Anointing and Ministry in the New Testament

ERIC J. LOTT

The meagre number of direct references to anointing in the New Testament may well hide from us the theology of anointing which underlies much early Christian thought. The verb χρίω occurs only in 2 Cor. 1:21 with reference to Christians and in four places with reference to Christ, viz. Luke 4:18; Acts 4:27, 10:38 and Heb. 1:9 (quoting Ps. 45:7). The noun χρίσμα is found only in 1 John 2:20 and 27. This lack of direct reference is more than made up for by the lavish use of the title ὁ Χριστός. We should bear in mind that while to the Jew this title would immediately convey the meaning ὁ Ἐρχόμενος, to the Gentile it would simply carry its literal sense, One-who-is-Anointed. Instruction would no doubt introduce further meanings, but that initial sense of anointing would remain prominent in their understanding of the title and its associated terms.

1. The Baptism of Jesus as a Messianic Anointing

The baptism of ὁ Χριστός has been variously interpreted in recent years. This discussion is directly related to the knotty problem of the Messianic consciousness. While we should certainly be hesitant in attempting to describe exactly why Christ went to receive baptism from John and what inner experience he received at the time, there is sufficient evidence to attempt with confidence to relate this event to the whole ministry of Christ. Without attempting to give details of conscious *motive*, we can fill in the *kerygmatic meaning* of that initial baptism.

Among recent British scholars, there seems to be a large measure of agreement that the Synoptic account is intended to indicate an 'anointing of Jesus with the Holy Spirit to the office and work of the Messianic Servant of the Lord'.[1] C. K. Barrett[2] describes Christ's baptism as the installation and inauguration

[1] A. Richardson, *An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament*, p. 178.
[2] C. K. Barrett, *The Holy Spirit and the Synoptic Tradition*, pp. 41–45.

of the ministry of Messiah.[3] G. Lampe claims that Christ was 'designated the anointed Son whose mission . . . was to be worked out in terms of the Servant's task . . .'[4] T. F. Torrance sees the Servant-Son 'clearly consecrated and anointed as the Christ . . .'[5] Torrance also calls the baptism an act of 'solidarity with sinners', as does Beasley-Murray.[6] The consensus of opinion seems to be that the voice from heaven of Mark 1:11 is to be regarded as a reference to the royal anointing of Psalm 2:9 and the ordination of the *'Ebhed Yahweh* in Isaiah 42:1.[7] These quotations, however, should not be regarded in isolation as proof-texts, but as representing the total message of the Prophets and Psalms for the ministry of the anointed as understood by Jesus and his community. We should remember that at least among the Jewish converts of the early Church a brief quotation would probably be intended as including the whole passage or even book in question. So the quotations here in Mark 1:11 focus attention upon the pattern of ministry entailed in the Messianic anointing. It is the contention throughout this paper that this anointing of Christ must primarily be understood as entailing mission and ministry.

Beasley-Murray warns against reading into this initial anointing a developed understanding of the ministry as the way of suffering, death and resurrection.[8] 'It is not for us immediately to turn to the conclusion of the Gospel to see whither this solidarity with sinners would lead him.' 'The baptism of Jesus was directed to the total eschatological action assigned to the Messiah; there are insufficient grounds for supposing that Jesus marked out from that total action a death and resurrection . . . and that he anticipated by his baptism a dying and rising as a means of entering the kingdom. If the baptism initiated a new creation, its goal must be its completion in the final kingdom. Nothing less than that was the aim of the Messianic consecration at the Jordan.' This emphasis on the total eschatological outlook of Christ is a rejection of the view of Cullmann, also followed by Lampe, that in his baptism Christ consciously enters into his sin-bearing role as the *'Ebhed Yahweh.* Perhaps Cullmann does exaggerate this one aspect of the meaning of the Messianic anointing, for he then finds it necessary to say that 'Christ at his baptism is not yet proclaimed King but only the

---

[3] Cf. Flemington, *The New Testament Doctrine of Baptism*, pp. 25–33. Also G. R. Beasely-Murray, *Baptism in the New Testament*, pp. 45–66.

[4] G. H. Lampe, *The Seal of the Spirit*, p. 38. Cf. L. Thornton, *The Common Life in the Body of Christ*, p. 141.

[5] T. F. Torrance, *Conflict and Agreement in the Church*, Vol. II, pp. 106–25.

[6] *Op. cit.*, p. 60. Cf. Vincent Taylor, *The Life and Ministry of Jesus*, p. 50.

[7] But cp., E. L. Wenger, 'The Words at Jesus' Baptism)', in *The Indian Journal of Theology*, Vol. 15, pp. 57–59.

[8] *Op. cit.*, pp. 60–63.

