoever. Looked at from the point of view of "the question of facticity", Jesus becomes merely one of all the wonder workers and *theioi andres* of ancient literature. Starting with the New Testament collection, both the scientist and the priest must ask the question: What do these texts purport to say about Jesus? If one asks such a question – that is, about the *res* of the texts, their material content – one sees that they speak of Jesus' fight with the demonic powers as a part in the establishment of the kingdom of God, whose powers are active wherever Jesus goes.

That which was important for Fridrichsen, which gave the interpretative key to the New Testament texts, was that they grew up *in the Church*, among the people of the Messiah. This he had learned purely scientifically from the form critical school, whose scientific methods he mastered in a supreme way. The life of the church with the worship of the Risen Lord, constituted the *Sitz im Leben* of these texts. They are all expressions of a confession of Christ; this applies to all of the New Testament writings. All of them, each in its own way and with its linguistic means, seek to give an answer to the questions: "Who is Jesus? What did he want?" "*Everything in the Bible emanates from the reality of Christ.* Thereby, its absolute character of revelation is given and explicit. But in that the Bible is *a witness to and an interpretation of the Christ event*, it is also a human word, conditioned and determined by historical, sociological, psychological circumstances. So, in the Bible we have the absolute in the relative. It is precisely the Spirit's work to make the word of man in the Bible into God's absolute word to us . . . It is precisely in its concreteness that the word of the Spirit is made into an inner word, an absolute message from God

⁴⁹ *Bibelsyn och Bibelbruk*. Utgiven av Biskopsmötets bibelkommission, Lund 1970, pp. 56f.