The University of Chicago
FOUNDED BY JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER

OUTLINE OF NEW TESTAMENT CHRISTOLOGY

A STUDY OF GENETIC RELATIONSHIPS WITHIN THE CHRISTOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT PERIOD

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE DIVINITY SCHOOL
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

(DEPARTMENT OF NEW TESTAMENT LITERATURE AND INTERPRETATION)

BY
JOHN COWPER GRANBERY

CHICAGO
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
1909

The University of Chicago
FOUNDED BY JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER

OUTLINE OF NEW TESTAMENT CHRISTOLOGY

A STUDY OF GENETIC RELATIONSHIPS WITHIN THE CHRISTOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT PERIOD

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE DIVINITY SCHOOL
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

(DEPARTMENT OF NEW TESTAMENT LITERATURE AND INTERPRETATION)

BY
JOHN COWPER GRANBERY

CHICAGO
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
1909

Published December 1909

Composed and Printed By
The University of Chicago Press
Chicago, Illinois, U. S. A.

To all his instructors the author makes grateful acknowledgment of indebtedness. He desires to make especial mention of the assistance of Associate Professor Clyde Weber Votaw, whose interest, encouragement, and suggestions have contributed helpfully toward this dissertation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

AIM, EXPLANATION OF CHARTS, AND RÉSUMÉ

This study surveys the entire period of the New Testament history and literature, *ca.* 28–160 A. D., and includes the other extant Christian writings of these years that lie outside of the New Testament canon.

The effort is to present types of Christology within the New Testament period in such a way that they will stand out with their distinctive features and in their proper relationships, and to denote the character and sources of the conception of Christ in writings not so fully christological. It is not proposed to give an exhaustive study of the several types. Important questions are left unanswered, or the answer is only vaguely hinted at; for example, the character and extent of some of the non-Jewish influences. The study is offered as a contribution to the understanding of the Christology of the period chiefly in its bold, outstanding features and more general relationships.

The dates given are not to be taken rigidly; they are intended to be suggestive, and form no essential part of the charts. It is not expected that anyone will find all of the dates acceptable. In many cases the evidence barely makes possible a choice between different dates. The development of Christology does not move along strictly chronological lines, and yet it is so closely bound up with the several periods that an attempt at approximate dating is unavoidable. It is to be noted also that a not unimportant factor in determining the chronology of the literature is the development of the christological thought itself.

The charts cannot tell everything, and in some instances may prove actually misleading. The connecting lines in Chart II do not indicate every relationship—only the principal connections. For example, there is indirect Alexandrian influence in the Pauline Christology, but it is comprehended only under the very general head: "Gentile Needs and Thought." Pauline influence is to be found in the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Apocalypse of John, but is not sufficiently direct and prominent to find place in the chart, unless the chart be made so complicated as to destroy its value. The personality of Jesus influenced in some degree all types of Christology, but it is not deemed best to draw connecting lines in every instance. The Matthaean Christology, that of Polycarp, James, etc., are given no visible connections, but this means only that they are products of

the period, not sufficiently indebted to any special source to call for connecting lines.

It is not intended to suggest that Gnosticism as such has made actual contributions in every instance where its influence is indicated by connecting lines, but that under the influence of the gnostic controversy the Christology in question took on the given form.

Chart I presents substantially the outline of this study. Chart II exhibits the genetic relationships. The succeeding treatment presents the evidence.

For convenience a brief résumé of the results achieved is here given:

In some of its leading features Christology existed in the form of Jewish messianism before Jesus came. His own ideals were nearer to Hebrew prophetism than to Jewish messianism; nevertheless he gave grounds for the application to himself of the messianic category. His purely personal, ethical, and religious influence is not estimated in this study, save as it bore upon the christological development. That the rich, strong, creative life proceeded from and gathered about Jesus is not denied; the age may well have owed to him first of all, its freshness and power. But where spiritual life is rich and growing, theology will be undergoing corresponding changes of form, and it is only with the christological aspects that we are here concerned. The fact is not overlooked that Jesus impressed men as being such a one as to require the use of various categories for the adequate evaluation of his person; all that is affirmed is that Jesus did not create those categories, nor explicitly teach their reference to himself, save that of messiahship in a modified, transformed, and spiritualized sense.

Had Jewish messianism been the only determining factor we might well drop the word Christology altogether in favor of messianism. But when we come, for example, to the Johannine Christology we find little messianism. Paul was the first after Jesus, so far as we know, to experience keenly the inadequacy of the messianic concept. His contribution is discussed under the heads: the pre-existent and incarnate Lord, the crucified Redeemer, the cosmic Savior, the indwelling Christ, and the divine Son of God. An advance upon the Pauline Christology is found in the cosmological Christology of Colossians and Ephesians, which was a further development of Paulinism, but made larger use of Alexandrian thought in the conflict with incipient Gnosticism. Another bold Alexandrian type was that of Hebrews, which was not so close to Paul but was directly dependent on Philo. In the Apocalypse of John, Jesus was interpreted by means of the concepts of apocalyptic, combined with the universalism of the post-apostolic age and a comparatively small Christian element. In First Peter and First Clement

we have edifying epistles containing much Christology, but not sufficient that is distinctive to warrant giving them a place beside the great types already discussed. The explicit emergence of the doctrine of Christ's saving mission to the world of the dead in First Peter is notable.

The Synoptic Gospels present a double problem, but we are at this point concerned with the Christology of the authors themselves and not with their sources. Mark represents the age just succeeding Paul; lying in the background is a high Pauline Christology. Luke-Acts falls at the beginning of the second century and moves in the direction of the apologies of the middle of the century. Matthew is strongly christological, representing an advanced stage and moving toward Catholicism.

The Johannine Christology is a further development of Paulinism; it is many-sided—mystical, theological, betraying sympathy with the deeper currents of the age, conserving what was most profound in Christianity and at the same time transforming it all into the ripest christological product of the period. The Ignatian Christology, called to expression by gnostic error, represents another bold, though unsystematized interpretation. A Jew could not bring himself to speak of Christ as God in the unreserved manner of this vigorous ecclesiastic. The originality of his thought may be discerned by reading his letters beside that of his conservative contemporary Polycarp. The current Christology appears again in the Pastoral Epistles, affirmed in opposition to gnostic error. A somewhat different and more responsive type appears in Barnabas.

About the middle of the second century there arose certain edifying works not strongly christological: James, Hermas, Didache, Second Clement, Jude, and Second Peter. In this period the gnostic systems were fully developed and the real controversy began. The earlier apologists also were putting forth their works. But the discussion of these subjects would take us beyond the New Testament period proper to the age of the Catholic church. It is a singular and significant fact, however, that among those counted heretics there should have been one who was at least partly gnostic, who understood, as did no contemporary of whom we know, the gospel of the Christ who brings spiritual freedom as it was preached by the apostle Paul—Marcion of Pontus.

If now we ask to what extent the development of christological thought was in accord with Jesus, anything like an adequate answer would carry us beyond the task we have set ourselves. It may not be amiss, however, to note that although Paul had his gaze fixed on the exalted Lord and not on the earthly Jesus, yet in certain respects he came nearer understanding Jesus than the Jewish Christians at Jerusalem, many of whom had known

Jesus in the flesh. In the death of Jesus, Paul saw the principle of self-sacrifice that animated his life. Paul's universalism was a logical development of the universalism implicit in Jesus. Paul's doctrine of the freedom of the Christian man was essentially one with the ideal of ethical and religious freedom for which Jesus lived and died. But it would be a mistake to overlook the fact that at every point the way of arriving at these principles is different. Into Paul's thought there enter the wisdom of the rabbis, the speculation of apocalyptic, and the popular thought-world of Hellenism. On the other hand, Jesus thinks and speaks in terms that are elementary and universal; his religious ideas are simple, fundamental, and mighty. Although Paul's liberation of the gospel from national barriers was in accord with the mind of Jesus, Paul did not appeal for support to Jesus' own attitude of freedom; indeed, in his view, Jesus was born under law and came as a minister of circumcision for the truth of God (Gal. 4:4; Rom. 15:8). The basis of Jesus' criticism of the law was purely ethical: the law substituted appearance for reality and did not go to the heart of things. Paul's polemic against the law was practical in motive also, but his contention was for redemption in Christ. The love of neighbor was broader in the thought of Jesus than in that of his followers; for while they were not lacking in the comprehensive Christian virtue of love, they dwelt upon the love of brethren of the church. Where Paul departs most widely from the thought of Jesus is in the sphere of doctrine and not of life; he stakes everything on certain divine acts that entered into human history but transcended it—acts which secure for men salvation: the incarnation, death, and resurrection of Christ. Although Paul spoke of the obedience and self-sacrifice of Jesus Christ, he had in mind the exemplification of these virtues on the part of the Son of God who came down from heaven to save men, rather than their exemplification in Jesus as he walked among men. Yet the latter was not absent, and had not Jesus, in Paul's view, lived that kind of a life, the ascription to him of that character in the larger conception would have been an impossibility.

Wrede (*Paulus*, S. 88–97; Eng. trans., pp. 155–69) protests vigorously against the statement that Paul understood Jesus, and minimizes almost to the extent of elimination all dependence of Paul on Jesus. Closely as they are related, we must in this connection distinguish between life and dogma, and our study is of dogma. Had Wrede confined to the sphere of doctrine his contention as to Paul's independence, his position would have had more to commend it.

CHARTS—CHRONOLOGICAL AND GENETIC

CHART I

CHRONOLOGICAL EXHIBIT OF TYPES OF CHRISTOLOGY WITHIN THE NEW TESTAMENT PERIOD

A. D.		
	Hebrew Prophetism	
	Jewish Messianism	
	THE MESSIANISM OF JESUS	
30– 40	JEWISH-CHRISTIAN CHRISTOLOGY	
40– 50		
50– 60	PAULINE CHRISTOLOGY	
60– 70	(Sources of Synoptic Gospels)	
70– 80	Mark	
80– 90	COSMOLOGICAL CHRISTOLOGY (Col. and Eph.)	
90–100	CHRISTOLOGY OF HEBREWS	
	I Peter	
	I Clement	
	APOCALYPTICAL CHRISTOLOGY (The Apocalypse of John)	
100–110	Luke-Acts	
	MATTHAEAN CHRISTOLOGY	
	Pastoral Epistles	
110–120	JOHANNINE CHRISTOLOGY	
	IGNATIAN CHRISTOLOGY	
	Polycarp	
120–130	Apocalypse of Peter	
130–140	Gospel of Peter	
	Barnabas	
	(Marcion)	
140–150	Jude	
	James	
	Hermas	GNOSTICS
150–160	Didache	APOLOGISTS
	II Clement	
	II Peter	

CHART II

SHOWING GENETIC RELATIONSHIPS WITHIN THE CHRISTOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT PERIOD



CHART III
CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE OF LITERATURE AND EVENTS

A. D.	Harnack	Krüger	Knopf	Emperors and Events
				Tiberius, 14–37 Caiaphas High Priest 18–36 Pontius Pilate Procurator 26–36 Death of Jesus *ca.* 30 Conversion of Paul *ca.* 30–32 Caius Caesar (Caligula) 37–41
40–50....	I Thess., II Thess. 48, 49 (47, 48)			Claudius 41–54 Herod Agrippa 41–44
50–60....	I Cor. (Gal. ?), II Cor. 53 (52) Rom. 53, 54 (52, 53) Col., Philemon, Eph. (wenn er echt ist), Phil. 57–59 (56–58) Genuine portions of the Pastoral Epistles 59–64	Paul's Letters 54–64		Appointment of Felix *ca.* 50, 51, 52 Nero 54–68 Recall of Felix 55–56 ? 57–59 ? Festus Procurator 55–56 ? 57–59 ?
60–70....	Mark (probably) 65–70 Gospel according to the Hebrews 65 (70)–100			Burning of Rome and persecution by Nero 64 Jewish War 66–73 Galba, Otho, Vitellius 68–69 Vespasian 69–79
70–80....	Matthew (excepting some later additions) 70–75 Luke-Acts *ca.* 78–93	Mark ? I Peter, Barnabas, Heb. 75–100	Mark *ca.* 70 Hebrews 70–96 Barnabas 70–131	Destruction of Jerusalem 70 Titus 79–81

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE OF LITERATURE AND EVENTS—*Continued*

A. D.	Harnack	Krüger	Knopf	Emperors and Events
80–90....	I Peter (possibly earlier), Hebrews (possibly earlier) 81–96 John, I John, II John, III John, Mark 16:9–20 (Aristion) 80–110		Matt., Luke-Acts 80–100 I Peter 81–90 Apoc. of John 80–95 Jude 80–100	Domitian 81–96
90–100...	Pastoral Epistles (with still later additions) *ca.* 90–110 Apoc. of John 93–96 I Clement 93–95 (96, 97 ?) Gospel acc. to Egyptians (possibly earlier) 98–130	Apocalypse of John	James 91–100 John, Pastoral Epistles 90–110 I Clement 95, 96 I John, II John, III John 98–113 Didache 90–140	Nerva 96–98 Trajan 98–117
100–110...	Jude *ca.* 100–130 Preaching of Peter *ca.* 100–130 (140)	Preaching of Peter, Hermas *ca.* 100 ? Gospel and Epistles of John, I Clement, James } *ca.* 100 Didache, Gospel of Peter, Apoc. of Peter, Gospel acc. to Egyptians, Pastoral Epistles, II Clement } after 100 before 150 Ignatius, Polycarp *ca.* 105–117 ? Papias *ca.* 140 ?	Preaching of Peter 100–120 Epistles of Polycarp and Ignatius 107–117 Apoc. of Peter 100–140	

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE OF LITERATURE AND EVENTS—*Continued*

A. D.	Harnack	Krüger	Knopf	Emperors and Events
110–120...	Epistles of Polycarp and Ignatius 110–117 Gospel of Peter *ca.* 110(100)–130		Hermas 117–140	Letter of Pliny to Trajan concerning Christians 111–113 Hadrian 117–138
120–130...	James *ca.* 120–140 (130) Apoc. of Peter *ca.* 120–140 (110–160) Acts of Paul *ca.* 120–170 Apology of Quadratus (date is not certain) 125, 126	Quadratus, Aristides (? 138) } 125–126	II Clement 120–140	
130–140	Barnabas 130, 131 Didache 131–*ca.* 160 Apology of Aristides 138–161 (147)		Papias 135–150	Jewish revolt under Bar-Cochba 132–135 Antoninus Pius 138–161
140–150...	Hermas (in its present form; parts are earlier) *ca.* 140 Dialogue of Aristo of Pella *ca.* 140 (135–170) Papias *ca.* 145–160			
150–160...	Justin's Apology *ca.* 152, 153 Justin's Dialogue with Trypho 155–160 II Peter *ca.* 160 (150?) II Clement (Soter) *ca.* 166–174	Aristo of Pella, Justin (d. 163–7) } *ca.* 150 Acts of Paul, Jude, II Peter } after 150	II Peter 150–180	

Harnack's chronology of the Apostolic Age given in the first column does not represent the judgment of the majority of scholars. The crucial point is the date of the accession of Festus as procurator of Judea to succeed Felix, the removal of Paul the prisoner from Caesarea to Rome having followed shortly after the arrival of Festus (Acts 25:1, 6, 13, 23; 27:1). The question is as to whether Josephus, Tacitus, or Eusebius is to be followed. The dates for the recall of Felix and the accession of Festus gathered from the works of these historians are as follows:

Josephus—57–61, probably 60.
Tacitus—55
Eusebius—55–56, according to Jerome's version of Eusebius' Chronicle; 54, according to the Armenian version of Eusebius' Chronicle.

(See Votaw, "Recent Discussion of the Chronology of the Apostolic Age," *Biblical World* (1898), Vol. XI, pp. 112–19, 177–87.)

The more common dates for the Pauline letters, after Josephus, are about as follows:

I Thess.	52	Rom.	58
II Thess.	53	Phile., Col., and Eph.	62
Gal.	54	Phil.	63
I and II Cor.	57	Pastoral Epistles	65–67

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Introduction

SIEGFRIED, CARL. *Philo von Alexandria.* 1875.

DRUMMOND, JAMES. *Philo-Judaeus, or the Jewish-Alexandrian Philosophy in Its Development and Completion.* 1888.

LIGHTFOOT, J. B. *The Apostolic Fathers.* Part I, 1890; Part II, 1885.

CHARLES, R. H. *The Book of Enoch.* 1893. *The Assumption of Moses.* 1897. *The Book of Jubilees.* 1902. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs.* 1908.