Servant of God. His Lordship appears later, after his resurrection . . . Jesus is baptized in view of his death, which effects forgiveness of sins for all men'.[9]

While Cullmann is right to see in Christ's baptism an initiation into a ministry of self-giving and suffering for all others, and in that sense an anticipation of his death, Beasley-Murray is correct in denying the existence at that initial anointing of a fully detailed soteriological programme. As Torrance has pointed out,[10] 'Baptism has essential reference to the whole incarnational event: to the coming of the Son of God in our mortal humanity, to his whole life of obedient self-oblation, and to his ascension . . . Baptism is grounded in the Incarnation in which the eternal Son immersed himself in our mortal human life . . .'[11]

In one sense Beasley-Murray rightly emphasizes the Messianic inclusiveness of the anointing, the acceptance primarily of the way of obedience to whatever was the will of God, and of a mission of solidarity with his fellows. From this point of view we would criticize Vincent Taylor and others who hold that 'the essence of his baptismal experience is the authentication of his filial consciousness'.[12] G. S. Duncan goes so far as to say that 'Jesus sees clearly at his baptism, not that he is called to act as God's Messiah, but that he is so linked in spirit with the Father that the Father acknowledges him to be his Son. This emphasis on "character" rather than on "mission" is further brought out by the words that follow'.[13] It is the viewpoint of this paper that almost the opposite is the case, viz. that the Messiah receives his anointing to a particular pattern of self-giving ministry. Surely the combined evidence of Mark 1:11, Matt. 3:15 and John 1:29 is sufficient to indicate at least that this was the understanding of the early Church, and that considerable content was given to this ministry. Beasley-Murray's description of this as 'the total Messianic task' is true, but inadequate. Cullmann's claim that this 'points forward to the end, to the climax of the Cross' is also true, but over-simplified. Both, however, give a proper emphasis to the nature of the anointing as a task to be accomplished rather than a status either conferred or confirmed.

The difference of outlook between these two scholars is most clearly seen in their respective interpretations of Mark 10:38 and Luke 12:50. Beasley-Murray contends that the suffering and death, which Christ has come to realize lie ahead,

---

[9] O. Cullmann, *Baptism in the New Testament*, pp. 18-19.

[10] *Op. cit.*, p. 117.

[11] Cf. also Lampe, *op. cit.*, p. 43, commenting on Mark's unusual use of ἀναβαίνω to describe Christ coming out of the water, though Mark links the κατάβασις to the descent of the Spirit.

[12] *Op. cit.*, p. 51.

[13] G. S. Duncan, *Jesus, Son of Man*, p. 116.

are indicated in a figurative sense just as—so he claims—the 'Cup' and the 'Fire' carry a purely figurative meaning.[14] He feels there is no basis here for thinking that Jesus looked back to his baptism in Jordan as an anointing received proleptically in anticipation of a baptism of suffering and death yet to be undergone. We must again recognize that there is some justification for this contention. The full implications of that initiation into the ministry were grasped and given expression in acts of selfless love, only in his life of continuing obedience. But the use here of the technical *βάπτισμα* points fairly conclusively to a conviction, at least in the mind of the early Church, that the baptism prefigures and symbolizes a ministering life of unlimited self-offering for others. It could be argued that it is the technical *βάπτισμα* in Luke 12:50 that governs the meaning of the wholly metaphorical 'fire' in 12:49. Thus 'I have come to set fire to the earth, and how I wish it were already kindled' undoubtedly has an eschatological reference, as Beasley-Murray argues.[15] But if *βάπτισμα* in the parallel in v. 50 governs the meaning of 'fire' here in v. 49, then should not both sayings be thought of primarily as referring both back to the initial baptism with the Spirit and forward to the final accomplishment of this proleptic anointing? There is considerable evidence that the accomplishment was the inclusion of others in the anointing. 'I have come to set fire upon the earth' could well mean 'I have to initiate others into the Spirit-anointing I myself have received' for fire is not only a symbol of destruction. It is certain that the desire to create a community of the anointed seems to have caused Jesus unusual agitation at certain times (e.g. Mark 8:15–21, taken along with the particular miracles and the strange agitation of Jesus in the whole chapter). The agitation of Gethsemani in the context of Jesus' desire that his disciples share the hour with him seems to have a similar cause. We can note the reference here also as in Mark 10:38 to the 'Cup'. To the Jew this was a natural symbol of sharing as well as of joy on the one hand and disaster on the other. Is it possible that Jesus' original intention in Mark 14:36 was 'Father, all things are possible to thee; give these others to share with me in this cup'? This would then be an exact parallel to Mark 10:39, where also we should note the context of Jesus' agitation on the Jerusalem road (10:32–34) and the concern of Jesus that his disciples should take up their cross and go along with him.

I have now introduced three new themes which we need to consider in more detail: Baptism as an anointing with the *Spirit*; the relation of this to the *Servant* ministry; and the concern of Christ for *others* to share in his anointing.

---

[14] *Op. cit.*, pp. 54-55.

[15] Cf. also C. K. Barrett, *op. cit.*, pp. 124-125. 'Wind (pneuma?) and fire are the instruments of judgement.'