HARNACK, ADOLF. *Die Chronologie der altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius.* 1897. *Sprüche und Reden Jesu.* 1907. Eng. trans., *The Sayings of Jesus.* 1908. *Die Apostelgeschichte.* 1908. Eng. trans., *The Acts of the Apostles.* 1909.

MCGIFFERT, ARTHUR C. *A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age.* 1897.

KRÜGER, GUSTAV. *Geschichte der altchristlichen Litteratur.* Zweite Auflage. 1898. Eng. trans., *History of Early Christian Literature.* 1897.

HASTINGS, JAMES. *Dictionary of the Bible.* 1898–1904.

KAUTZSCH, E. *Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments.* 1898–99.

CHEYNE AND BLACK. *Encyclopedia Biblica.* 1899–1903.

GEBHARDT, HARNACK, AND ZAHN. *Patrum Apostolicorum Opera.* 1900.
MOFFATT, JAMES. *The Historical New Testament.* 1901.
SINGER, ISADORE. *Jewish Encyclopedia.* 1901.
WEIZSÄCKER, CARL. *Das apostolische Zeitalter der christlichen Kirche.* Dritte Auflage. 1901. Eng. trans., *The Apostolic Age of the Christian Church.* 1894–95.
BURTON, E. D. *Principles of Literary Criticism and the Synoptic Problem.* 1904.
WERNLE, PAUL. *Die Quellen des Lebens Jesu.* 1904. Eng. trans., *The Sources of Our Knowledge of Jesus.* 1907.
KNOPF, RUDOLF. *Das nachapostolische Zeitalter: Geschichte der christlichen Gemeinden vom Beginn der Flavierdynastie bis zum Ende Hadrians.* 1905.
SODEN, HERMANN VON. *Urchristliche Litteraturgeschichte.* 1905. Eng. trans., *The History of Early Christian Literature: The Writings of the New Testament.* 1906.
WELLHAUSEN, J. *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien.* 1905.
BURKITT, FRANCIS C. *The Gospel History and Its Transmission.* 1906.
HOLTZMANN, OSKAR. *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte.* Zweite Auflage. 1906.
JÜLICHER, ADOLF. *Einleitung in das Neue Testament.* Fünfte und sechste, neu bearbeitete Auflage. 1906. Eng. trans., *Introduction to the New Testament.* 1904.
SCHMIEDEL, PAUL W. *Das vierte Evangelium gegenüber den drei ersten.* 1906. *Evangelium, Briefe und Offenbarung des Johannes.* 1906. Eng. trans. of both in one vol., *The Johannine Writings.* 1908.
ALLEN, WILLOUGHBY C. *Commentary on St. Matthew* (International Critical Commentary). 1907.
SCHÜRER, EMIL. *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi.* Dritte und vierte Auflage. 1901, 1907. Eng. trans., *A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ.* 1891.
GOODSPEED, E. J. *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (*Bible for Home and School*). 1908.
WEISS, JOHANNES (editor). *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments.* Zweite Auflage. 1908.

Theology

SPITTA, FRIEDRICH. *Christi Predigt an die Geister.* 1890.
HARNACK, ADOLF. *Dogmengeschichte.* Dritte Auflage. 1894. Eng. trans., *History of Dogma.* 1894. *Das Wesen des Christentums.* 1901. Eng. trans., *What is Christianity?* 1901.
HOLTZMANN, HEINRICH J. *Lehrbuch der neutestamentlichen Theologie.* 1897. *Das messianische Bewusstsein Jesu.* 1907.
HORT, F. J. A. *The First Epistle of St. Peter: 1:1—2:17.* The Greek Text with Introductory Lecture, Commentary, and Additional Notes. 1898.
CONE, O. *Paul: the Man, the Missionary, and the Teacher.* 1898.
STEVENS, GEORGE B. *The Theology of the New Testament.* 1899.

CLEMEN, CARL. *Niedergefahren zu den Toten.* 1900. *Die Entwicklung der christlichen Religion innerhalb des Neuen Testaments.* 1908. *Religionsgeschichtliche Erklärung des Neuen Testaments.* 1909.

MONNIER, JEAN. *La première épître de l'apôtre Pierre.* 1900.

HOLTZMANN, OSKAR. *Leben Jesu.* 1901. Eng. trans., *Life of Jesus.* 1904.

PFLEIDERER, OTTO. *Das Urchristentum: seine Schriften und Lehren in geschichtlichem Zusammenhang.* Zweite Auflage. 1902. Eng. trans. of Band I, *Primitive Christianity*, two vols. 1906, 1909.

NEUMANN, ARNO. *Jesus, wer er geschichtlich war.* 1904. Eng. trans., *Jesus.* 1906.

RÉVILLE, ALBERT. *Histoire du dogme de la divinité de Jésus-Christ.* 3me ed. 1904. Eng. trans., *History of the Dogma of the Deity of Jesus Christ.* 1905.

WEINEL, H. *Paulus: der Mensch und sein Werk.* 1904. Eng. trans., *St. Paul, the Man and His Work.* 1906.

WERNLE, PAUL. *Die Anfänge unserer Religion.* Zweite Auflage. 1904. Eng. trans., *The Beginnings of Christianity.* 1903.

BAILEY, JOHN W. *Does Hellenism Contribute Constituent Elements to Paul's Christology?* 1905.

GRESSMANN, HUGO. *Der Ursprung der israelitisch-jüdischen Eschatologie.* 1905.

MATHEWS, SHAILER. *The Messianic Hope in the New Testament.* 1905.

PFLEIDERER, OTTO. *The Early Christian Conception of Christ: Its Significance and Value in the History of Religion.* 1905.

PORTER, FRANK C. *The Messages of the Apocalyptical Writers.* 1905.

BOUSSET, WILHELM. *Die Religion des Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter.* Zweite Auflage. 1906. *Jesus.* 1906. Eng. trans., *Jesus.* 1906.

SCHWEITZER, ALBERT. *Von Reimarus zu Wrede: eine Geschichte der Leben-Jesu-Forschung.* 1906.

SCOTT, ERNEST F. *The Fourth Gospel; Its Purpose and Theology.* 1906. *The Apologetic of the New Testament.* 1907.

SANDAY, WILLIAM. *The Life of Christ in Recent Research.* 1907.

WREDE, WILLIAM. *Paulus.* Zweite Auflage. 1907. Eng. trans., *Paul.* 1907.

CAUSSE, A. *L'évolution de l'espérance messianique dans le christianisme primitif.* 1908.

DENNEY, JAMES. *Jesus and the Gospel.* 1909.

SHARMAN, HENRY B. *The Teaching of Jesus about the Future, according to the Synoptic Gospels.* 1909.

WEISS, JOHANNES. *Christus: die Anfänge des Dogmas.* 1909.

In so large a field an exhaustive bibliography would be impracticable and would probably not be especially useful; hence only a selection of the more important books is given. Other good books that have made no special contribution to this study are omitted. Periodical literature is not given in the list, but articles are referred to in the proper places.

Mention should be made of some of the books that have been of greatest

service. Both for introduction and for theology McGiffert's admirable *Apostolic Age* has been extensively used. Stevens' *Theology of the New Testament* is the best that has yet appeared in English, and the following treatment is largely indebted to it. Pfleiderer's *Urchristentum* is a work of remarkable insight on the theological side, and has been found especially useful in the patristic field. Unfortunately it is at present but half accessible to those who read only English. Wernle's *Beginnings of Christianity* is vigorous and stimulating. *Christus*, by Johannes Weiss, is brief but valuable. E. F. Scott's *Fourth Gospel* and *Apologetic of the New Testament* are masterly, and have been used to great advantage. Harnack's *Chronologie* is a monumental work and an indispensable storehouse of information. Lightfoot has been of service on the Apostolic Fathers.

However, even in the case of books that have been found most helpful, many of their conclusions are rejected in the following pages.

I. JEWISH MESSIANISM

Were the subject of our study the personality of Jesus, we should begin with Israelitish prophetism instead of Jewish messianism, for Jesus felt himself akin to the old prophets, and his prophetic vocation and consciousness precede and determine his relation to current messianism. But the beginnings of the christological world-drama which has played a large part in the world's religious life for more than eighteen hundred years are to be found rather in the new world of apocalyptic Judaism which succeeded the age of the great Hebrew prophets.

Early in Israel's history, when the people thought of their God as "a man of war" (Exod. 15:2) whose interests were one with his people's, and who fought their battles with them (Num. 10:35), the popular hope was directed toward the day of Yahweh, when God himself would come and destroy the enemies of Israel and establish his people in peace and prosperity. The prophets of the eighth and succeeding centuries used and transformed the popular eschatology in the direction of higher, more ethical conceptions of God. For them Yahweh was no longer a god among other gods, and his interests were not bound up with Israel and its fate. They too looked for a day of Yahweh which would inaugurate a new epoch and mean for the enemies of Yahweh vengeance, for all the wicked punishment, for Israel sifting, and for the righteous deliverance; and this crisis would come through God's initiative.

The glorious reigns of David and Solomon left a profound impression on the popular mind, and the nation hoped for a restoration of the Davidic glory. The hope at first had reference not to an individual Messiah but to theocratic kings of the house of David, and the promise of a king of his house forever meant a continuation of the Davidic dynasty. But the thought passed to that of a personal Messiah, another warrior-king, endowed by God with special gifts and powers. This popular, political conception persisted far into the Christian era. It was a powerful factor in the revolts against Rome. The tumults of the years 44–66 A. D. bear witness to the feverish state of the public mind. We meet with the idea again and again in the gospels. Any political revolutionist possessing qualities of leadership might be enthusiastically received as the Messiah. Up to the time of the Bar-Cochba rising men looked for the coming of an earthly Messiah.

But in contact with foreign life there grew up among the Jewish people a developed belief in an organized kingdom of demon-powers on the one

hand, and of angels and heavenly armies on the other, and the result was that the messianic hope became transcendental in character. In much of the Jewish post-exilic literature elements of the messianic hope appear only here and there, but with the Maccabean uprising the hope revived, and from that time became part of Jewish patriotism, bursting forth passionately in the Psalms of the Pharisees and finding more transcendental expression in other apocalyptic literature.

In the first great apocalypse, the Book of Daniel (167–165 B. C.), it is God himself who is to overthrow Antiochus and right the wrongs of his people. But there appears also the figure of an angel, one like a man, in the famous passage: "I saw in the night-visions, and behold, there came with the clouds of heaven one like unto a Son of man, and he came even to the Ancient of Days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all the peoples, nations, and languages should serve him; his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed" (7:13, 14).

In the 17th Psalm of the Pharisees the Messiah is most strikingly portrayed. He is Israel's king, the son of David, who will break in pieces them that rule unjustly, purge Jerusalem from them that trample her down, thrust out the sinners from the inheritance and utterly destroy their proud spirit; but he shall also gather together a holy people whom he shall lead in righteousness, and suffer no iniquity to lodge in their midst, for he shall take knowledge of them, that they be all the sons of their God. He is a righteous king and taught of God. He shall not put his trust in horse and rider and bow, for his hope is in God. He himself also is pure from sin, so that he may rule a mighty people. He leans upon God, and God shall cause him to be mighty through the spirit of holiness. The psalms in the first and second chapters of Luke breathe the same spirit; there is the same union of political elements with the ethical and religious elements in the national hope.

Advanced apocalyptic presents a more transcendental Messiah. In the Book of Enoch the figure of Dan. 7:13, probably symbolic, is transformed into a half-divine companion of God and angels, who was created before heaven and earth and will sit on God's throne in the coming age to judge men and angels. A chief mission of the Messiah in the Psalms of the Pharisees, 64–40 B. C., was to make the Jewish people pure and righteous, but in Enoch the Messiah comes to make righteous Israel triumphant.[1] According to Charles (*The Book of Enoch*, p. 41), "the influence of Enoch

[1] Cf. Porter, *The Messages of the Apocalyptical Writers*, p. 329.

on the New Testament has been greater than that of all the other apocryphal and pseudepigraphical books taken together."

In Enoch 90:37, 38, written according to Charles in the period 166–161 B. C., from the same general standpoint as Daniel, the Messiah is grotesquely symbolized as a white bull with large horns, and the people who make petition to him are beasts and birds, afterward transformed into white oxen. This Messiah is born after the kingdom has been established by God, and he becomes head of the messianic community. The passage appears to have exercised no influence upon the New Testament.

But not so the Messiah of the Similitudes (Enoch, chaps. 37–70). Charles gives the date 94–79 B. C. or 70–64 B. C. Porter places the passage in the latter part of the reign of Herod the Great. In this section the Messiah occupies the central place. The kings of the earth and the strong who possess the earth will be afflicted and fall, "for they have denied the Lord of spirits and his Anointed" (48:8–10). At the final judgment the Righteous One shall appear before the eyes of the elect righteous (38:1, 2). In 53:6 he is called "the Righteous and Elect One," and in many other passages "the Elect One." But most characteristic is the title "Son of man," found here as a definite title for the first time in Jewish literature. The oppression of the kings and mighty ones will not long continue, for the Head of Days will suddenly appear, and with him another being whose countenance has the appearance of a man and whose face is full of graciousness, like one of the holy angels—the Son of man. He has righteousness in an extraordinary degree, will grind to powder the teeth of the sinners and put down kings from their thrones because they do not extol and praise him (46:1–5). In him dwells the spirit of wisdom and the spirit of him who gives knowledge (49:3). He rules over all (62:6). He is the revealer of all things (46:3). "And from henceforth there will be nothing that is corruptible; for the Son of man has appeared and sits on the throne of his glory, and all evil will pass away before his face and depart; but the word of the Son of man will be strong before the Lord of Spirits" (69:29). Men and angels will be judged before him, and the word of his mouth will slay all the sinners (62:2). "He will be a staff to the righteous on which they will support themselves and not fall, and he will be the light of the gentiles and the hope of those who are troubled of heart" (48:4). He is to be their companion forever (62:14). His pre-existence is plainly taught: "For this reason has he been chosen and hidden before him before the creation of the world and for evermore. And the wisdom of the Lord of Spirits has revealed him to the holy and righteous, for he preserveth the lot of the righteous, because they have hated and despised this world of

unrighteousness, and have hated all its works and ways in the name of the Lord of Spirits: for they are saved in his name and he is the avenger of their life" (48:6, 7).

In the Jewish *Sibylline Oracles*, an Alexandrian production the oldest portion of which was written *ca.* 140 B. C., the messianic element is strong: God will send a king to bring peace upon the earth by destroying God's enemies and fulfilling the promises to his children; then will be established a universal kingdom with Jerusalem as its theocratic center. In the description of the approach of the kingdom of God in the Assumption of Moses, of about the beginning of the Christian era, there is no mention of the messianic king, and again he does not appear in the joyous days to come after Israel's repentance in the Book of Jubilees. In his description of the messianic age Philo appears to include the messianic king (*De Praemiis et Poenis* 16). The Apocalypses of Baruch and Ezra witness to the persistence of the hope after the destruction of the holy city and temple. In the Apocalypse of Ezra, written 90–100 A. D., the Messiah introduces and rules over the millennial earthly kingdom, but God himself will be the final judge (chap. 7). The Messiah is pre-existent—"kept unto the end" (12:32), "kept a great season" (13:26).

The dominant note of the religious life of Judaism in the period we have been studying was the conviction that God had given his people a law, and the one work of the pious Jew was the observance of that law. But the rewards of such observance were in the future, and the hope of a better future was ever the faith-element in the religious consciousness of Israel. This hope assumed different forms. Alongside of belief in an earthly, Davidic Messiah there entered the idea of a heavenly world-ruler and representative of God, who sits on the throne of glory and holds judgment over sinners. In general it may be said that the Messiah was earthly and the Son of man heavenly. The Son of man might be called the Messiah, but he could not be the Son of David; that is to say, a descendant of David would hardly be described as an angelic being. For the Son of man was superhuman, and as everything valuable was supposed to have previously existed in heaven, he was a pre-existent being (Enoch 46:1–3; 48:3, 6; 49:2–4; 62:7). There was therefore nothing fixed in the conception of the Messiah. The significant fact is that before Jesus came the materials for a Christology were already present in the messianic hopes and conceptions of his countrymen, and when he gained world-significance and the Jewish concepts proved inadequate to express what men experienced in him, new materials were at hand in the gentile world; hence the rapid development of a rich Christology.