2. Christ's Baptism as an Anointing with the Spirit

In Acts 10:38, 'an authentic early tradition',[16] Luke tells us that God anointed Jesus with the Holy Spirit and power, and it is clear that the baptism is intended as the context of this anointing. In the Old Testament we find that although endowment with the Spirit in a number of passages is linked directly with anointing (e.g. 1 Sam. 10:1–13, 16:13-14; 1 Kings 19:16–21; and especially Isa. 61:1), nowhere is it said to be anointing with the Spirit. The intertestamental Messianic writings also emphasize that the Anointed will be endued with unique power and wisdom as a result of possessing the Spirit (especially 1 Enoch 49:3; Test. of Levi 18:2–14; Test. of Judah 24:2 f.; cf. Barrett, *op. cit.*, 42–44). As Barrett says, 'The work of the Spirit is to call into being part of the New Creation of the Messianic days, namely, to inaugurate the ministry of the Messiah.'[17]

John the Baptizer is reported in Mark 1:8 as predicting that the distinctiveness of the Mighty One who is coming after him would be the baptism with the Holy Spirit which he would administer. In the Q tradition (Matt. 3:11; Luke 3:16) 'and with fire' is also predicted of his baptism. Some commentators hold that John's original prediction was simply of the Messiah's judgement with fire, but that in the light of later developments in the Church 'and with the Holy Spirit' became added, this latter alone remaining in Mark's tradition. Vincent Taylor seems to favour this suggestion,[18] while Barrett[19] favours an original reading of *πνεύματι καὶ πυρί*, meaning, 'He will baptize you with wind and fire'. However, this does not materially affect the Church's understanding of the kind of baptism Jesus himself received.

The close association in Acts 10:38 of the 'virtually synonymous terms'[20] *Πνεῦμα*, *Ἅγιον* and *δύναμις* with the initial baptism is further evidence that it is to be regarded as the event inaugurating the dynamic, demanding *mission* of the Messiah. This anointing with the Holy Spirit thrusts Jesus immediately into a life of ministering to others by which the Reign of God is manifest among men. There is an important connection throughout the New Testament between *δύναμις*, *ἐξουσία*, *πνεῦμα ἅγιον* and *βασιλεύς*. Barrett[21] has an interesting discussion of the meaning of *δύναμις* and its relation to *ἐξουσία*. *δύναμις* describes the mighty activity of God in the deeds of Christ. 'It has a sense close to *ἐνέργεια*' (cf. Eph. 1:19 f.); that is, it is not merely the power of God, but the power of God in action—

---

[16] Lampe, *op. cit.*, p. 34.
[17] C. K. Barrett, *op. cit.*, p. 45.
[18] V. Taylor, *Gospel according to St. Mark*, p. 157.
[19] *Op. cit.*, p. 126.
[20] Cf. A. Richardson, *op. cit.*, pp. 103 f.
[21] *Op. cit.*, pp. 78–82.

force doing work . . . ἐξουσία corresponds to potential energy; it is the divine authority which may at any moment become manifest as δύναμις . . . But, there are cases in which ἐξουσία is used in substantially the same sense as δύναμις. (This is especially so in Luke; cf. Luke 4:36 and Mark 1:27; Luke 9:1 and Mark 6:7). Barrett goes on to suggest that in his answer to the question, 'By what authority are you doing these things?' (Mark 11:28), Jesus' reference to the authority of John the Baptist perhaps indicates that 'it came to him at his baptism by John'. But a significant point to notice in this answer is that Jesus refuses to point to any definite, outward, basis of authority for his works of ministry. It is as if he says, 'If you cannot recognize a divine authority in the dynamic ministry inaugurated by the baptism of John, then it is useless for me to point beyond' (cf. Mark 8:12; Matt. 16:1–4; also Luke 11:20 and Matt. 12:28); even if Luke's 'by the finger of God' is the earlier form[22] (and a good case can be made out for Matthew's 'by the Spirit of God'), the association of the dynamic activity of God, present among men by the ministry of Christ, and the manifestation of the kingdom remains unaltered. This in turn is directly related to the anointing with the Holy Spirit.

3. Anointing with the Spirit and the Servant Ministry

The Old Testament prefigures or, if typological motifs are rejected, describes a threefold anointing as Prophet, Priest and King. In the passages already referred to it will have been seen that it is primarily the prophetic office that requires a special endowment with the Spirit. We can see, however, that there was no sharp delineation of these three ministries. In David, the ideal king, we find that his anointing enabled him to exercise a prophetic and priestly ministry. Before him, Moses the Shepherd-Ruler also acted as Priest and Prophet, and although there is no mention of a special moment of endowment with the Spirit, such passages as Num. 11:17 f. indicate quite clearly that Moses was reckoned not only as possessing the divine Spirit in a unique degree, but also as being a mediator who enabled others to prophesy. (Note that the context here is of Moses feeding the hungry.) Perhaps the effective power of the Word of the Lord (*dābār*) takes the place of the Spirit (*ruach*) in the prophetic-priestly ministry exercised by this archetypal Servant of the Lord.[23] 'The term *dābār* has a dual significance. On the one hand it refers to the hinterground of meaning, the inner reality of the Word, but on the other hand it refers to the dynamic event in which that inner reality becomes manifest . . . it looks as if the whole Tabernacle were constructed around the significance of *dābār*.'

---

[22] So Barrett, *op. cit.*, pp. 62-63.

[23] Cf. T. F. Torrance, *Royal Priesthood*, pp. 1–7, for a fine account of the significance of *dābār* in the cult of the Tabernacle.

In what sense did Christ's anointing initiate him into this threefold office and ministry? Historically Eusebius of Caesarea first clearly developed this idea, but it was in Reformation theology that it became a central concept. Each stage in Christ's ministry seems to give more particular expression to one or other aspect of this threefold role. In the pre-Passion state there is a prophetic emphasis.[24] In the Passion we see a priestly emphasis, and in the post-Resurrection stage an emphasis on Christ as King. (Torrance suggests that the *words* of Christ reveal his prophetic and the *acts* of Christ his priestly significance.) But it is better to recognize at every point of his ministry not one but various aspects of the threefold task to which he was anointed.[25] In this sense we cannot agree with Cullmann that the initial anointing is only as Servant, and that the final baptism in death alone established him as the Messiah. This unnecessarily limits the meaning of Messiah as reinterpreted in Christ's total ministry. Torrance suggests that only as Servant could Christ hold together inclusively and fulfil the threefold office[26] '. . . the title of *Christ* brings together and contains the fullness of the ancient ministries which Jesus enhances and fulfils'. We are now anticipating a later section, but Torrance[27] relates this idea splendidly to the ministry of the Church. He concludes: 'Only as (the Church) learns to let the mind of Christ be in its mind, and is inwardly and outwardly shaped by his servant-obedience unto the death of the Cross, can it participate in his prophetic, priestly and kingly ministry. It is in utter self-humiliation in *κένωσις*, in *ταπείνωσις*, that the Church can follow in the steps of the Son of Man . . . It is indeed in terms of the Suffering Servant-ministry that we are to see the basic unity in the Church's prophetic, priestly and kingly functions.' Here again, we see the significance of the baptism not so much in either the conferring or the confirming of a status, but the humble acceptance of the task of ministry. Christ never openly declares himself to be the Messiah, either as Prophet, Priest or King. He even tried to avoid the kind of open recognition some felt was due to him, and used of himself the obscure title 'Son of Man', especially in connection with the impending humiliation and glorification, the climax of his life of self-offering for others. There is no need at this point to make reference to the vast amount of literature on this subject. It appears most reasonable to hold that the New Testament regards the name 'Son of Man' as indicating,

---

[24] Cf. C. H. Dodd, 'Jesus as Teacher and Prophet', in *Mysterium Christi*, edited by Bell and Deissmann.

[25] Cf. A. Richardson, *op. cit*, p. 178.

[26] *Royal Priesthood*, pp. 8-9. Cf. *Vocabulary of the Bible*, edited by J. J. von Allmenn, p. 21, article on 'Anointing' by D. Lys.

[27] *Op. cit.*, p. 87.

to those who are prepared to recognize it, the Messianic ministry as exercised by the Servant of God.[28]

We see this Servant-pattern of ministry if we turn again to the Caesarean sermon of Peter in Acts 10:34-43. In a summary of the early *kerygma* it is said that the anointing of Christ with Holy Spirit was to do good, to heal all the oppressed, to hang on a tree, to be raised, to appear, to eat and drink with his disciples, to appoint witnesses and to offer forgiveness of sins. There is much in common here with the passage in 1 Peter 2:21–25 where the pattern of Servant-ministry depicted in Isa. 53 is more clearly indicated.[29] Perhaps we can note here that intrinsic in these passages is the thought that the Servant-ministry finds its fulfilment when the anointed community share with Christ in it. It is to suffer according to his *ὑπογραμμός* that we have received a *κλῆσις* (1 Peter 2:21). The death and resurrection seem to be regarded as the climax of the ministry, at least to some extent, because through this event Christ was able to include others of the Messianic community to share with him in the divine acts for the salvation of the world. Christ's last act in the Upper Room was a dramatic sign of this fact. The reference here in Acts 10:41 to eating and drinking with the risen Lord (perhaps also carrying a Eucharistic intention) is probably included not merely to establish the historical truth of the resurrection, but to indicate the authoritative basis of the apostolic sharing in the Messianic ministry. We also note that it is through the apostolic sharing in this ministry and witness to the *kerygma* that others are also able to receive the same baptismal anointing. In the case of these first-fruit Gentiles, while the *kerygma* is still being proclaimed, direct anointing with the Spirit takes place.

The view held here that anointing with the Spirit is to be regarded as initiation to a ministry of obedient self-offering is further confirmed, though indirectly, by the meagre number of references to the Spirit in the ministry of Christ. Barrett has made an exhaustive study of this very point and concludes that the Spirit is essentially an eschatological hope in the thought of Jesus. Mark 9:1 is regarded as a key text, interpreted to mean that the Kingdom of God had not yet come in the power of the Spirit, but is still hidden. Although Christ himself had been endowed with this Spirit proleptically, standing in an authentic prophetic tradition he tries to divert attention from the 'pneumatic', 'spiritual', or 'inspirational' element in his ministry. 'Direct emphasis upon the Spirit had to be avoided also because Jesus was keeping his Messiahship secret . . . Lack of glory and a cup of suffering were his Messianic vocation, and part of his poverty was the absence of all the signs

---

[28] Cf. C. H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, pp. 92 f. R. H. Fuller, *The Mission and Achievement of Jesus*, pp. 56–58.