II. THE MESSIANISM OF JESUS

In the present state of gospel-criticism it is not possible to set forth with precision the attitude of Jesus toward the current messianism. We have ample means of judging what impression he made upon others, but before we can arrive with historical assurance at Jesus' own thought, the documentary sources of the Synoptic Gospels and the mutual relationships of these sources must be more conclusively determined and evaluated. It now appears that there are more than two relatively independent and quite different sources. One of them, which is essentially our Gospel of Mark, is probably not without Pauline influence, and is in general so largely a developed expression of the faith of primitive Christians as to demand critical treatment; it has also been influenced textually by Matthew and Luke. It is interpretation as well as narrative, opening with the words, possibly a title: "Beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ." In its present form it was written after 70 A. D. The remaining material common to Matthew and Luke, consisting mainly of discourses and sayings of Jesus, has been generally referred to a single, homogeneous source, and this error has to some extent vitiated a vast amount of otherwise valuable criticism. The sayings and discourses of Jesus that find their way into Matthew and Luke were probably gathered into groups in Aramaic in Palestine before the destruction of Jerusalem. Intended for the Christian community, they are not directly affected by apologetic interests.

The impression made by the Gospel of Mark, critically considered, is that during the first part of his ministry, although possessed of an intimate knowledge of God and conscious of being intrusted with a great mission and endowed with divine power, Jesus did not lay claim to messiahship; at Caesarea Philippi he accepted the confession of his disciples to his messiahship, and from that time he called himself the Son of man and proclaimed the *parousia*. In the discourse-sources messiahship is assumed throughout; it comes to more definite expression in the Temptation and in Matt. 11:25–27 (Luke 10:21, 22), and in connection with the announcement of the *parousia* toward the close he puts forth the claim that he will come as king and judge. In many instances in these discourses and sayings the personality of Jesus stands out prominently. It is clear, accordingly, that our sources bear emphatic witness to messiahship as an element in the self-consciousness of Jesus, but it is equally evident that they

tend to throw into the forefront of his message the ethical and religious element, and remove to the background of his thought or eliminate altogether much of the eschatological coloring of the gospels as they now stand. Certainly the eschatological terminology and views of the age appear in these sources, and it is not always easy to determine to what extent Jesus shared in such conceptions, but the emphasis upon his prophetic vocation is unmistakable.

It would appear, then, that in the mind of Jesus his prophetic character was of primary significance. From the time of the Baptism he was conscious of a special mission; he had seen a vision of God, the heavenly Father, and his whole nature, emotional, reflective, and volitional, was powerfully stirred. His conception of his special mission is best expressed in the text at Nazareth (Luke 4:18, 19). He believed himself to be a teacher, a reformer, a prophet—and more than a prophet, the final messenger of God to men. Under these circumstances it was inevitable that he face the question of messiahship. It was in the air. With a mission distinct from that of the Baptist, a full knowledge of the Father, a work for the kingdom not only preparatory, but actually initiating the new age, he could not but accept the thought of messiahship. The incident at Caesarea Philippi, the reply to the question of the Baptist, the entry into Jerusalem, the confession at the trial, and above all the unanimous conviction of the disciples, it would seem, immediately after the resurrection, leave little room for doubt that Jesus believed that he was the Messiah. The prophetic consciousness related to what he *was*, the messianic to what he was to become, if indeed such a distinction is permissible.

It is clear, however, that he advanced the claim with great reserve. Neither the popular terrestrial and political nor the literary supra-mundane conceptions of the Messiah fitted in exactly with his inner convictions. The political rôle he rejected outright. The eschatological he appears to have accepted in part. Unless it be involved in the thought of messiahship and in the use of the title Son of man, there is no trace of any consciousness of pre-existence. If in his last hours, when his work was cut short by the forces of opposition to God's kingdom, he spoke of returning in glory, as seems to have been the case, it was a messianic expression of his faith that God's cause must finally triumph and his own work receive vindication. With this interpretation of his messianic consciousness his use of titles is in general agreement. Titles suggesting the political aspect of messianism, such as "Son of David," made no appeal to him, and if he did not in every instance positively reject them, it was only because such rejection would have been interpreted as a rejection of messiahship. "Son of God" as a title

would seem not to have been used by him as a self-designation, yet as much is involved in the recurring expressions "the Son" and "the Father;" his sonship was personal, moral, and religious, and in the accounts as they stand there is the implication of something more. His most frequent self-designation seems to have been "Son of man." He is never represented as having been so addressed by others. Both the Old Testament conception of man's frailty and lowly estate and the influential passage in Daniel (7:13, 14) may have been factors leading to the choice of the title. That he was influenced strongly by the high apocalyptic use in the Book of Enoch is not clear, though it is certain that his followers came to attach that meaning to the term in application to Jesus, with all that it involved. Jesus appears to have used the title mostly toward the close of his career, suggesting that then his consciousness assumed more strongly the messianic form. It came to mean for him that the messianic glory was to be obtained by renunciation, suffering, and death.

It is not assumed that the above sketch even remotely does justice to the subject, but the problem is too intricate to justify at this point a satisfactory exhibit of the processes by which the conclusions have been reached, or final judgment has been withheld, as the case may be. The gospels will again come before us for consideration in this discussion. Certain results of criticism may be confidently set forth and the direction in which they point indicated. The recognition of Matthew and Luke as composite works, one of whose sources is the Gospel of Mark, enables us to discover many heightened christological features of Matthew and Luke, and throws us back upon the simpler presentations of Mark and the other sources. Yet here too we must bear in mind that the writers of these sources were not especially interested in historical sequence and connection, but were concerned to awaken and foster faith in Jesus as the Christ and to secure obedience to him as Lord. The eschatological discourses of Mark, chap. 13, Matt., chap. 24, and Luke, chap. 21, seem to have taken their present form not earlier than 70 A. D., and there is much else in the discourse-material that bears marks of later origin. For example, one passage in which the speaker is the Wisdom of God appears to be a prophetic fragment from some Wisdom-writing of about 70 A. D. (Luke 11:49–51; Matt. 23:34, 35). There is specific mention of the murder of Zachariah, son of Barachiah, whom Josephus mentions as having been slain in the temple in 68 A. D. Certain passages bear indications of origin within the Jewish-Christian community. Side by side with passages of great spiritual freedom there are in Matthew expressions of narrowness and circumscribed sympathy that sound strange in the mouth of Jesus—

a high valuation of the law, an express limitation of his mission to the Jews, a command to obey the Jewish leaders (Matt. 5:18, 19; 10:5, 6; 23:3). The emphasis especially in Matthew on eschatology—on Jesus as the coming king and judge and the Twelve as judges of the twelve tribes of Israel in the regeneration—is, as we shall see when we treat of that topic, so in line with the messianism of Jewish Christianity that we hesitate to carry it all back to Jesus himself. Justice must be done to the unique religious genius and moral power of Jesus, of which there can be no reasonable doubt. Constant factors in all estimates of his thought and person should be the effects of his coming and the influence he exerted. But when criticism has eliminated much that is fantastic and traceable to other sources than his own thought, it yet leaves in his consciousness a mysterious element that may properly be called messianic: there are mighty stirrings and strivings in his soul, there is a spirit of exaltation and expectancy, there is the conviction of a unique vocation as God's last messenger to men. It is not enough to say that the title Messiah was imposed upon him by historical conditions and was something altogether external to him; it answered, to be sure inadequately, to something in his own consciousness. In the impressive language of H. J. Holtzmann,[1] as his forerunner John was a prophet and more than a prophet, so he was the Messiah and more than a Messiah.

There were other features in the overmastering personality of Jesus that influenced christological doctrine in the course of its development, but an adequate presentation of these would involve us in an extended historical study and estimate of Jesus for which there is here no place. Suffice it to recall his consciousness of filial relationship to God which lies at the root of his messianic consciousness and behind all his activity, the universalism at the heart of his message and work, his extraordinary dignity and authority lifting him above past and contemporary religious authorities, and the ideal of life he held up and enjoined with all of its social implications, and the abiding spiritual impression of his personal character.

[1] *Das messianische Bewusstsein Jesu*, S. 100.

III. JEWISH-CHRISTIAN CHRISTOLOGY

The sources for our study of Jewish-Christian Christology are the genuine epistles of Paul, the early chapters of Acts, and the Synoptic Gospels, all of which must be used with critical caution. We possess no literature that is directly the product of the faith of the earliest Christians. The former habit of so employing the First Epistle of Peter and the Epistle of James and of handling the first chapters of Acts uncritically is not justified, as will appear when we come to consider these works.

A good starting-point is the passage in which Paul sets forth explicitly the contents of the tradition which he received: "For I delivered to you first of all that which I myself had received: that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures, and that he was buried, and that he was raised on the third day according to the scriptures, and that he appeared to Cephas, then to the Twelve. Afterwards he appeared to more than five hundred brethren at one time, most of whom remain until now but some have gone to their rest. After that he appeared to James, then to all the apostles. And last of all, as to one born at a wrong time, he appeared to me also" (I Cor. 15:3–8). We here note several elements of Jewish-Christian Christology.

1. Jesus is the Christ. This Paul assumes. To be sure Paul uses the word "Christ" in this instance without the article as a proper name, for when the Hebrew מָשִׁיחַ, "Anointed," was translated into Greek, χριστός, the original Hebrew idea of the Messiah meant little to gentile Christians and χριστός became a proper name. In some instances it is not clear in which sense it is used. But its significance for Jewish-Christian Christology is that the earliest interpretation of the person and work of Jesus was through messiahship.

Indeed the first impression that Jesus made was that of a prophet; he was the prophet like Moses promised in Deut. 18:18, 19: "I will raise them up a prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee; and I will put my words in his mouth, and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him. And it shall come to pass, that whosoever will not hearken unto my words which he shall speak in my name, I will require it of him." This passage is quoted in Acts 3:22, 23. But there was for them one higher category than that of prophet; Jesus was the Messiah. We have seen that the question of Jesus' own thought on this subject is beset with difficulties, but the readiness with which his disciples accepted and pro-

claimed his messiahship renders it almost inconceivable that he gave them no grounds for so doing. These men had known Jesus in the flesh, had eaten and drank with him, and now they revered him as Messiah and Lord and thought of him as the coming Judge.

When Jesus was thought of in the messianic framework, his speedy return from heaven to complete his messianic work took the place of the first manifestation of the Messiah in Jewish eschatology. In the appearance of Jesus upon earth the new era had already dawned, but his work had been cut short and he would soon appear on the clouds of heaven for the destruction of Satan, the god of this world, and of the kingdom of darkness, and for the deliverance of his people. Paul received from the primitive tradition—"by the word of the Lord"—how those that are alive, that are left unto the coming (*παρουσίαν*) of the Lord, shall in no wise precede them that are fallen asleep, etc. (I Thess. 4:15 ff.). Under the inspiration of early Christian prophetism pictures of the future were painted like those of Paul (such as in I Cor. 15:55 ff.), of the Apocalypse of John, and of the Synoptic Gospels. At the common meal in which the fellowship of the brethren came to expression the thoughts of all were centered upon the Savior and especially upon his glorious return.

2. Christ died for men's sins. The representation in Acts is that in the primitive Christian community the acceptance of Jesus as the Christ brought with it the forgiveness of sins, but in the passage before us a further step is taken when connection is made between Christ's death and men's release from sin. Paul's language at this point is not to be taken as in itself conclusive, but there is every probability that very early the disciples were not content with the assurance that the death of Jesus had been foretold in the Scriptures, but that being familiar with the conception of atonement by the shedding of blood, they regarded his death in the aspect of a sacrifice offered to God. In IV Macc. 6:27–29 the idea appears that the martyrdom of the righteous has atoning merit.

3. Jesus was raised from the dead on the third day and appeared to his disciples on the six occasions mentioned. The first recorded appearance was to Peter, of which we seem to have a hint in our earliest gospel (Mark 16:7). The last appearance was to Paul himself, and is not referred to by him as being in a different class from the others. Something of the character of this appearance to Paul may be inferred from his references elsewhere to the revelation of Christ that was made to him. In I Cor. 9:1 he exclaims: "Am I not an apostle? Have I not seen Jesus our Lord?" In Gal. 1:15, 16 he says: God "saw fit . . . . to reveal his Son in me." We have an indirect reference in II Cor. 4:6: "God . . . .

shone in upon our hearts, to give the illumination of the knowledge of the glory of God on the face of Christ." Elsewhere he speaks of "visions and revelations of the Lord" (ὀπτασίας καὶ ἀποκαλύψεις κυρίου) subsequently received (II Cor. 12:1). The view of Pfleiderer that Paul did not in his own mind connect these appearances with the body of Jesus that was laid in the grave seems highly improbable.[1] Note the words: "He was raised on the third day." For Paul these appearances were special and unique. What we may infer from the references of Paul, both as to the nature of the appearance to him and consequently as to the nature of the appearances to others that preceded his, is another question.

With this testimony from our primary source there is no room for reasonable doubt as to the reality of these appearances, both those to individuals and those to groups. Our other sources—the gospels and Acts—are in agreement with Paul that through some such experiences the disciples became convinced that Jesus had risen, and that the primitive Christian community came into being in consequence of that faith. We recall from the gospels that in that world and age men could see in such a one as Jesus, John the Baptist, Elijah, or one of the prophets actually reappearing on earth (Mark 6:14–16; 8:28). In Matt. 27:52, 53 it is reported that at the death of Jesus "the tombs were opened, and many bodies of the saints that had fallen asleep were raised, and coming forth out of the tombs after his resurrection they entered into the holy city and appeared unto many." The personality of Jesus made an impression on the hearts and lives of his disciples that was ineffaceable. He bound them to him by a love so strong that even his death could not separate him from them. Their faith took the historically conditioned form that was natural to it.

Our sources then give, as the ground for the change from the gloom and despair of the crucifixion to the joy and confidence that soon succeeded, the appearances of the risen Lord, although the exact content of the resurrection-faith is not as clearly set forth as the fact itself. The preparation for these experiences consisted in the general world-view and the impressions of the personal life of Jesus. For Paul the resurrection meant that Jesus had conquered death and opened the gates of life, and he gave to it also a mystical significance (I Cor., chap. 15; Rom., chap. 6). But for the first community the resurrection of Jesus meant the vindication of his messiahship (Mark 12:10, 11; Acts 3:15) and a means toward his heavenly exaltation. The elevation of man to the sphere of the gods was a thought not strange to circles even outside of Judaism. To specify

[1] *Das Urchristentum*, I, S. 5 (*Primitive Christianity*, I, p. 7).

only Hebrew instances, there were Enoch (Sir. 44:16; 49:14), Moses (Assumption of Moses), and Elijah (II Kings 2:11). The significance of the resurrection and exaltation of Jesus in the interpretation of his person may be gathered from the following passages:

Jesus said to the disciples on the way to Emmaus: "What things?" And they said to him: "The things concerning Jesus the Nazarene, who was a prophet (ἀνὴρ προφήτης) mighty in deed and word before God and all the people; and how our chief priests and rulers delivered him up to be condemned to death and crucified him. We hoped however that it was he who was about to redeem Israel" (Luke 24:19–21).

"This Jesus God raised up, of which we are all witnesses. Being exalted therefore at the right hand of God and having received from the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, he has poured forth this which you see and hear. For David ascended not into the heavens, but he says himself:

> The Lord said to my Lord:
> Sit at my right hand,
> Till I lay thine enemies under thy feet.

So let all the house of Israel know assuredly that God has made him both Lord and Christ—this Jesus whom you crucified" (Acts 2:32–36).

"You know of the matter that came through all Judea . . . . Jesus of Nazareth, how God anointed him with the Holy Spirit and power, and he went about doing good and healing all that were oppressed by the devil, for God was with him . . . . whom they slew . . . . him God raised up on the third day and gave him to be made manifest. . . . . This is he who is ordained (ὡρισμένος) by God, judge of living and dead" (Acts 10:37–42).

"And we bring you good tidings of the promise made to the fathers, that God has fulfilled this to our children by raising up Jesus, as also it is written in the second psalm: Thou art my Son; to-day have I begotten thee" (Acts 13:32, 33).

To these passages must be added two from Paul, in one of which he says that Jesus was constituted (ὁρισθέντος) Son of God with power according to the spirit of holiness by the resurrection from the dead (Rom. 1:4), and the second is in the great christological passage, most of which is characteristically Pauline: "Wherefore God also highly exalted him and gave him the name which is above every name"—the name of Lord (Phil. 2:9–11; κύριος, for יהוה in the Septuagint; see Isa. 42:8; 45:23).