[29] Cf. J. Jeremias, *Servant of God*, pp. 91-92.

of the Spirit of God. They would have been inconsistent with the office of a humiliated Messiah. The temptation narrative stands as a turning-point in the Gospel story . . .' The kingdom, 'too, like Jesus the Messiah, was hidden, and under constraint. Therefore the Spirit was the possession of Jesus, as Messiah, alone, and in him it was veiled . . . The general gift of the Spirit belongs to the time of the vindication and manifestation of the Messiah and of the Messianic kingdom'.[30]

Perhaps Barrett gives too much emphasis to a futuristic eschatology in discussing the place of the Spirit in Christ's ministry. Although he mentions approvingly the point briefly made by Newton Flew[31] that the mystery of the Spirit is closely connected with the mystery of the Servant-Messiah, he merely criticizes one aspect of it and then ignores it. But just as a proper understanding of the meaning of the anointing must await the final baptism of death, so the significance of the Spirit's activity can only be grasped after the final act. 'Calvary was the only gateway to Pentecost.'[32]

Perhaps we can go further and say that the anointing with Spirit is intrinsically an anointing to sacrifice. The descent of the Spirit upon Christ in the form of a dove at the time of the baptism has been given various interpretations. I find it strange that as far as I am aware no one has suggested the possibility of the dove being used as a symbol parallel to the Lamb in St. John's Gospel, i.e. indicating that this was an anointing by the Holy Spirit to a life of innocent, humble self-oblation for the sake of others. It was as Jesus was coming up out of the water (in Hebrew *'olah* means both ascent and oblation, referring to the priestly ascent to the place of sacrifice)[33] that the anointing with Spirit took place.

4. Baptism and Chrismation

I have been assuming so far that the baptism with water that Christ underwent is to be regarded as his anointing, his chrism, which is at the same time to be regarded as anointing with the Spirit. Dom Gregory Dix[34] maintains that Patristic doctrine and practice of the late second century show us quite clearly that although the term 'Baptism' is to be given to the rite of initiation as a whole, we should distinguish quite definitely between 'the washing of regeneration and renewal in the Holy Spirit' (Titus 3:5), the former being the immersion in water and the latter the anointing and sealing with oil. Dix argues that this truly Apostolic Paradosis is also reflected in the

---

[30] *Op. cit.*, pp. 158 f.
[31] Newton Flew, *Jesus and His Church*, p. 51.
[32] *Ibid.*
[33] Cf. T. F. Torrance, *Royal Priesthood*, p. 17.
[34] *The Theology of Confirmation in relation to Baptism*, p. 30 and *passim*.

Biblical evidence, though we should not expect to find there a detailed account of the rite. Even in Christ's baptism, Dix maintains that we are intended to see a distinction between water-baptism and Spirit-baptism. Lionel Thornton[35] has also argued that it is the confirmation following after water-baptism which is essential to the reception of the indwelling Spirit, though he differs from Dix in making the laying on of hands the rite by which the Holy Spirit is bestowed. While Dix does not attach great importance to the evidence of Acts for our knowledge of primitive practice regarding baptism, Thornton makes much of it. It is impossible, and in view of Lampe's fine study of the whole question in *The Seal of the Spirit*, unnecessary here to go into this in any detail. Lampe contends that the sealing referred to in 2 Cor. 1:21-22, Eph. 1:13-14 and 4:30 does not refer to a ceremony of chrismation either separate from or included in the rite of baptism, but refers to the reception of, or anointing with, the Spirit in water-baptism itself. It is 'the inward experience of which baptism is the effective symbol . . . They have received the inward stamp of God's possession, the sign and mark that they are His people. This stamp is the presence and activity of the indwelling Spirit of God'.[36] Thus Lampe argues that the sealing (σφραγίζω) in 2 Cor. 1:22, Eph. 1:13-14 and 4:30, and the anointing (χρίω) in 2 Cor. 1:21, 1 John 2:20 and 27 refer to and are derived from one and the same event, viz. 'the baptism which the Church derived in its earliest days from John and which had been transformed in its significance by the baptism, death and resurrection of Jesus'.[37]

I confess to having some reservation about accepting this view. Discussing the question of the actual emergence of the ceremony of chrismation as a sign of sharing in the Messianic unction of Jesus, Lampe himself says later, 'An outward act of anointing would be a piece of natural symbolism by which to convey to the newly baptized the truth that they had become χριστοί in the Christ and had been made, in him, a "royal priesthood", and the ordinary use of oil in washing would lend itself readily to a symbolical interpretation in connection with the bath of baptism; there is no evidence that this act was in fact carried out in New Testament times . . . It is conceivable that liturgical practice was more fully developed than our documents suggest . . . No such rite would in any case be regarded in the primitive Church as conveying the bestowal of the Spirit, which is but one aspect of the baptism into Christ whose outward sign was water and not oil.'[38] Lampe goes on to suggest, rather unconvincingly perhaps, that Hippolytus reflects the