Now these passages clearly point toward an original Adoptionist Christology: Jesus became the Son of God and Messiah by a divine act

of adoption connected with the resurrection from the dead and the exaltation to heaven at God's right hand. The use of the second psalm is instructive. From ancient times in the Orient kings were regarded gods or of divine origin. Amid the plottings of the rulers of the earth against Yahweh and against his Anointed, God gives assurance to the king on the day of his accession to the throne that he will give nations for his inheritance and the uttermost parts of the earth for his possession. When the passage is quoted in the Epistle to the Hebrews the thought of the writer can hardly be that the divine sonship of Jesus began at some particular time (Heb. 1:5), but the earlier view was that the divine sonship of Jesus was not by nature and from eternity, but that he was raised to it by an act of God. In the gospel-tradition there was the story how God had already chosen him as his Son at the Baptism and by the descent of the Spirit consecrated him the Messiah and endowed him with messianic power, and still later the divine act was pushed back to his birth. In the Lukan account of the Baptism, Codex D, the very words of Ps. 2:7 occur (Luke 3:22). Old Testament analogies are the anointings of Saul and of David by Samuel (I Sam. 10:1; 16:13), in each instance a period elapsing before accession to the throne, as in the case of Jesus. It is evident that the hope of establishing an earthly Davidic kingdom was still in some sense alive in Jewish-Christian circles. The Palestinian hymns of the first chapters of Luke breathe the same spirit. The genealogies of Matthew and Luke, giving the list of ancestors of Jesus in direct line from David to Joseph, were intended to prove that Jesus was the Messiah. Paul knows the tradition—"born of the seed of David according to the flesh" (Rom. 1:3). In discussing with the scribes Jesus seems to have tried to show that the Messiah need not necessarily be a descendant of David, though this is certainly not the thought of the evangelist who reports the incident (Mark 12:35).

But this Adoptionist Christology does not represent the whole thought of the Jewish-Christian community regarding Jesus. Paul makes use of the doctrine of the pre-existence of Christ as though it were already familiar. It was easily taken over from messianism. We have seen how in the Similitudes of Enoch (37–70) the Son of man is described as hidden with God before the world was and manifested as judge of men and angels. The idea was that precious persons and things were of heavenly origin, and everything of real value that appeared on earth had its existence in heaven (Exod. 25:9, 40; 26:30; 27:8; Num. 8:4; Ps. 139:15, 16; Gal. 4:26; Heb. 12:22; Apoc. 21:2). On the other hand, the Greek conception of pre-existence was based on the contrast between spirit and matter and

pre-temporal existence was deemed a certainty only in the case of higher and purer spirits. It cannot be said that the notion of a pre-existent Messiah was widespread in Judaism or that it played a large part. Certainly the thought of the first disciples was quite different from Paul's, for the Jewish conception of the Messiah's appearance on earth was neither that of an incarnation nor of a humiliation. But undoubtedly in identifying Jesus with the Son of man of Jewish apocalyptic the first disciples were bordering closely upon the idea that he was not merely a man who had been exalted to heavenly glory, but was originally a heavenly being who had come down to earth.

4. The Old Testament scriptures were used as foreshadowing both the death and the resurrection of Christ. Doubtless the passages appealed to as foretelling his suffering and death were those telling of the suffering Servant of Yahweh (Isa., chaps. 52, 53; cf. Acts 8:30 ff.). The stumbling-block of his death could be removed, if, in addition to his resurrection and exaltation, proof were adduced that the sufferings and death of Christ were in accord with the Old Testament vocation of the Messiah and founded in the counsel of God. The passage used as foretelling his resurrection may very well have been Ps. 16:10, as found in Peter's sermon, Acts 2:27, and also in the mouth of Paul at Antioch of Pisidia, Acts 13:35. Other passages that may have been used in this connection are Ps. 86:13 and Hos. 6:2.

But not only were the death and resurrection found in the Old Testament but almost everything else in the evangelic tradition.[1] Of course it worked the other way also: what was in the Old Testament must have been in the life of Jesus. Accordingly it is to be expected that some material which found its way into the gospels had its beginnings in primitive Christianity.

We close this section with some reflections on the significance of Jewish-Christian Christology. We have seen that in Judaism along with devotion to their divinely given law there was the faith-element of the messianic hope. Among the early Christians the latter element eclipsed the former. In Paul's account of the controversy about the law recorded in the second chapter of Galatians he takes it as common ground that all who believed on Christ Jesus did so in order that they might be justified by faith in Christ, but it had never occurred to his Jewish-Christian opponents that faith in Christ entirely set aside the Jewish law and abolished legalism. To their minds this would make Christ a minister of sin. To them it

[1] For instance, the *parousia* was seen in Zech. 12:10: "They shall look unto me whom they have pierced," quoted in Apoc. 1:7.

was not a question of faith in Jesus or observance of the law. Their hope was really not in the law but in the Lord at his coming. Faith in Jesus and hope of the kingdom were working a change of attitude. The story of Stephen in Acts points toward a larger freedom and a deeper insight into the implications of the gospel on the part especially of converts among the Hellenists.

The thinking and preaching of the first disciples were not primarily concerned with the gospel of the fatherliness of God, prominent in the teaching of Jesus. Theirs was another problem. They must prove to their countrymen that Jesus was the Messiah, and would shortly return to establish the kingdom. His crucifixion was the obstacle in the way, but that was foreshadowed by Scripture and its force destroyed by the resurrection. For them Jesus was the Servant of God, a man approved of God, constituted the Christ, raised from the tomb, exalted in the heavens, to come again to complete the messianic work. The miracle of the resurrection and his exaltation cast a halo about his earthly life, removing him from men and investing his person with mystery. Looking toward the future they made him the center of their eschatology, the chief part of which they drew from Jewish apocalyptic. They were attempting to express what they had experienced in Jesus, and their expression was more prophetic and practical than doctrinal. Their own state was one of ecstasy and exaltation, one of their charismata from the heavenly world being "speaking with tongues," described by Paul in I Cor., chap. 14; and they beheld Jesus as their risen and exalted Lord.

We often meet with the statement that in this period the Christians were nothing more than a Jewish sect,[1] and that their Christology was nothing more than the framework of Jewish messianism with the name of Jesus written in it. Thus Wernle concludes: "The Jewish faith swallowed up the Christian, and in reality it was the Jews who came forth the conquerors from these disputes."[2] Of course it is true that the Christian movement was within Judaism; that as Jesus never intended to found a "church," that is, an institution, so the early Jerusalem disciples remained members of the Jewish church, and to them the idea of two churches was an impossible one. Their aim was to convince other Jews that Jesus was their Messiah. In this sense the Christian community formed a Jewish sect, but it was something more. Although Jesus had in his own thought

[1] For example, Clemen, *Die Entwicklung der christlichen Religion innerhalb des Neuen Testaments*, S. 74.

[2] *Die Anfänge unserer Religion*, erste Auflage, S. 85 (*The Beginnings of Christianity*, I, p. 141).

transformed, purified, spiritualized, and enriched the term Messiah in its application to himself, yet his disciples did not in this respect altogether understand him, and after his death the older elements were retained in the term. Nevertheless there was much involved in thinking of Jesus in the messianic framework. The resurrection of the Messiah was not an element in Jewish messianism because he was not expected to die.[1] Another new element was the redemptive significance of his death. The second coming simply corresponded to the messianic first coming. So far all seems formal. But related to it all there was a rich religious experience that was new and creative. There was something tangible and concrete about a Christ who had actually lived among men, who had been raised from the dead, had been seen in his glorified state, and to whom (or through whom) one could pray, as did Stephen, according to the testimony of Acts, in the words: "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit" (Acts 7:59). Through the presence and power of the Spirit that Jesus sent down from heaven there was an enthusiastic life, a joyousness, an assurance of acquittal at the coming judgment, a faith-principle, that current, somber, depressing Judaism conspicuously lacked.

The noblest and truest expression of their new experience of Jesus the Christ was to be seen in their preparation for the kingdom, the new order about to be established at the Lord's return. This preparation consisted of repentance and righteousness, but essentially it was a social phenomenon, a real brotherhood. The poor were relieved by means of a common fund. The Lord's Supper—"the breaking of bread," Acts 2:42, 46—was a fellowship-meal. Through this practical Christian brotherhood Jesus, the helper of the helpless, the friend of sinners, the refuge of the heavy-laden, came to his own, and thereby Christianity conquered the world.[2] Beneath the thought-forms of the primitive church which have been occupying our attention there lies the gospel, and in the experience of these first disciples was manifested the practical Christian life.

Moreover we must not forget that the primitive Christian community possessed the priceless tradition of Jesus' own imperishable words and deeds. Narrowness and legalism were far from being hopeless for those who possessed a measure of his spirit and the memory of his words and conduct. Indeed, it is by no means incredible that one of the number, Stephen, should have come near to grasping the very heart-principle of

[1] Yet see Apoc. of Ezra 7:29.

[2] See Pfleiderer, *Das Urchristentum*, I, S. 22, 23 (*Primitive Christianity*, I, p. 32).

the gospel, Christian freedom; and, because he proclaimed it, to have brought martyrdom upon himself and persecution upon the other disciples. Had primitive Christianity been nothing more than a sect of Judaism, Paul the Pharisee would not have been found so zealously persecuting it, nor would he have been powerfully converted to a religion that was essentially the same as that which he held.

IV. PAULINE CHRISTOLOGY

The letters upon which this treatment is based are Galatians, First and Second Corinthians, Romans, First Thessalonians, Philippians, and Philemon. Others are reserved for later consideration.[1] In these letters there is found no development in his conception of Christ of which it is necessary to take account. The first of the letters to be written, whether First Thessalonians or Galatians, was written not far from a score of years after his conversion, and all of them fall within a period of twelve years. He was at the time a mature man, aged somewhere between forty-five and sixty-five. Varying circumstances elicited differing forms of expression, but for him there was one original gospel.

Four factors in the formation of his Christology may be mentioned, but not always distinguished: pre-Pauline Christian thought, Jewish thought, gentile thought, and his own creative personality. No more original and influential thinker has appeared in the history of the Christian church.[2] Yet his primary purpose was not to give Christianity doctrinal expression, but to preach Christ; he was first a missionary, and secondly a theologian. His epistles were called forth by the exigencies of his missionary work and adapted to the needs of the churches. Vital as was his conception of the person of Christ in his apprehension of Christianity, his Christology was with a view to Soteriology, and must be studied from that point of view. But he has a Christology that is original and thought out, because he was powerfully intellectual; he felt the true theologian's necessity for harmonizing convictions growing out of his religious experience with the rest of his thought which he held in common with the age. To this fundamental need of his nature is added the fact of his rabbinical training. Though he was more than a rabbinic dialectician, still it is essential to

[1] It is now generally recognized among scholars that the Pastoral Epistles are in their present form not from the hand of Paul. Second Thessalonians and Ephesians are regarded as doubtful, especially the latter. The tendency at present is to defend the Pauline authorship of Colossians. Most scholars do not take seriously the contention of a few critics that all the Pauline letters belong to a later time.

[2] The fact is that Paul comes near being the only perfectly clear figure among the Christians of the first century. Both the immediate disciples of Jesus and the Christians of the age succeeding Paul are more or less shadowy. We have seen how difficult of historical access is Jesus himself, though on account of his dominating personality and universalism Jesus does stand out before us as not even Paul does. The point is that for Paul we possess direct sources. See Wrede, *Paulus*, S. 1, 2 (Eng. trans., pp. xi, xii).

remember that his education was Jewish; he knew the Hebrew scriptures, though he generally quotes from the Septuagint; he was trained in Jewish theology and rabbinical methods of interpretation. So while in the Jewish-Christian church certain conclusions about Jesus had been reached through reflection and in recommending him to the Jews, chiefly in connection with his messiahship and its corollaries, yet no such man as Paul had arisen who felt the necessity upon him of thinking things through theologically and who had the ability to do so.

A third factor in the situation ought, however, not to be underestimated: he was a Hellenist as well as a Pharisee. His knowledge of the Greek language and Greek Bible is in itself a matter of great importance. His native city of Tarsus was a university city and a seat of Stoicism. Under these circumstances a universal horizon and a broad and human interest were almost inevitable for such a man as Paul. This side of his nature was brought out when he became not only a Jew to the Jews but a Greek to the Greeks and took up his work among gentiles. He had not only to discuss daily in synagogue and market-place with Jews (Acts 17:17), but also to take account of Paganism and adapt his message to the heathen. Philosophic Hellenism had its conviction of the supremacy of the spirit, its desire for freedom from the sensuous, its ideals of exaltation above the world and of communion with the divine life, its belief in immortality; and while Paul did not as a scholar know Greek philosophy, yet to the Greek world he did successfully minister.

It was Paul's repeated and earnest contention that he derived his gospel from no human source, but from the revelation of God's Son in him; from God and Christ he received his apostleship and authority to preach, and the very content of his preaching as well (Gal. 1:1, 11, 12; 2:8; I Cor. 1:1, 17; II Cor. 10:8; 13:10; Rom. 1:1). Not seldom the Lord is referred to as his authority in certain specific matters (I Cor. 7:10, 12, 25; 9:14; 11:23; I Thess. 4:15). Yet we have it on his own statement that his gospel was substantially that of the Jerusalem Christians (Gal. 2:6–9). At first he and the Palestinian Christians were at one, even in regard to salvation by faith, at least nominally so (Gal. 2:15, 16). The trouble came when he emphasized salvation by grace in opposition to Jewish particularism and acted upon his principles in the evangelization of the gentiles. More than once Paul acknowledges his dependence upon the primitive Christian tradition (e. g., I Cor. 11:23; 15:3). He acquired knowledge of the historical character and teaching of Jesus both before and after his conversion. For instance, his recognition of the law of love as the regulative principle of the Christian life undoubtedly had its source

in the character and teaching of Jesus himself. But much more than that: his acquaintance with the earthly life and teaching of Jesus was more extensive than some scholars have supposed, impressed as they are with the fact that Paul dwells upon the glorified Redeemer and says comparatively little about the earthly experiences of Jesus. What Paul knew about Jesus was just what other Christians in general knew, for all alike were instructed in the evangelic tradition, not to dwell upon what ever remains the greatest source of knowledge—the life, the conduct, of those animated by his spirit. Paul found a Christian community at Damascus (Gal. 1:17; II Cor. 11:32, 33). On his visit of a fortnight to Jerusalem he had the opportunity of interviewing Peter, who had been with Jesus, and others whose knowledge was personal (Gal. 1:18, 19). His association with Barnabas (Gal. 2:1, 9; Acts 11:25) and with the churches of Syria and Cilicia, in fact his whole contact with Christian communities which he himself did not found, could have no other result than to acquaint him with the common church tradition about Jesus. It also formed in all probability a part of his own preaching, a primary duty being the instruction of his own converts on the subject. A curious confirmation of this is found in Aramaic words which he transliterated and taught to his gentile readers and which have found their way into the epistles (*ἀββᾶ*, Gal. 4:6; Rom. 8:15; *μαραναθά*, I Cor. 16:22).[1]

It is impossible here to give a full and adequate presentation of the Pauline Christology; all that is attempted is an indication of what is distinctive in his thought about Christ. His contribution to Christology may be exhibited under five heads, to which is added a paragraph on eschatology: the pre-existent and incarnate Lord, the crucified Redeemer, the cosmic Savior, the indwelling Christ, the divine Son of God, the coming Lord. In the treatment of future topics we shall have occasion often to recur to the teaching of Paul.

1. There is good reason to believe that when the Jewish-Christian community applied to Jesus the category of messiahship, in spite of his own cautious use of the term as applied to himself, they felt that all that the Jews expected of the Messiah must be true of him. Now in Jewish thought the Messiah was waiting in the heavens for the time of his manifestation, when he would come in pomp and power for the overthrow of his enemies and the salvation of God's people. In this view much of the messianic work was deferred in thought to a second coming; the pre-existence was taken for granted. But whether this pre-existence was to

[1] See Case, "Paul's Historical Relation to the First Disciples," *American Journal of Theology*, 1907, p. 269.

their thought ideal, existing in the mind of God, or, as is more likely, personal, the Jewish Christians probably made no such ethical use of it as Paul. He speaks of the pre-existence of Christ as familiar to his readers and undisputed. The Man from heaven of apocalyptic speculation, who had existed from all time with God, out of love for man left his high estate, came from heavenly glory to earth, to participate in the lowly fortunes of men for their redemption. Originally of a different nature from us, he became like us and took our nature; was born of a woman, became a real but sinless man, died on the cross, and was buried. His nature was thus judged not from his appearance in the flesh, but from his heavenly origin. The resurrection proved him to be the Son of God. He returned to glory and will come again to complete his messianic work in the consummation of the age. Paul could have found examples of Christ's love and self-sacrifice in the life of Jesus; indeed, he did center his thought upon the supreme example of his death. But he was dominated by the Jewish speculative idea, and viewed the nature and the work of Jesus from the point of view of the heavenly Christ. However, Wernle's way of putting it does not help us to understand Paul; he says: "Doubtless this whole point of view is a myth from beginning to end, and cannot be termed anything else;" it is the "story of a God who had descended from heaven."[1] It was rather the transformation of a current Jewish speculation into an ethical and spiritual doctrine, resulting from the impression Jesus had made upon Paul; the end was practical: it means the divine love manifesting itself in the incarnation, an example of service, sacrifice, humility, obedience —more than that, a God who redeems us, enters our life, and secures our renewal, personal communion, and sonship (II Cor. 8:9; Phil. 2:5–11).