---

[35] *Confirmation, Its Place in the Baptismal Mystery.*
[36] G. H. Lampe, *op. cit.*, pp. 5-6.
[37] *Ibid.*, p. 7.
[38] *Ibid.*, pp. 81 f.

influence of Gnostic practices in the Western Church when he gives so much importance to anointing with oil in his ceremony of initiation.[39]

It seems clear that John himself did not anoint Jesus with oil at the time of the baptism, but considerable importance seems to be given in the Marcan, Lucan and Johannine traditions to the anointing of Jesus with oil in anticipation of his burial (Mark 14:3–9; Luke 7:36–50; John 12:1–8). It is only in Mark that Jesus is anointed on the head (though it is not χρίω but καταχέω and μυρίζω that are used of the act), and this would seem to signify proleptic (προλαμβάνω) recognition as Messiah. In John the story is placed immediately before the triumphal entry, and a post-Passion anointing (ἀλείφω) of the body is also added, so that although Mary anoints the feet of Jesus here, John's interest 'lies . . . in the anointing as a means of expressing the royal dignity of Jesus in preparation for his triumphal entry . . . It is as anointed king that Jesus rides into Jerusalem, and as anointed king that he dies'.[40] Does this possibly reflect a feeling in the early Church that something further needed to be added to the baptismal anointing to make it a fully Messianic anointing? Cullmann holds that the symbolism of water-baptism seemed inadequate to express the pouring out (ἐκχέω) of the Spirit, and so chrismation also developed later.

On the other hand, is it possible that the lack of the use of holy oil in the initial (baptismal) anointing of the Servant-Messiah deliberately indicates the intrinsic nature of that anointing? In other words, the emphasis is not on the bestowal of a royal office, but on the task of engaging in the work of the Son of Man, a ministry which is totally self-effacing and status-denying. Submission to a rite of descent into and ascent from 'the deep' is the more appropriate expression of this kind of anointing. St. Mark vividly depicts the contrast between the baptism, with the dove-like Spirit resting upon him, and the same Spirit thrusting (ἐκβάλλει) him out into the desert to struggle with Satan over the method of Messianic ministry to be employed. Perhaps Mark intends to indicate that anointing with the Holy Spirit does not give opportunity for calm reflection upon the various paths open to Christ by virtue of his new status. Rather it entails the immediate, pressing urgency of engaging in obedient service, to fulfil in self-effacing action the demands of the anointing. Could not Luke 12:50 be faithfully interpreted, 'I have received an anointing which must be fulfilled, and how I am constrained until it is accomplished'?

St. Luke makes this understanding of the baptism and temptation more obvious than the other Evangelists by including almost immediately the Nazareth sermon (4:16–30). Here

---

[39] G. H. Lampe, *op. cit.*, pp. 120–32.
[40] C. K. Barrett, *Gospel According to St. John*, p. 341.

Christ quotes Isa. 61:1 f., claiming that the anointing and endowment with the Spirit are his, for he is about to fulfil the task of announcing good news to the poor, of accomplishing release for prisoners, sight for the blind and liberty for the oppressed, for now is the acceptable time. The recent emphasis on the coming of the Spirit as an eschatological event can be seen as confirmation of this view of Christ's anointing, though some seem to use the idea with an entirely opposite intention. The life of the *eschaton,* the foretaste of heaven, forces the anointed into the world, there to manifest the pattern of divine service fitting to the New Age of God. To be 'sealed to the day of redemption' (Eph. 4:30) is not simply to be protected against the evils of the present age, but, as St. Paul goes on to say, is a responsibility to 'be kind to one another, tenderhearted, forgiving one another, as God in Christ forgave you' (4:32). It is to 'walk in love, as Christ loved us and gave himself for us, a fragrant offering and sacrifice to God' (5:2).

So then, the Messianic anointing and sealing refers primarily to the inward reception of the Messianic Spirit, and its outward expression in self-effacing ministry of the Servant. Such an anointing should never become the occasion for boasting in outward show. (Note Paul's argument in Galatians and elsewhere that it is the seal of the Spirit and not the seal of circumcision that is of any value. We must glory in the Cross, not in the flesh.) But as the New Testament evidence is not entirely conclusive regarding the manner of this chrismation in the early Christian community, the question still remains, does the use of oil in the ceremony of initiation give added significance to this anointing? Or, does it detract from the essential meaning of the anointing, adding further complications which confuse the issue? Perhaps if such baptismal chrismation is accompanied by *consignation,* the truth that such chrismation is with a view to conformation to the Cross-ministry of the Servant Messiah is more likely to be recognized. The further question of laying on of hands will be touched on in the last section of this paper.[41]

5. Participation in the Ministry of the Anointed

Despite the objections expressed most carefully by Beasley-Murray,[42] I feel that the position maintained by Cullmann, Flemington, Lampe, Torrance and others stands quite convincingly in its main intention. 'The baptism of the individual is . . . an initiation into and sharing in the One baptism common to Christ and His Church.'[43] In 2 Cor. 1:21-22, Eph. 1:13 and

---

[41] G. H. Lampe, *op. cit.,* pp. 221-22 and 321-22, regards this as the most appropriate symbol to follow after baptism.