But what was Paul's conception of the human nature of Jesus? Between the two periods of the Son of God's existence in heaven there comes that of the incarnate life, the humiliation. His becoming poor (II Cor. 8:9) is sometimes taken to refer to a state of earthly poverty, and there may indeed be a secondary reminiscence of the fact that Jesus was lowly, but the primary thought is that he abandoned the riches of heaven for a human life. Paul's language implies that the manhood of Jesus Christ was assumed and formal. We are even reminded of the docetic teachers of a later period, but the reality of the humanity of Christ is essential to the thought of Paul; that is to say, he was born into the world in a human way, possessed a body of flesh, and was subject to death. To what extent did he also possess human thought, feeling, and will? Paul does not say

[1] *Die Anfänge unserer Religion*, erste Auflage, S. 154 (*Beginnings of Christianity*, I, p. 251).

that the Son of God became man, but that "he emptied himself, taking the form of a bond-servant, coming in likeness (ἐν ὁμοιώματι) of men, and being found in fashion (σχήματι) as a man he humbled himself" (Phil. 2:7), and that God sent his own son ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας (Rom. 8:3).[1]

2. We have seen that according to his own testimony Paul received in the primitive tradition the fact that Christ died for the sins of believers (I Cor. 15:3). The contradiction between the ignominious death and the messianic vocation was felt by him as keenly as by the Jewish-Christian community (τὸ σκάνδαλον τοῦ σταυροῦ, Gal. 5:11; I Cor. 1:23). He grappled with the problem seriously and boldly, and permanently influenced the thinking of the church. He developed, explained, and enriched the primitive connection in thought between the death of Christ and his saving work. His new spiritual life would not seem to have needed help from thought of the death of Christ, for its strength was drawn from communion with the risen Lord; yet the death had to be explained. Somehow it must be a fact of supreme significance, and so Paul came to regard it as the culmination and crowning glory of Christ's saving work. From his point of view there was no special help to be gained from dwelling upon the historical situation; he makes but one reference to it (I Thess. 2:15). It must be looked at from above, and in the light of his own vision-experience of the risen and glorified Christ. Jesus was a curse (κατάρα), but it was ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν (Gal. 3:13). Though holy, he was made sin on our behalf (II Cor. 5:21, ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἁμαρτίαν ἐποίησεν). The cross becomes the symbol of the divine condescension, in which Paul glories (Gal. 6:14). It is a sacrifice God himself has furnished, which men have only to accept; he was in Christ, reconciling the world to himself; it is an expression and assurance of his love (Rom. 5:8; 8:32).

But how was a sacrifice necessary? There is an aspect of the divine character expressed by the words ὀργή and δικαιοσύνη. God disapproves sin, and the death of Christ is an ἔνδειξις τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ (Rom. 3:25). So Paul uses a rich variety of expressions: those implying substitution (ὑπέρ or περὶ ὑμῶν, or τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν, not however ἀντὶ ὑμῶν), redemption (ἀπολύτρωσις), reconciliation (καταλλαγή), propitiation (ἱλαστήριον, Rom. 3:25), the language of sacrifice (blood), Christ as our passover who has been sacrificed (I Cor. 5:7). In one instance, the notable passage in Rom. 3:21–26, Paul undertakes to explain why it was

[1] "Die Menschheit ist ihm also eigentlich etwas Fremdes, ein Bettlergewand, das der himmlische Königssohn für eine Weile überwirft, um es wieder abzustreifen." —Wrede, *Paulus*, S. 55 (Eng. trans., p. 90).

necessary that Christ should die, the reason being that God had in his forbearance formerly passed over sins, with the result of creating the suspicion that he was indifferent to them; but to erect this into Paul's theory of the atonement is to give it undue weight and to ignore the obvious meaning of his language elsewhere. In Paul's thought there was not merely a substitution of methods, but a transfer of penalty, a transaction (if the meaning of the word is not pushed too far), an expiation, a propitiation. That his way of looking at it is not acceptable to some modern men does not argue invalidity in his reasoning for him. For he had been trained in Jewish law. Deissmann thinks that the forensic terms he uses could have been heard daily in the police-courts of Greek cities, but the decisive factor with Paul at this point was probably his Jewish theology. He was not a slave to it; he has given us abundant evidence that when he chose, he could use vital analogies. Certainly the religio-ethical element is present, and indeed dominant, in his thought. It is a mistake, however, to deny and explain away the other.

3. The original Christology and controversy centered in the messiahship of Jesus, but more was involved in the affirmation of such messiahship than was at first realized. It was Paul's great office to discern that the gospel of Jesus is different from the religion of law and to lay bare the radical opposition between Judaism, the religion of law, and Christianity, the religion of spirit, grace, faith, and ethical freedom. For him, therefore, the maintenance of the messianic claim for Jesus meant the exposition and defense of a new morality and a new attitude toward life. The Jewish teachers themselves discerned in the person and message of Jesus the antithesis of that for which they stood, but Jewish opposition to the Jewish-Christian church was principally not from the side of the Pharisaic party, but from the priestly, Sadducean custodians of law and order (Acts 4:1). Paul's penetration into the heart of the gospel was deeper and his horizon broader; so it devolved upon him to bring into the light of day the universalism implicit in Christianity from the beginning. For him Jesus was not only a Jewish Messiah, but much more a world-Redeemer. Paul eliminated what was merely Jewish and national, and drew to the person of Jesus the larger and universal aspirations of men.[1] Jesus

[1] Paul retained belief in the special rôle reserved for Israel (Rom. 11:25–32), but in the church at large this remnant of Jewish nationalism could not long exist alongside of the Pauline universal conception of Christ's work. The increasing enmity of the Jews against Christians, the diminishing influence of Jewish Christianity, and the destruction of the temple and holy city and of the Jewish people as a nation, contributed toward eliminating the hope for Israel *κατὰ σάρκα*. The Old Testament promises were then taken to refer to the new nation. The admission of the law for Jewish

Christ, the Son of God, died for all men, and his death was a cosmic fact, holding the center of the world's history. Through him are all things, and his relation to mankind is original and organic (I Cor. 8:6). The heavenly, second Man may have been Paul's equivalent for the Son of man of Daniel and the first Christian community, but his cosmic conception gave to Jesus a significance like that of Adam, the father of the race; as the second Adam, the head and founder of a new humanity, he recovers what Adam lost, and in him a new human epoch takes its rise (I Cor., chap. 15; Rom., chap. 5). As Adam started the race wrong and downward, so Christ comes and makes a complete break in history, sets up a new human line, and starts the race anew. He is ὁ ἔσχατος Ἀδάμ, ὁ δεύτερος ἄνθρωπος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ.[1]

4. A point at which Paul departed fundamentally in his Christology from his predecessors and contemporaries and where he is independent, individual, and original, is in his conception of the indwelling Christ. What manner of life Jesus lived on earth Paul learned from others and he acknowledged his indebtedness to the primitive tradition; but the heart of his Christology was built on the basis of his inner experience, on the risen Christ who had appeared to him, whom he knew directly and not by hearsay. Paul did not distinguish sharply in his experience between the influence of Christ and that of the Spirit (I Cor. 15:45; II Cor. 3:17). In the Jewish-Christian community the Spirit was the source of ecstasy and special endowments; Paul transferred the Spirit's activity to the entire ethical and religious life of the believer, in union with God and in fellow-

Christians was but a temporary expedient; Jewish Christianity and universal Christianity could not long exist side by side. Paul's doctrine that the law was divine in origin and holy, but abrogated and not binding upon gentile Christians, was quite difficult, till the allegorical interpretation made possible a "spiritual" understanding of the ceremonial ordinances. On the national side the extreme is reached in the Fourth Gospel, which mentions the Jews in terms of the divine rejection, though their pre-Christian status was one of privilege (1:47; 4:22). On the anti-ceremonial side the extreme among orthodox churchmen was reached in Barnabas, who rejected the cultus and legal ordinances of the Old Testament as a diabolical misrepresentation, claiming the Old Testament exclusively for Christianity. It was a short step to Gnosticism, which regarded Judaism and the Old Testament as the work of the devil and the Demiurge. See Harnack, *Apostelgeschichte*, S. 9, 211–17 (*Acts of the Apostles*, pp. xxv, 281 ff.).

[1] In the second century Christians spoke of themselves as a separate race. Aristides says that there are four races of men in this world: barbarians and Greeks, Jews and Christians; and that the barbarians reckon their head from Kronos, the Greeks from Zeus, the Jews from Abraham, and the Christians from Jesus Christ.—*Apology*, 2.

ship with Christ. In his own experience the presence of the Spirit was that of Christ, and meant life, freedom, sonship, as well as certain specific gifts of the Spirit (I Cor. 12:4–11). The pre-Pauline thought about Jesus was of an external character: Jesus was in heaven, exalted at the right hand of God, and he sent down his Spirit upon men. Paul needed no such mediation; Jesus himself was a life-giving Spirit, and he saved a man by taking up his abode within him (Gal. 1:16; 2:20; 3:27; 4:6, 19; Rom. 8:10). Under the control of the Spirit of Christ he was freed from bondage to the flesh; he died with Christ to the flesh and rose with him to the new life of the Spirit, and the experience of others is described in the same terms as his own (Gal. 2:20; II Cor. 4:10; Rom., chap. 6; 7:4; 8:10; Phil. 3:10).

The union between the believer and the risen Christ was certainly one of disposition, mind, heart, will, character, but it was more; it was an organic union, corresponding to the physical relation between men and Adam (I Cor. 15:47–49). In the case of the natural man and Adam the basis of the union was the *σάρξ*; in the case of the spiritual man and Christ the basis was the *πνεῦμα* (I Cor. 6:17). In becoming united to Christ a man becomes a partaker with him of the divine nature or *πνεῦμα*. His personality being in harmony with the Spirit, he is a spiritual man (Gal. 4:6; 5:16, 17; I Cor. 2:12; 6:11; 12:13; II Cor. 1:22; 5:16, 17). He is master of the lower nature (Gal. 5:16–18, 24; I Cor. 6:15, 16; Rom. 8:4, 5, 12–15). He is a free man (Gal. 2:19; 3:24–27; 5:13, 18; Rom. 6:14; 7:6; 10:4). Yet the life is a fulfilling of that inner, spiritual law which represents the divine character and will (Gal. 5:14; Rom. 7:14; 8:4; 13:8–10). But while the flesh remains there must still be a struggle, and a man may lose his hold on Christ. Final salvation means release from the flesh and resurrection in a new, spiritual body, suited to the heavenly life (I Cor. 15:54–57; Rom. 6:8–10, 23; 8:23; 13:11).

This organic relationship is not only with the individual, but is also with the body of believers, the brotherhood (*ἐκκλησία*); the church is the body of Christ (I Cor. 12:12, 27). The communion is realized in the Supper (I Cor. 10:16, 17; 11:23, 29). Paul knew what according to the evangelic tradition Jesus said about his death being for the benefit of his followers, and his identification of the bread and wine with his body and blood. How further he came to his profound conceptions of oneness and fellowship with the glorified Christ and participation in the life of God through him is not easy to determine. His thinking was akin to the longings of fine religious spirits among the Greeks. Justin, writing just beyond the middle of the second Christian century, says that to look upon

God is the end of Plato's philosophy (*κατόψεσθαι τὸν θεόν—τοῦτο γὰρ τέλος τῆς Πλάτωνος φιλοσοφίας.—Dialogue with Trypho*, 2:6).

5. Titles of Jesus which Paul took over from the Jewish-Christian community assumed for him new meaning. There was in general a broadening and a heightening. Even during his earthly life Jesus was called "Lord," the Semitic term, מר, preserved by Paul, being applicable to God to indicate rulership and to men deemed worthy of special honor, such as the king. After the resurrection and exaltation of Jesus the term in its application to Jesus was proportionately elevated. The early Palestinian disciples who spoke Aramaic called Jesus "our Lord" (מרן)—a form preserved not only by Paul (I Cor. 16:22), but also in the Didache (10:6). When Christian missionaries came to transfer Hebrew and Aramaic terms to Greek, Κύριος had to do service for יהוה and אדני, as in the Septuagint, and for מר. So a common expression with Paul, based on the Aramaic, is ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν. There was a tendency to reserve Κύριος for Jesus and use Θεός of God. The address of prayer to Jesus and the application to him of Old Testament passages that originally referred to God indicated that in their thought God and Jesus occupied similar positions in relation to men. But the Jewish Christians were strictly monotheists, and did not go to the length of calling Jesus God. Their heaven-exalted saints and heroes like Enoch and Moses and Elijah were not thought divine, and even the Messiah was but a heavenly being chosen and sent by God. As in modern Greek, *κύριε* was but a polite form of address, used in speaking to others as well as to God or Jesus. But for Jewish Christianity Κύριος was employed to express the heavenly, spiritual authority of Jesus the Christ over the community.[1] Now Paul was a Jew, and therefore a monotheist; and although among the heathen there were gods many and lords many, for him as for Mohammed there was no God but one—the Father, of whom are all things (I Cor. 8:4–6).[2] But there was also one Lord, Jesus Christ, through whom are all things and we through him, and as we shall see, the recognition of this mediatorship for Paul's thought carried the movement well on the way toward the high Christology subsequently reached.

Now no such monotheism prevailed in the gentile world. No insuperable difficulty was experienced in ascribing deity to Jesus. Their heroes were called gods, and the emperor was worshiped; surely Jesus was deserv-

[1] See Case, "Κύριος as a Title for Christ," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. XXVI, 1907.

[2] J. Weiss (*Christus*, S. 29) thinks that in the much-discussed passage, Rom. 9:5, Christ is called God, but that the text is corrupt.

ing of no less an honor. It is reported that at Lystra when Paul healed a lame man, the crowd cried out: "The gods are come down to us in the likeness of men;" and they called Barnabas Zeus and Paul Hermes, and the priest of Zeus brought bulls and garlands and desired to sacrifice with the crowd (Acts 14:8–13). Again, on the island of Melita, when Paul unharmed shook a snake from his arm into the fire, the friendly barbarians said he was a god (Acts 28:1–6). To this gentile public Christianity had to be presented, and the problems were vastly different from those of the Jewish apologetic. Jesus must be set forth not as the Jews' Messiah, but as the divine Savior, the world's Redeemer from sin. Savior, the Latin form, is the gentile equivalent for Messiah; for the Jews themselves were after salvation, and their hopes went out after a coming Deliverer. Accordingly by Paul and after his time Jesus is interpreted as a world-character; as in the gospels, where he appears as a miracle-worker, a demon-conqueror, Lord over nature, one who commissions for world-evangelism.

The title "Son of God" conveyed a different meaning to the Greek mind from the impression conveyed to the Semitic mind. The older Hebrew conception was mostly an ethical one; God's son was his chosen, his beloved. The gentile took the title literally. He did not distinguish between a heavenly being who was not God and God himself, and Ignatius did not hesitate to call Jesus God. Paul stopped short of this, but went so far as not only to accommodate himself to gentile needs, but in his own thinking to fall into their modes of thought. The Son of God was by nature son; he had been with God from eternity, existing in the divine form and being equal with God. As has been already emphasized, to Paul's thought the Son stands in a relation of subordination to and dependence on God (I Cor. 3:23; 15:24–28; Phil. 2:9–11). In one passage Paul says that Jesus was appointed (or constituted, ὁρισθέντος) Son of God with power according to a spirit of holiness by the resurrection of the dead (Rom. 1:4); but elsewhere it is clear that his thought is that Jesus did not have to become the Son of God, his divine sonship being essential and coextensive with his existence (Gal. 4:4; Rom. 8:3, 32).

Yet his humanity was real. Paul speaks as though his was a normal human birth (Gal. 4:4; Rom. 1:3), and mentions the Lord's brothers (Gal. 1:19; I Cor. 9:5).

The messianic concept was inadequate to express Paul's thought of Christ. It alone was not able to secure for him fellowship with God. It failed to do justice to his experience. It did not express his conviction that the inward, spiritual authority of Christ was superior to the external

authority of law. It did not meet the needs of world-redemption. It was unintelligible to his gentile hearers. The political aspects of messianism seem never to have made any appeal to him. One thing he did know—that God had apprehended him through Christ; the light of the knowledge of God's glory had shone upon him from Jesus Christ (II Cor. 4:6). No relation between a merely angelic being and God would answer to such facts of experience. Only one who is outside the category of creation, the representation and manifestation of God, possessing God's own nature —God's own Son—is able to meet the needs of experience. In this Paul has influenced the later thinking of the church. But the movement was already under way. In Paul the deeper thought-currents of the age, growing naturally out of the situation, found profound and victorious expression.