[42] *Op. cit.,* pp. 49 f., 62–64.

[43] T. F. Torrance, *op. cit.,* p. 115.

4:30 St Paul 'is reminding his readers that by their incorporation into the Body of Christ, effected through baptism into him, they have become partakers in the effect of his own baptism . . .'[44] The supreme importance of the phrase ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ (and related phrases) in the Apostolic writings needs no emphasizing. To be 'in Christ' is to share through baptism in all that this anointing entailed for Christ himself. This κοινωνία in the anointed Body of Christ is to be given effective expression among the members of the Body by mutual acts of self-effacing ministry, made possible by the κοινωνία of the Spirit. The early Fathers were quite right to call the baptized 'χριστοί'. To share in Christ at all is to share his χρίσμα, his πνεῦμα, his δύναμις and so his διακονία.[45]

The thought has already been put forward that such sayings as Mark 10:39, Luke 12:51 and Mark 14:36, etc. (cf. also Matt. 3:15), suggest that Jesus regarded his own baptismal anointing as requiring the anointing of the Messianic community as part of its fulfilment. I feel that we need to be extremely cautious as to just how we refer to Christ's baptism as an 'accomplished work' which already includes all other baptisms within it. Surely Cullmann overstates the case when he says, 'It belongs to the essence of this general baptism effected by Jesus that it is offered in entire independence of the decision of faith and understanding of those who benefit from it.'[46] When Christ speaks so agitatedly of his desire to see the baptism accomplished (Luke 12:50), is he not in some sense indicating his concern to see his people sharing with him in this anointing? 'With the baptism with which I am baptized *you will be* baptized' (Mark 10:39). The gathering and sending into the world of an anointed community is an essential part of the fulfilment and accomplishment of his Messianic task. The same thought is seen in John 13, where Christ sets a pattern of Servant-ministry that all are to share in. 'If I your Lord and Teacher have washed your feet, you also ought to wash one another's feet. For I have given you an example (ὑπόδειγμα) that you also should do as I have done to you' (14-15). Here Christ clearly calls his Church to share with himself in the Servant-form of ministry in the world, and indicates that the way to this participation is through the water of baptism (vv. 8-10).

By using the term παράκλητος for the Spirit in the discourse following this event, John reminds us of the coming and consolation (παράκλησις) of the Anointed for which Israel hoped.

---

[44] G. H. Lampe, *op. cit.*, p. 6.

[45] Cf. A. Richardson, *op. cit.*, pp. 250 f., also pp. 136–41, where he examines sympathetically and modifies T. W. Manson's suggestion that the 'Son of Man' primarily indicates a corporate personality.

[46] *Op. cit.*, p. 20, all in italics. Cf. also Torrance, *op. cit.*, pp. 123-24, especially, 'Baptism is a sharing in a finished work to which we cannot add one iota of our own . . .'

The eschatological emphasis in this passage (e.g. 16:8–11) confirms this connection. We also see in Luke 2:25 that Simeon who was looking for the *παράκλησις* was endued with the Holy Spirit. It is the possession of Holy Spirit alone that is the true anointing in baptism, and makes it a true sharing in Christ's anointing, initiating the Christian as a *συνκοινωνός*, *συνμέτοχος*, *συνεργός*, *συνκληρονόμος*, *σύμμορφος* and *σύμφυτος* with Christ, all of which indicate ministry in the world together with him (1 Cor. 9:23; Phil. 1:7, 3:10; 1 Cor. 3:9; 2 Cor. 6:1, 8:23; 1 Thess. 3:2; Eph. 3:6; Col. 4:11, etc.).

It is St. Paul who most clearly indicates the direct relation between the Spirit and ministry, and so between anointing and ministry. In several key passages (e.g. Rom. 12:3–13; 1 Cor. 12:4–13, 27–31, 14:12 and Eph. 4:1–16) he describes the ministry as essentially charismatic. 'There are varieties of *χαρισμάτα* but the same *Πνεῦμα*, varieties of *διακονία* but the same *Κύριος*, varieties of *ἐνεργημάτα* but the same *θεός*. To each is given the manifestation of the Spirit for the common good' (*πρὸς τὸ συμφέρον*). The passages in 1 Cor. all emphasize that all manifestation of the Spirit is for *οἰκοδομή*. The same thought is in Eph. 4:2 f.: '. . . forbearing one another in love (we should be) eager to maintain the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace . . . Grace was given to each of us according to the measure of Christ's gift . . . for the equipment of the saints (,) for the work of *διακονία*, for building up the Body of Christ, until we all attain . . . to mature manhood.' In this passage we see that the ministry of the anointed community in the world is related to the total *κατάβασις* and *ἀνάβασις* which was Christ's sharing of our humanity.[47]

We find throughout these passages concerning the Christian ministry that it is essentially the use of the gifts of the Spirit, with which each is anointed, solely for the welfare of others. This is the Servant-form of ministry to which the Church is to conform (cf. Phil. 2:1–13). Because of the pastoral context in which St. Paul was so urgently involved the need for this ministry to build up the Christian community, the need for mutual love and concern within the Body of Christ, is emphasized. But the wider and perhaps more important implications of this same concept of the ministry of the anointed Servant-people is that they are to be a people for others, just as Christ himself was anointed to such a ministry. Paul describes his own ministry as a bearing about (through the seal of Baptism ?) of the death and resurrection life of Christ (2 Cor. 4:10–12; cf. Phil. 3:10), and it is all 'for your sake' (4:15 *δὶ ὑμᾶς*, 5:13 *ὑμῖν*; Col. 1:25 *εἰς ὑμᾶς*). The basis of this life-for-others is that Paul lives for him who for our sake died and was raised to life (2 Cor. 5:15). It is for the sake of this

---

[47] T. F. Torrance, *Royal Priesthood*, p. 39.

Jesus that we can call ourselves the servants of others (4:5). The derived and dependent nature of the Church's ministry is made very clear.

In all this there is no basis for limiting this ministry-for-others to the Christian community. (I feel this to be the great weakness of so much of the brilliant discussion of the Priesthood of Christ in the Church by Torrance; cf. *Royal Priesthood.*) The Ephesian letter seems to set the ministry against this wider background by, e.g., directing it at 'mature manhood, measured by nothing less than the full stature of Christ' (Eph. 4:11).

6. The Baptismal Ministry and Ordination

It is the use in Telugu of the Sanskrit word, *abhishekam,* for ordination, that first prompted me to make this study, for *abhishekam* is the same word that is used to translate chrism in the New Testament. What is the relationship between the *abhishekam* of baptismal anointing and the *abhishekam* of ordination? It is interesting to find that Dix regards the laying on of hands in Acts in the rite of initiation as effecting the ordination of Christians as prophets.[48] Lampe[49] believes that it is correct to see an ordination in the laying on of hands in Acts, but that it 'is a sign of association in the apostolic or missionary task of the Church'.[50] He concludes that it has 'little or no direct connection with the use of the same sign in confirmation today, nor has it anything to do with the Pauline "seal of the Spirit"'.[51] But it is, nevertheless, 'a singularly appropriate symbol, in our modern situation, of the incorporation of those baptized in infancy into the κοινωνία of conscious and active church life . . . For in this way they are "brought within the sphere of (the Church's) apostolic mission . . ."'[52]

But if baptismal anointing (whether accompanied by the actual laying on of hands, as in Roman, Lutheran and Anglican rites of initiation, and as once widely practised in connection with the Baptists' rite,[53] or not so accompanied) is to be regarded as initiation into Christ's ministry, prophetic, priestly and kingly, what is intended and achieved by a further laying on of hands in the *abhishekam* of ordination? The familiar Protestant answer is that this *abhishekam* sets a man aside to a special ministry of the Word and Sacraments. This is not very different from the typical Catholic answer that ordination

---

[48] *Confirmation or the Laying on of Hands,* p. 18. Thornton of course holds that in the rite of initiation the Holy Spirit is given only through this ceremony.

[49] G. H. Lampe, *op. cit.,* pp. 70–81.

[50] *Ibid.,* p. 76.

[51] *Ibid.,* p. 80, but cf. p. 322.

[52] *Ibid.,* pp. 80 f.

[53] Cf. Beasley-Murray, *op. cit.,* p. 125.

is to the priesthood. But, on the one hand, is there anything expected of this ministry of Word and Sacrament that is not already included in the ministry of the Anointed? And, on the other hand, does not the ministry of the Word and Sacrament in its fullest sense, not confining this ministry to the particular expression of it seen in our present church systems, include the total ministry of Prophet, Priest and King?

The more recent understanding of the ministry seems to suggest that baptismal ordination is to a ministry in the world, whereas 'ministerial' ordination is to a ministry in the Church. But it is doubtful if a ministry out of the world can prepare a ministry for the world. Anthony Hanson has made a most convincing study of the Biblical, especially the Pauline, doctrine of the apostolic ministry and concludes that the 'aim of Paul's apostleship is that his converts should be apostles . . . The ordained ministry, carrying out the Messiah's ministry, passes that ministry on to the Church which it founds'.[54] This emphasis on the apostolic remnant acting as a 'pioneer' body, leading the Church into its apostolic task (cf. 155–58), is a somewhat different and more realistic understanding of the ministry in its relation to the world than that mentioned above. But the ordained minister is not only a pioneer, in the sense of going on ahead and leading others into their ministry in the world. In his ordination the ordination of all the anointed is writ large, focused, made explicit. Entering the ministry of the Servant-Messiah he is a 'man-for-others' *par excellence*. This aspect of his ministry will be seen particularly in his life 'for the sake of' the whole body which shares in the Messianic anointing. But there seems to be a certain unresolved tension here between ministry in the Church and in the world. If we are to be faithful to that Servant-anointing which we have received, the least that we can say is that all ministry in the Church is for the sake of, or with a view to, making more effective the Messianic ministry in the world.

---

[54] A. T. Hanson, *The Pioneer Ministry*, p. 63.