6. Perhaps the most striking and significant fact in connection with Paul's eschatological views is that while he takes over the whole eschatological-messianic programme from Judaism, at the same time he practically transcends it, being lifted above its limitations by the power and dominance of his religio-ethical thought. For example, formally justification is acquittal at the Judgment-Day, practically it is realizable at once. Like all other Christians of his age, he held that the consummation had not yet been realized, and Christ must come again to complete his messianic work; and yet his emphasis is upon what Christ has already done by his incarnation, death, and resurrection to achieve salvation, and upon his present activity as the living Savior. The unhealthful tendencies toward ecstasy and idleness that early manifested themselves under the glowing expectation of the Lord's speedy return in glory and of the catastrophic passing-away of the present order were rebuked by Paul, who transferred the emphasis from the future to the blessings and duties of the present: the state of acceptance with God, sonship, spiritual freedom, love of the brethren, and social duties with respect to the state, marriage, property, and labor. The final judgment is described after the current Jewish manner as according to deeds (II Cor. 5:10), but in his characteristic thought Paul does not believe that a man's standing before God is legalistically determined. The resurrection of Christ was as for the first disciples an assurance of the messiahship of Jesus; it was also a guaranty of the final resurrection of believers, who on account of their personal relation to Christ (I Cor. 15:23) are to return to full vitality in a body suited to the spirit (*σῶμα πνευματικόν*). In the resurrection of Jesus the sovereignty of death was abolished; and although physical death remained, it was no longer as to the Jew regarded as punishment for sin, for its sting was

removed for those who had already died to sin and the flesh and entered upon the new life in the Spirit. Sometimes Paul writes as though there were an intermediate state of sleep (I Thess. 4:14; I Cor. 15:51), and again as though the believer passed to the resurrection-life at death (II Cor. 5:1–9) and to depart were to be with Christ (Phil. 1:23). Evidence of a real development or change in Paul's thought with reference to the *parousia* is wanting in his epistles; if in the earlier letters he writes as though he expected the Lord to return in his own lifetime (I Thess. 4:17; I Cor. 15:51), in Rome he is still waiting for a Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ (Phil. 3:20). If, as his end drew near, he did not think the Lord would return before his own death, that would indicate no fundamental change in his thought.

A second point of interest in Paul's eschatology is his attitude toward the present world and his view of its destiny. He is concerned with it only in its moral aspect. As an evangelist and missionary he is zealous to rescue "from this present evil age" (Gal. 1:4) as many of his own race and as many out of heathenism as possible. As a pious Jew, though a Christian, he lived in the consciousness of impending judgment. Jews, gentiles, and even the material world were doomed and bound for destruction. The pious Hebrew believed that the world was so wicked that a flood was needed to wipe out the existing race of men and make a new start. So Paul thought that all men were under the condemnation of death, on account of Adam's sin and their own. The flesh was weak, so that although man desired to be free, he was a slave. The world was ruled by powers hostile to God. This dark picture was Paul's inheritance. But on the road to Damascus he saw a great light. In the resurrection of the Lord whom he beheld the reign of death came to an end, and the world of Satan became for him God's world. The Spirit of Jesus took possession of the heart that had been irredeemably evil and energized the impotent will. In the cross he found no longer a stumbling-block, but a message of grace and love. Now the eschatological work of Christ was glorious for the comparatively few who were among the saved, but it was hard on his enemies. Paul preached glad tidings. But what was to be the fate of those who died in impenitence? Paul does not resort to the ingenious expedient of supposing that upon his descent to Hades between his death and resurrection Christ preached the gospel to imprisoned souls, but there is evidence that he found a way out. Here as elsewhere his dominantly ethical nature asserted itself. Perhaps it would not be to the point to appeal to the fact that the redeeming work of Christ is described as coextensive with the ruin wrought by sin (I Cor. 15:22; Rom. 5:18),

and that universal terms are used of Christ's complete triumph which to us may seem hardly in keeping with the salvation of comparatively few. There are, however, other indications that tend to relieve him of the pessimism sometimes ascribed to him. Against an insistence upon conscious acceptance of Christ irrespective of opportunity as the basis of acceptance with God we have only to recall the instance of such Old Testament saints as Abraham. In its higher and more blessed stages faith was in Paul's thought the act by which the believer identifies himself with Christ, but fundamentally it was a moral attitude—a receptive and obedient relation of the soul toward God and truth. The wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all impiety and unrighteousness of men who suppress the truth in unrighteousness (Rom. 1:18). Character is the basis of judgment, for the judgment of God is according to truth, and God will render to each according to his works; to them that by patience of well-doing seek for glory and honor and incorruption, eternal life, but to them that are factious and disobedient to the truth and obedient to unrighteousness, wrath and indignation (Rom. 2:2, 6–8). For there is no respect of persons with God; each shall be treated in accordance with his circumstances (Rom. 2:11). Even the gentiles possess conscience, by which they stand or fall (Rom. 2:14, 15).

Paul was a many-sided man, through whom flowed the currents of the age, and it is too much to ask of him that he always be rigidly logical and consistent.

V. CHRISTOLOGY IN THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS AND ACTS

The christological importance of the Synoptic Gospels for our period is not commensurate with their central place as sources of the knowledge of Jesus. The picture of Jesus presented therein was not the leading factor in christological development. Other factors determined the course of that development and the christological forms, so that the tendency was more and more to obscure Jesus as a historical person. Yet the Synoptic Gospels, in spite of their own Christology, have by virtue of the memory of Jesus they preserve ever acted as a check upon alien speculation and recalled the Christian church to the historic basis of its faith. The memorabilia of Jesus have proved themselves a powerful vitalizing ethical and religious force. An illustration may be given in the case of the Fourth Gospel: its wonderful ethical and religious power is due to the fact that combined with its theological interpretation is a penetrating insight into the personality and character of Jesus. In thus emphasizing the central importance of the Synoptic Gospels as preserving the knowledge of Jesus it is not intimated that the attempt to interpret him theologically could or should have been avoided. The effort to understand the real significance of Jesus, to place the proper estimate upon him, to explain him by the means and in the forms at their disposal, was inevitable and necessary to the success of the Christian movement.

It is then a matter of the greatest significance that along with the development of christological doctrine the church was interested in maintaining the historical picture of him whom they sought first to explain messianically. Accepting the messianic estimate they worshiped him as the risen and exalted Redeemer and looked forward to his coming again in glory, but they looked also toward the past and fixed their gaze upon Jesus. Some of the first generation had seen him; others had to rely upon the tradition of his mighty deeds and words. As the eyewitnesses were passing away the church felt the need of gathering and preserving in writing the oral tradition. It is the Palestinian community we have ultimately to thank for the preservation of the evangelic tradition,[1] inevitably embellished as it is with their reflections upon his glorified life and their messianic hopes. In Palestine the original disciples of the Master were gathered and there the memory of his works and words was cherished. A conservative group, they wanted to be true to his teaching and example, and so they brought

[1] Yet justice must be done to the gentile Christians, who carried farther the gospel-making process, and to whom we owe our four canonical gospels.

together his sayings and deeds in collections for practical guidance. His works of wisdom, power, and goodness, fulfilling Old Testament prophecy, were pointed to for confirmation of his messiahship. On earth Jesus, though still a man, was equipped with the Spirit and power.

Paul worshiped the risen, eternal Christ who for but a brief space had appeared among men in Jesus, to bring to an end the curse of the law, and so in his letters he makes comparatively little use of the evangelic tradition, though he was familiar with it and doubtless made larger use of it on other occasions. To him it was of first importance that Christ had come into the world, died on the cross, and risen from the dead. But others felt the need of returning to Jesus as he lived on earth. The author of First Peter finds inspiration in his suffering and patience, and the writer of Hebrews makes especially striking use of the evangelic tradition (as in 5:7–9). In the literature of the second century there is frequent appeal to what the Lord had said or commanded. In some instances we find a great deal of gospel-material, as in the Didache in its present form and in Justin. In like manner the sayings of great rabbis were gradually collected by the Jews. After Paul and others had introduced Christianity into the gentile world, Jewish Christianity of Palestine assumed less and less of importance; it was off to the side, out of the strong current of progress. Yet these Palestinian Jewish Christians left to the church the legacy of the evangelic tradition. The next step was the translation of the Aramaic collections for the Greek-speaking world.

Luke says that already many had taken in hand to draw up the evangelic narrative. We know of the existence of several gospels in addition to those that found final ecclesiastical recognition, but such fragments of them as we possess are too meager to justify our taking account of them in this discussion. The authors of the ones we possess were not eyewitnesses, but belonged to the second or third generation, which felt an interest in preserving what had been delivered to it. Their christological standpoint was simply that of the generation to which they belonged. Accordingly their narratives were written under the influence of their Christology and had to be somehow brought into relation with it. It is easy to undervalue the christological material and influence in the Synoptic Gospels, and no less a mistake to look upon it all as christological, after the manner of the Fourth Gospel.[1] Many illustrations of the self-restraint of the synoptists might be given; let one suffice. The phrase "Son of man" is frequently

[1] For example, W. A. Brown exaggerates when he says: "It is as true of the Fourth Gospel as of the epistles, and of the Synoptics as of the Fourth Gospel, that their subject is not so much the Jesus of history as the Christ of faith."—*Christian Theology in Outline*, p. 328.

used, but always by Jesus himself; it occurs only once in Acts, twice in the Apocalypse, never in the epistles, and rarely in other Christian literature of the period. It is not our problem to note what the synoptists have to say about Jesus, but to determine their christological standpoint. Everywhere, however, we shall be confronted with the difficult task of distinguishing between the account of Jesus in the sources and the synoptists' own conceptions of Christ. The task is simplified by the fact that we already know in its main outlines the prevalent Christology of the period.

MARK

Mark gives us a simple and graphic account of the ministry of Jesus, telling only how he appeared to men during the period between his baptism and his resurrection. He appears to follow the tradition with fidelity, recounting events and words without comment of his own and not permitting his christological views to eclipse Jesus as he was. Papias has set the example of ever distinguishing sharply between the accounts of Jesus' works and his words, perhaps to the confusion of modern students;[1] a quarter of Mark is taken up with the teaching of Jesus. Mark's order is intended to be in general outline chronological and does not accord with Papias' statement that he wrote accurately but not in order ("*ἀκριβῶς ἔγραψεν, οὐ μέντοι τάξει*," Euseb., *H. E.* 3:39:15). The Hebraistic style suggests that the book was written by a Jew, but it was composed in Greek. It was not intended for Palestinian Jews nor for Jews outside of Palestine, but for readers unacquainted with Jewish affairs; hence Aramaic words are translated and Jewish customs explained (3:17, 22; 5:41; 7:3, 4, 11, 34; 9:43; 10:46; 14:12, 36; 15:6, 22, 34, 42). The traditional place of composition is Rome, and the numerous Latin words suggest a Roman public; yet the other gospels employ Latinisms, which had in considerable number very naturally found their way into the Greek language.[2] Chap. 13 shows that in its present form Mark was written after the destruction of Jerusalem, but probably not long after.

The christological standpoint is manifest in the opening words: "Beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ." Mark presupposes the work of Paul. The evangelic tradition is adapted to practical use in the churches. The double name "Jesus Christ" in the opening verse is significant. "Christ" has lost its original messianic meaning and become a personal

[1] The fact is that Papias has been taken too uncritically. There probably never existed any such "Logia" as modern scholars build upon.

[2] Grabatus, 2:4, 9, 11; 6:55; legion, 5:9, 15; speculator, 6:27; denarius, 6:37; 14:5; sextarius, 7:4; census, 12:14; quadrans, 12:42; flagello, 15:15; praetorium, 15:16; spira, 15:16; centurion, 15:39, 44, 45.

name. To the gentile Christians for whom the book was written the Jewish "Messiah" meant little. But the author knew well that in the lifetime of Jesus the double name was not yet in use, and so as he passes on to his narrative he uses "Jesus" only, reserving "Christ" for the strict messianic sense (8:29; 14:61; 15:32). Likewise "Son of God" and "the Son" are generally employed in the historical Old Testament sense of one beloved of God, occupying a position of special nearness to God, in personal fellowship with him (1:11; 9:7; 12:1–8). The idea of the centurion at the cross was of course that Jesus was a hero or demi-god (15:39). But it is evident that for the author himself the title has the Pauline, theological meaning of one possessing God's nature. We are here upon a Pauline basis. We should therefore be unwarranted in supposing that because Mark did not mention the doctrine of Christ's pre-existence, he did not believe in it. The case is different with respect to the virgin-birth, of which like Paul he seems to have known nothing (10:47; Rom. 1:3).[1] The Greeks were accustomed to think of their gods in the form of men, and Mark like Paul could think of the human Jesus as of divine, heavenly origin.

It is with this Pauline, christological background that the whole narrative is to be read. We may be able to see in Jesus' baptism an act of great significance for his own consciousness, as did the original Jewish-Christian community, but it is doubtful whether for Mark it had such a meaning.[2] As Samuel took the horn of oil and anointed David in the midst of his brethren, and the Spirit of Jehovah came mightily upon David from that day forward, so the Spirit descended upon Jesus at his baptism, designating him the Christ and assuring him of God's favor (1:10, 11; cf. I Sam. 16:13); yet the voice from heaven but testified to a fact already present. Likewise the transfiguration was for the sake of the disciples, who had just confessed his messiahship and now beheld him for a brief time in his glory. His sonship is of a character to be recognized by supernatural demons, but is not easily discovered by men (3:11; 5:7). The primitive conception of his miracles as mighty works and wonders and signs which God wrought by him is retained (Acts 2:22; Mark 2:12; 5:19; 6:2, 5, 14), but the feeding of the multitudes and the walking on the sea are related in a matter-of-fact way, as though such acts were to be expected of a divine personality like the figure we meet with in the Fourth Gospel. Yet in the tradition

[1] It is not unlikely that the question of 6:3: "Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary?" in the original copy contained the words of Luke 4:22: "Joseph's son."

[2] Of Matthew's thought there can be no doubt, for he changes to the third person: "This is my beloved Son" (Matt. 3:17).

there were evidences of limited power (6:5; 10:40; 14:36; 15:34). Jesus knows beforehand about his sufferings and resurrection in detail (10:32–34), but knows not the day or the hour of his return (13:32). His sinlessness was taken for granted; but his coming to John for baptism, his temptation, and his refusal to be called "good" (10:18) were in the tradition, and he was too true to what he had received about Jesus to eliminate it all in favor of his Christology. For Mark as for Paul everything culminates in the death of Christ (2:20; 8:31–33; 10:42–45; 14:22–24). Large space is given to the closing days. The death is of sacrificial, atoning significance. The Last Supper is a Christian passover. Of course Mark does not attempt to interpret it theologically as does Paul, and that for two reasons: he is writing a narrative and is loyal to the tradition, and secondly, the generation following Paul viewed Christianity in a simpler way than the apostle did.

Summing up, we may say that Mark's sources represent Jesus as a preacher of the kingdom of God, calling sinners to repentance; a Prophet and Teacher, superior to the scribes, speaking with authority, his utterances carrying weight; one who on the authority of God wrought miracles of healing (1:14, 22; 4:1–20; 6:4); also as the Messiah who will come again in the glory of his Father with the holy angels (8:38). But Mark's own christological standpoint is that of the age succeeding Paul: for him Jesus Christ was the eternal Son of God, who alone had the right on earth to forgive sins (2:7, 10).

LUKE-ACTS

It is generally recognized that Luke and Acts have the same author and are in a way parts of the same work. The preface to Luke, written in characteristic literary form, marks the author as a man of culture. He was probably a convert from heathenism, and had little personal acquaintance with the scenes of the Lord's life. He was no theologian, but was possessed of good historical taste and feeling. The Jewish war and the siege and destruction of Jerusalem are described in more vivid and detailed prophecies than in Mark and Matthew (Mark 19:42–44; 21:20–24). The description of the persecution of Christians is also striking (Luke 6:22). It has been more frequently thought that Luke was later than Matthew, but decisive evidence is wanting. Both gospels were probably written about the same time at the beginning of the second century. The closing of Acts without mentioning the death of Paul is not conclusive for an early date. It is not likely that the end of the book has been lost, but when we consider the writer's apologetic purpose, the freedom accorded the apostle though a

prisoner seems a more fitting close than his condemnation to death. Acts was probably written after the persecution of Domitian.

The Gospel of Luke was composed in an environment of Greek culture, and, addressed to "most excellent Theophilus" (κράτιστε Θεόφιλε), was designed to inform persons of social standing, doubtless non-Christians, about the origin and character of the Christian movement. The author's own Christology is not brought to the front. The speech-material which he uses in common with Matthew strengthens the Markan impression of Jesus as a great prophetic personality dependent on God. Luke has subordinated doctrinal interests. He delights in the parables of Jesus. The comprehensive sympathy of Jesus is brought out in his conversation with sinners, Samaritans, and women. He has contributed one new miracle: the raising of the young man at Nain. The great christological contribution he shares with Matthew: that of the virgin-birth. Both Luke and Matthew attempt to show that Jesus was David's son by means of genealogies, which do not agree with one another (Luke 3:23–38; Matt. 1:1–17), and the result does not harmonize with the miraculous birth. The first chapters of Luke have strong Semitic coloring and came from Jewish-Christian sources. The beautiful Palestinian hymns and the primitive descriptions of the Messiah are especially to be noted (Luke 1:32; 2:4, 11). The Semitic setting suggests that the conception of the virgin-birth was of Palestinian origin. Its christological significance is that it furnished a way of accounting for the divine personality of Jesus. The agency of the Spirit under such circumstances was not unfamiliar to Hebrew thought.[1] The incidents related in these opening chapters of Luke are closely related to Old Testament stories. As for the Greeks, they were accustomed to think of men of unusual gifts as sons of gods with a human mother.[2] Of course with their exalted ethical conception of God derived from the prophets and from Jesus himself Christians could not think in the realistic forms of the Greeks, and hence the holy conception was spoken of in terms of awe and mystery: "The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee and the power

[1] Paul speaks of Isaac as born after the Spirit (Gal. 4:29; Rom. 4:16–21). Job claims to have been the helper of the poor, the widow, and the fatherless, from his mother's womb (31:16–18). Unusual circumstances are connected with the births of Isaac, Samson, and Samuel. This is especially true of John the Baptist, who was "filled with the Holy Spirit even from his mother's womb" (Luke 1:15). In the Gospel according to the Hebrews the Holy Spirit, which in Hebrew is a feminine noun, is represented as the mother of Jesus: ἡ μήτηρ μου τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα. (Quoted by Origen, *Comm. on John 2:6;* in *Homil. on Jer. 15:4;* by Jerome on Isa. 40:13; Ezek. 16:13; Mic. 7:6.)

[2] See for examples Pfleiderer, *The Early Christian Conception of Christ*, pp. 33–45.

of the Highest shall overshadow thee; wherefore also that which is born shall be called holy, Son of God" (Luke 1:35).

The Book of Acts is the longest work in the New Testament, but it does not furnish us with much material for determining the author's own christological standpoint. Its object is to give information concerning the introduction of Christianity into the gentile world and concerning the relation of Christianity to the Jewish religion and to the Roman state, and it treats of events of an outward nature. It was the first generation that fulfilled the task of introducing Christianity into the world at large and diffusing it over the earth, and although some time separates the author from the first generation, he chooses that through which to give his message. The Book of Acts is best understood as one of the earliest of our great Christian apologies; it has the leading features of those that began to flourish about the middle of the second century. Christianity is the worship of one God, Creator, and Ruler of the world revealed to men by Christ; it is accepting Jesus as the Christ, proved such by the resurrection, and believing in the coming judgment and resurrection and living a holy life. The author would prove to the Roman power and the heathen world of culture that Christianity is the true religion: the fulfilment of revealed religion in Judaism, at one with the wisdom of the Greeks—worthy of tolerance and recognition by the state in view of the blameless lives of its adherents. Its extension is in accordance with God's will and without danger to the state. Thus the problem of the relation of Christians to the state taken up by Paul in Rom. 13:1–7, resumed in I Pet. 2:13–17, again receives attention. The early speeches of Acts are apologies for the Christian brotherhood and its missionary activities and the later speeches of Paul are further apologies for Christianity and its extension among the gentiles. The attitude of the civil authorities toward charges brought against Christians receives special attention, the Christians always being found innocent: at Philippi (16:20–40), at Thessalonica (17:6–9), at Corinth (18:12–17), and at Ephesus (19:23–40).

Thus we see that the general purpose of Luke and Acts is the same, and the Christology is that of the third generation.

MATTHEW

The Gospel of Matthew is a doctrinal work, representing an advanced stage of Christology. The author was a Christian Jew, possibly of Palestine, who knew the Hebrew Old Testament. He was, however, not a particularist—did not belong to the Jewish-Christian party, but to the church universal. He was free from Jewish law and prejudice, and

wherever his own thought shows itself, his Christology finds splendid universalistic expression. He represents the spirit of the developing church. He is a teacher and an artist. Mark's order is in general chronological, his topical. Lacking the picture-painting power of Mark and the poetic genius of Luke, he arranges his material according to numerical system. He presents not a portrait but an argument. He is perhaps more akin to John than to Mark.

We may say that his primary purpose is to establish the messiahship of Jesus by showing how from birth to ascension he fulfilled the messianic requirements; lineage, birthplace, manner of birth, the events of his life, his death and resurrection, all pointing in the same direction. The conformity of Old Testament prophecies concerning the Christ with the life of Jesus is demonstrated. He is Messiah, Son of David, King of the Jews, Immanuel, Son of man, Son of God, Teacher, Lord. But although the gospel was written to prove that Jesus bore the messianic character, such must not be understood in the older national sense. Matthew treads the path that leads to catholicism. Jesus is the Savior of the world, and from beginning to close it is the author's own conviction that the gospel is intended for all nations (2:1–12; 28:19, 20). Either the date of Matthew is quite late, or else our author has anticipated ecclesiastical developments in a remarkable manner: witness the advanced recognition of the authority of the apostles and of the church (16:18, 19; 18:15–20) and the developed baptismal formula. Christianity is a new spiritual law and Christ one who gives commandments (see especially the Sermon on the Mount and the Great Commission). In these directions the church was in a degree getting away from Paul.

Three points may be especially noted: the heightening of the evangelic tradition, the place of the sacrificial death, and the eschatology.

1. Matthew's transformation of the evangelic tradition in favor of his own Christology reminds us of the Gospel of John. One has only to set before him side by side Matthew where he follows Mark and Mark to behold the inner workings of Matthew's own mind. It is not enough that Jesus cast out demons by the Spirit of God (12:28), performed miracles of healing, raised the dead to life, walked on the water, and on two occasions fed the multitudes with a few loaves and fishes. Miracles where cure is effected by physical means must be omitted; he heals with a word (8:8, 16). Miracle must be immediate: the disciples marveled, saying: "How did the fig-tree immediately wither away?" (21:20). The scope of the healings must be made universal: "all" instead of "many." Human emotion, inability, desire unfulfilled, and the asking of questions must not be ascribed

to Jesus if there is a way of escape. In other words, Mark's defects must be corrected. The difficulty in Mark's account of the baptism of Jesus must be removed.[1]

2. The Pauline doctrine of the death of Christ as a sacrifice which propitiates God and does away with the necessity for further sacrifices is taught: "This is my blood of the new covenant which is shed for many for remission of sins" (26:28).

3. The striking feature of the eschatology is the prominent place given to the Son of man as Judge. He shall send forth his angels for judgment and to gather together his elect from the four winds, from the uttermost bounds of the heavens (13:41–43; 24:31). In the regeneration the Son of man shall sit on the throne of his glory and shall render to every man according to his deeds (16:27; 19:28; 25:31–46). Even in the Sermon on the Mount he is presented in this capacity (7:21).

[1] In his *Commentary on Matthew*, Allen gives a full list of passages where the heightened Christology appears—pp. xxxi–xxxiii. He gives a good summary of Matthew's Christology, pp. lxvi, lxvii.

VI. CHRISTOLOGY OF THE EPISTLES TO THE COLOSSIANS AND THE EPHESIANS: COSMOLOGICAL CHRISTOLOGY

If the epistles to the Colossians and the Ephesians were written by Paul, they mark an advance upon the conception of Christ found in his other epistles. Inasmuch as the Christology is distinct and more highly developed, it is here treated apart from the Pauline Christology, with which are its closest affinities, the question of the possibility of Pauline authorship being left an open one. If Paul was not the author, no early Christian known to us stood so near to him as the writer or writers of these epistles. It is possible, but not likely, that Colossians and Ephesians have the same author. Akin to Hebrews, they stand between the Pauline and the Johannine Christology, representing an interpretation of Christ that may be called cosmological.

COLOSSIANS

A better case can be made out for the Pauline authorship of Colossians than of Ephesians. Colossians probably has as its basis a genuine work of Paul, which has been worked over or interpolated. For example, the description of the work of redemption perfected in Christ in 1:15–20 may be a later amplification. Three influences upon the christological thought may be discussed.

1. *Paulinism.*—The genuine Paulinism underlying and pervading the epistle is too thoroughgoing to require enumeration of details. If this is not directly due to Paul himself as the author, it is remarkable in view of the fact that in general he was little understood. But the thought of Christ is carried a stage farther. In I Cor. 8:6 Paul intimates that Christ is the agent in creation, but in Col. 1:16, 17 he is set forth as the author, ground, and end—a relation which in Paul's thought belongs to God (I Cor. 15:28; Rom. 11:33–36). In Paul's teaching the reconciling death of Christ was for the benefit of men, with whom Christ identified himself, and not for the world of spirits (II Cor. 5:18–21; Rom. 8:3); but in Col. 1:20 the thought is that Christ's death has universal cosmic effects, reconciling things on the earth and things in the heavens.

2. *Alexandrianism.*—It appears that the Colossian Christians were for the most part gentiles, among whom an ascetic and legalistic tendency had appeared, not without a decided Jewish color. But the trouble was not due to the influence of the Judaizers who were a source of annoyance

to Paul, for the question is not one of circumcision or the observance of Jewish law or hostility to Paul's authority. These errorists did not preach another gospel, like the anathematized Judaizers in Galatia, but only an alleged higher stage of perfection. They represented not Palestinian Judaism, but the freer, more speculative kind prevailing at Alexandria, which made itself felt in the world at large and especially in Asia Minor.

Now the author meets those who make pretensions to philosophy and wisdom on their own ground (2:8, 23). In the spirit of the Alexandrian who wrote Hebrews he applies to Christ language that Philo used of the Logos. When he says that Christ is an εἰκὼν τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου (1:15), he recalls the language of Paul in II Cor. 4:4, but also the thought of Philo that the God who hides himself is revealed through the Logos, who mediates the relations of God to the world. Like the Logos, Christ is the immanent cosmic principle. Philo says that the incorporeal cosmos has its seat in the divine Logos, the cosmos perceptible by the external senses being made on the model of it;[1] that the Logos of the Ὄντος being the bond of everything holds together (συνέχει) and grasps all the parts, and prevents them from being loosened;[2] that the Logos holds together and regulates the whole.[3] In Col. 1:17 it is said that in Christ all things hold together (συνέστηκεν). Philo called the Logos the firstborn and oldest Son of God; in Col. 1:15 Christ is said to be the firstborn of all creation, and in Col. 1:18 the firstborn from the dead, recalling also the "firstborn among many brethren" of Rom. 8:29 and "the firstborn" of Heb. 1:6. Thus Christ is made the center of cosmology.

3. *Gnosticism.*—It was largely under the pressure of the gnostic controversy of the second century that out of the scattered Christian communities of the period of which we write the Catholic church was organized, with its settled order of government and worship, its formulated creed, and its New Testament canon; and it is not customary to speak of Gnosticism as existing at the time when these epistles were written. But long before the great gnostic systems had been elaborated the movement had begun and had excited the suspicion of church-leaders. Its origin was in the aspirations after deliverance from the bondage of the flesh and the earth on the part of an age which, having outgrown the popular religion, attempted the construction of something more satisfying in the union of oriental myth and Greek philosophy. Eclectic in spirit, it welcomed help from any source, not rejecting apocalyptic and Philonic Judaism; but when it came into contact with the powerful, vital Christian movement, which

[1] *De Mundi Opif.* 10.

[2] *De Profug.* 20.

[3] *De Vita Mosis* 3:14.

offered the very redemption for which it sought, it had to take a subordinate place.

Though later counted a heresy, incipient Gnosticism at first represented a tendency and movement within Christianity. In presenting Christianity to the Hellenic world Paul spoke of the gospel in terms of knowledge and mystery, and distinguished grades of initiation. He intimated that for more advanced, spiritual Christians he had a higher doctrine (I Cor., chap. 3). His sharp antithesis of flesh and spirit was in line with tendencies in the Greek world. He found it necessary to divert the emphasis of his teaching at Corinth from the speculative side. So the errorists at Colossae were not counted out of the fold as having denied Christ, but they were losing their hold on him (2:19). Prayer was made for the Colossian Christians that they might be filled not with speculative, but practical knowledge—the knowledge of God's will (1:9).

The writer's conception of Christ takes the form given it by gnostic thought. To what extent gnostic speculation had developed at this time cannot be said, but at least at a somewhat later period the Gnostics looked upon the work of Jesus as but an aspect of a magnificent cosmical process, in which he was united with an Aeon from the supernal world. It is against some such teaching that our author magnifies the dignity of Christ's person and the completeness of his redemptive work. He is not an Aeon of the Pleroma, but in him dwells in bodily form all the fulness (πλήρωμα) of deity. He is superior to and sovereign over all the visible and invisible forces of the universe. Having rid himself of the principalities and the powers, he held them up to open contempt when he triumphed over them on the cross (2:15). By his death all things in earth and heaven were reconciled to God, so that no place is left for the intermediate agencies of Gnosticism. What was sought in the doctrine of the Pleroma was to be found in Christ (2:3), fellowship with whom meant participation in the divine life. In spite of its pretensions to spirituality, the new teaching was materialistic—according to the rudiments of the world (2:8).

EPHESIANS

The Epistle to the Ephesians is certainly no letter of the apostle Paul to the church at Ephesus, with which he had had such intimate relations (1:15; 3:2–4). The words ἐν Ἐφέσῳ (1:1) are even textually suspicious,[1] Marcion having read in his copy ἐν Λαοδικείᾳ. It may have been a

[1] ℵ has ἐν Ἐφέσῳ only from the hand of a later corrector. B has the words only in the margin and not from the first hand. Church Fathers bear witness against any indication of place in this passage according to certain early manuscripts with which they were familiar.

circular letter addressed by Paul to a definite circle of churches (1:15; 3:18; 6:18, 21, 22). But while there is ample genuine Paulinism, the long, intricate sentences do not seem to have come from his hand, and as in Colossians, Pauline ideas are pushed farther. Echoes of the Pauline epistles appear everywhere; Ephesians is like an elaborated mosaic. The style is elevated and almost lyrical, some passages sounding like bits of liturgy. It is a hymn of love and peace and unity, and its theme is Christ and the church. The statement that the church is built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets (2:20), and the reference to Christ's holy apostles and prophets as the recipients of the revelation of the mystery of Christ (3:5), suggest an age considerably beyond that of Paul. Apparently the first epistle of Peter had reached Asia Minor and was known to the author.

The relationship between this epistle and Colossians is certainly close. The Christology of Ephesians does not go beyond that of Colossians. There is in the background the same syncretism of oriental theosophy and Christian faith which characterized gnostic systems and influenced even the church conceptions, though the form of error here is libertinism instead of asceticism. Influenced indeed by these speculations, both epistles combat the errors from the standpoint of the church in the name of the apostle Paul. It would seem that in thought and place of origin they stand near the Ignatian and Johannine writings, although removed perhaps in time. Profound thought is the weapon used against error, and not as in the Pastoral Epistles ecclesiastical authority and tradition. But in Ephesians there is a certain elevation above the concrete; contradictions have been abolished in Christ, and the strife and confusions of earth are harmonized in the kingdom of God. A new humanity rises in which the enmity that divided the old humanity into two hostile camps of Jew and gentile has been abolished. When Christ Jesus reconciled men to God he did away with the Jewish law that separated men from each other (2:13–16). This amalgamation of humanity into a new man, a new social fellowship, that is, the church, the mystical body of Christ, in which has been abolished the national and ceremonial particularism of Judaism so that the heathen who were once far off are taken up into the covenant-relationship of the Old Testament church and all have access in one Spirit to the Father, rests upon the foreordaining counsel of God before the foundation of the world (1:4, 5, 11). But for the present the church must wage a conflict with the spiritual powers of the world and make known to the principalities and the powers in the heavenlies the manifold wisdom of God (3:10; 6:10–18).

It will thus be seen that Colossians is cosmologically and we might almost say metaphysically christological, while Ephesians is ecclesiastically and soteriologically christological. The conception of the church as the body of Christ contained implicitly in Rom. 12:4, 5 and explicitly in I Cor. 12:12–30, found also in Col. 1:18, 24; 2:19, comes here into the foreground. It is not a local society, but the church universal—a conception not wanting in Paul (I Cor. 10:32; 12:28; 15:9). It is the object of Christ's love (5:25–32).

There is, as in Colossians, the effort to set over against the false and destructive Gnosis which did not rightly apprehend and value the Christian redemption the true Gnosis of Christ and his redemptive work. The gospel-mystery, at first hidden but now revealed to apostles and prophets and proclaimed to all, consists of God's love for the world, his revelation in Christ, and the inclusion of the gentiles as fellow-heirs and fellow-members of the body and fellow-partakers of the promise in Christ Jesus (3:4–6). The emphasis is transferred from knowledge to ethics. The higher knowledge is morally conditioned; love is the central virtue and energy. The Pleroma of Col. 1:19 and 2:9 is here introduced in connection with the church (1:23).

But while the practical and religious interest is dominant, the speculative side is not wanting. The creation of the world by Christ is not directly stated, God being designated as the Creator of all things in 3:9, but Christ is set forth as the cosmical principle of unity. As in Col. 1:16, 17 Christ appears as not only the mediator, but also the goal of creation, in whom all things find consistency, so in Eph. 1:10 all things in the heavens and on the earth are summed up (*ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι*) in Christ, and in 1:23 he is said to fill all in all. Christ seems to be thought of not merely as an individual person, but in some way the content of the totality of the elect (1:4; 2:21). He is the realization of the plan of the universe that existed in the counsel of God from all eternity, the basis of a unity which will embrace the whole creation.

VII. THE CHRISTOLOGY OF THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS

Theological interpretations of Jesus may be found in practically all the literature of primitive Christianity, but in most cases it is only the current Christology of the church in the particular period and region to which a given writing belongs. In several instances, however, the Christology is of a bold, original, and individual type, notably in the Pauline, Ignatian, and Johannine writings. To the former class belongs the First Epistle of Peter, to the latter the Epistle to the Hebrews. The writer of Hebrews is no mere Paulinist, but an independent Christian thinker worthy of comparison with Paul, Ignatius, and the author of the Fourth Gospel. For refinement, culture, precision, elevated and finished literary style, combined with vigorous thought, energetic utterance, moral earnestness, and practical aim, among the writers of primitive Christianity known to us he stands unique.

The epistle is a word of exhortation (ὁ λόγος τῆς παρακλήσεως, 13:22), addressed with extraordinary dignity and eloquence to sluggish, indifferent, and wavering Christians, in imminent danger of falling away from their Christian faith, designed to arouse them to a sense of the transcendent worth and sufficiency of the Christian revelation. It was not addressed πρὸς Ἑβραίους, nor to Jewish Christians at all, but to Christians in general, to a Christian community where race-distinctions no longer obtained, as was the case in most of the churches after the older Jewish controversies had passed away. The danger is not that of a reversion to Judaism, but of an evil, unbelieving heart, an apostasy from the living God, of being carried away by divers and strange teachings (3:12; 13:9). Writer and readers belonged to the second generation; they were not among those who at first heard the words spoken through the Lord, but received from them the word (2:3). Paul on the other hand received the gospel not from man, nor was he taught it, but directly from the risen Christ (Gal. 1:12); yet he acknowledges having received the tradition from others (I Cor. 11:2, 23; 15:3).

For the determination of date and destination comparison with First Clement (about A. D. 95) is instructive. Its extended use by Clement is unmistakable. The sudden and repeated calamities and reverses of I Clem. 1:1 in the latter part of the reign of Domitian (81–96) best answer to the situation reflected in Hebrews, where the persons addressed are

subject to persecution or have the near prospect of it (12:4–13; 13:3, 23). Domitian's cruel caprice manifested itself after the revolt of Antoninus Saturninus in A. D. 88, the famous cases of Titus Flavius Clemens and Flavia Domitilla coming toward the close of his reign. His persecution extended to Jews, Christians, and noble Romans.[1] Hebrews was then written late in Domitian's reign, shortly before First Clement. With this agrees the reference to the Neronian persecution of A. D. 64, in the former days, soon after their acceptance of Christ, when they endured a great conflict of sufferings and were made a spectacle (10:32, 33). Clement makes similar reference to the persecution under Nero (chaps. 5, 6; see also Tacitus, *Annals*, 15:44). In addition to the use by Clement, the references to the two persecutions (probably that under Nero was local only), and to former great leaders, also the mention of Timothy's release and the salutations of those from Italy (13:23, 24), if genuine, tend to confirm the Roman destination.

The author was a literary Hellenist, familiar with Alexandrian philosophy and skilful in argumentation, a master of periodic and antithetical Greek style. This type of academic and philosophic Judaism was not, however, confined to Alexandria. His treatment of Jewish history and religion gives the impression of remoteness and detachment; like Philo he speaks of the tabernacle and not of the temple, his source of information being the Pentateuch. Like Philo he represents the high priest as offering daily sacrifices for his own sins and the sins of the people (7:27), but elsewhere he shows that he is aware of the fact that it was yearly (9:7, 25). The altar of incense is placed within the Most Holy Place instead of in the Holy Place (9:4). Contemporary ceremonial Judaism is far from his mind. The attitude of Clement of Rome is very much the same; he likewise disregards the fact that the temple has been destroyed and the sacrifices are no longer offered (chap. 4). Hebrews makes large use of the Greek Old Testament; the canon is that of the Septuagint (note Maccabean heroes of chap. 11). Clement makes still larger use of the Greek Old Testament Scriptures, assuming that his readers knew them (chaps. 45, 53, 62). The Old Testament constituted the only authoritative Scriptures of the Christians themselves at this time. Clement, probably a gentile Christian, writing to gentile believers, speaks of "our father Jacob," "our father Abraham," and calls Old Testament worthies "our fathers" (4:7; 31:2; 62:2; cf. Heb. 1:1; 2:16).

Relation to Paul.—The dependence of Hebrews upon Paul is generally

[1] Compare the reference to confiscation of property in Heb. 10:34 with Dion Cassius, *Hist.* 87:14.

maintained, but it is not so easy to point out specifically in what such dependence consists. Paul so influenced the Christian movement in general that it would have been something different had he not come into contact with it; accordingly no Christian writing in the last decade of the first century A. D. could escape his indirect influence. In the case of First Peter, it is not difficult to distinguish the Pauline element. In Hebrews, the Philonic influence is evident. Resemblances to Paul in Hebrews there are, but evidence of direct indebtedness is not manifest. The pre-existence of Christ plays a part in Hebrews, but the idea of pre-existence belonged to Jewish messianism, Hellenistic Judaism, and pre-Pauline Christianity as well. It is true that Paul made a remarkable ethical and religious use of the conception that was unique, and at this point the writer of Hebrews was doubtless—in common with others—his debtor. Perhaps Pauline influence may be looked for with more confidence in the connection of the remission of sins with the death of Christ, and this doctrine upon which Paul laid great emphasis is certainly present in Hebrews; yet the point of view is different. Taking his words at their face value, Paul teaches that Christ bore the curse of the law as the representative of sinful humanity, receiving in himself the judgment of death. The satisfaction of the law or of the divine righteousness in the death of Christ is not brought to the front in Hebrews. Paul thought in terms of Pharisaic theology; the writer of Hebrews thought of the Old Testament offerings. Through suffering and death Christ became a Savior (2:14–18; 10:5–10); he is the high priest who offers his life in obedience and patience, to cleanse the hearts of men. Answering to the Pauline doing-away with the curse of the law, there is in one passage in Hebrews the destruction of him who has the power of death, so as to free those who are in lifelong bondage and fear (2:14, 15). For the almost personified law of Paul is here substituted the devil, who is not represented as satisfied by a ransom, but as in some way overcome by Christ's sacrificial death.

It is only on the surface that the epistle is seen to take up the argument against Judaism on the lines of Paul; the standpoint is different. The conclusions of Paul are assumed; they had already prevailed. Christianity had been severed from the Jewish law, and was recognized as a new religion with a new principle. Of course in a deeper sense the battle against every kind of legalism had not been fought to a finish; in this most of Paul's followers failed to catch the full import of his doctrine. His conception of Christian freedom from the flesh and the law, effected by oneness with Christ in his death and resurrection, does not appear in this epistle; an approach to this is seen in the proposition that believers are partakers

of Christ and of the Holy Spirit (μέτοχοι τοῦ χριστοῦ, 3:14; 6:4). In the first instance the relationship is that to a leader or elder brother, and probably not that of mystic union: partners of Christ. For Paul faith meant life-union with Christ; in Hebrews it is akin to obedience, fidelity, heroism, and belief in the unseen.

To the Jew the ritual side of his religion was of subordinate interest. Judaism was able to survive the destruction of its temple and holy city in A. D. 70. So Hebrews is not concerned with the temple, but the tabernacle. Paul was interested in neither; passing by the temple and external worship of Judaism he fixed his attention upon its very heart—the law. Now for the purpose of his argument the author of Hebrews finds the soul of Old Testament religion in the priestly cultus. He is not engaged in the old Pauline conflict with the Judaizers, nor is he even making a plea primarily for Christianity against Judaism; rather it is his effort to set forth Christianity as the perfect, eternal religion, better at every point than the only pre-Christian and non-Christian religion worthy of consideration in comparison, one based on a real revelation. Paul considers the law in relation to justifying faith in Christ; Hebrews in relation to the perfection of Christ's sacrifice. For Paul the law is weak only through the flesh—through its incapacity to enable a man to obey the will of God (Rom. 8:2); it cannot save because man is morally impotent to keep it. The office of the law is to deepen the consciousness of sin and to make transgressions abound. On the other hand, viewing it in its ceremonial aspects Hebrews considers it carnal (7:16; 9:10), its failure being due to the fact that animal sacrifices cannot cleanse the conscience. Judaism's partial truth is perceived, as a system of types and symbols foreshadowing the reality in Christ. The law and the gospel are shadow and substance.

Generally, the emphasis in Hebrews is different from that in the epistles of Paul. It is notable that Paul was not able to find so great a value in the earthly life and experiences of Jesus as our author finds. His present activity in our behalf is differently represented. To be sure Paul does in one instance describe Christ as the intercessor in heaven on our behalf (Rom. 8:34). Only in one passage is there reference to the resurrection of Christ in Hebrews (13:20).

Relation to Philo.—The Epistle to the Hebrews is a Christian work written from the standpoint of philosophic Judaism. We have noted the absence of direct dependence on Paul; very different is the relation to the Book of Wisdom and to Philo. Doubtless the author had felt the influence of Philo before his conversion to Christianity. His allegorizing exegesis discloses his Alexandrian education. The allegorical interpretation was

indeed current in rabbinic circles of Palestine, but this author's method is that of Philo—employing historical characters, institutions, and events as symbols of spiritual realities. Points of contact with Philo are found almost everywhere, and the conclusion is irresistible that often there are genuine echoes. To be sure our author is more temperate than Philo in allegorizing the Old Testament. Even the more striking resemblances are too numerous to exhibit here; the reader is referred for details to Siegfried, *Philo von Alexandria*, S. 321–30.

It would have been strange had our author not employed the Logos-conception of Philo. The fact is that he uses it on a far larger scale than does the writer of the Fourth Gospel, only he does not take over the word; another title used by Philo of the Logos was already in Christian use and served his purposes better—the Son of God. The striking designations of Christ and the functions attributed to him in Heb. 1:2, 3 may be found in the Book of Wisdom and in Philo, there having reference to Wisdom personified and the Logos. Of Wisdom it is said in a notable passage (Wis. 7:26):

> For she is an effulgence (ἀπαύγασμα) of eternal light,
> And an immaculate mirror of God's energy,
> And an image of his goodness.

Philo says that every man in regard to his intellect is related to the divine reason, being an ἀπαύγασμα of that blessed nature;[1] and that the πνεῦμα in man is a certain type and χαρακτήρ of the divine power, man in his reason being the image of God.[2] A favorite conception with Philo is that of the Logos as the agent through whom God fashioned the world. In *De Plantat.* 5 he says: ὁ χαρακτήρ ἐστιν ἀΐδιος λόγος. In Heb. 1:6 the Son is designated πρωτότοκος; so Philo often calls the Logos God's πρωτόγονος υἱός (as in *De Agricult.* 12).

Just as Philo does not scruple to call the Logos a second God (ὁ δεύτερος Θεός),[3] though dependent on the one original God, so the writer of Hebrews applies to Christ passages from the Psalms in which God is addressed, setting forth his eternal royal dignity and creative rôle (1:8–12); yet what Christ did was part of God's own plan and under his direction (2:9, 10; 5:4, 5).

In Philo the Logos is not only the mediator of creation, but also of

[1] *De Mundi Opif.* 51.

[2] *Quod Det. Pot. Insid.* 23.

[3] Found only in one passage, which is preserved by Eusebius, *Praeparatio Evangelica*, Bk. VII, chap. xiii. See E. H. Gifford's edition, *Eusebii Praeparatio Evangelica*, 1903; also Drummond, *Philo Judaeus*, II, p. 197.

redemption: the great high priest, exposed to affliction and misery, an ambassador sent to the subject race;[1] not a man, but the divine Word, a non-participant in both voluntary and involuntary sins;[2] the priest-king typified in Melchizedek (Gen. 14:18–20; Ps. 110:4)—the names Melchizedek and Salem being treated in the same etymological manner as that we find in Hebrews.[3]

Perhaps the most fundamental and significant fact is that the general view of the world—the cosmology—is the same in Philo and Hebrews: the contrast between the ἐκ τῶν ἰδεῶν συσταθεὶς κόσμος νοητός and the sensuous, visible world.[4] The visible world is a copy, a shadow and symbol of the invisible, spiritual world; created things are perishable, divine things eternal. Plato and Philo distinguish the sensible and the intelligible worlds; so Hebrews contrasts the lower world of semblances and the heavenly world of abiding realities, related as type and reality, shadow and substance (ὑπόδειγμα καὶ σκιὰ τῶν ἐπουρανίων, 8:5; παραβολὴ εἰς τὸν καιρὸν τὸν ἐνεστηκότα, 9:9; ὑποδείγματα τῶν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, ἀντίτυπα τῶν ἀληθινῶν, Heb. 9:23, 24). In Philo the mediator of the two worlds is the Logos, the firstborn son of God; for the author of Hebrews the heavenly sanctuary is accessible through Christ, the Son of God. There is indeed a vast difference between Philo and our author, but it consists in the fact that the latter was a Christian. Philo's abstract theories are made to do religious service. The chasm between this mundane sphere and the supernal world of eternal realities is bridged and free access to the throne of grace is gained when the Logos, the great high priest, the firstborn son of God, the second God of Philo, becomes the Jesus of history, the Brother and Savior of men (4:14–16). Philo was still in a way in bondage to the letter and groping in the dark; but his pupil had learned also from a higher Master, and now used Philo's own method and thought-forms to show that what was formerly the world's divinest religion must be considered but a shadow-copy since the revelation of the substance, the perfect spiritual covenant in Jesus Christ.

Summing up the thought of Hebrews, we observe that the new is superior to the old because Christ is higher than the angels, through whom the old came (Acts 7:53; Gal. 3:19; LXX of Deut. 33:2), higher than the prophets, whose revelation was partial (1:1), higher than Moses who organized the old and than Joshua who ushered in an inferior rest, higher

[1] *Quis Rer. Div. Haer.* 42.

[2] *De Profug.* 20, 21.

[3] *Leg. Alleg.* 3:25, 26; Heb. 5:10; 7:1–10.

[4] *De Somn.* 1:32.

than Aaron and all earthly priests who ministered in the old. He is the Son of God, his agent in creation, revelation, and redemption (cf. 1:3 and Col. 1:15–17); in him is realized man's world-dominion of prophecy (2:5–10); he established the Old Testament system (3:3; cf. I Cor. 10:4); he is our high priest from heaven, but one of us, possessing sympathy as a priest should; immortal, abiding a priest forever, higher than the heavens, a son holy and perfected for evermore, minister of a convenant that endures in a heavenly tabernacle with spiritual ordinances, offering his own blood which is efficacious for the cleansing of the conscience from dead works to the service of the living God, putting away sin, obtaining eternal redemption, and perfecting forever them that are sanctified—in such language is set forth the superiority and perfection of the priestly character and work of Christ. To Christians who were growing discouraged under persecution and in danger of lapsing into their former heathenism the writer exhibits the glory of Christ's person and work, reminding them of the blessings he has secured and the terrible consequences of neglecting his salvation and denying him.

Hebrews presents a remarkable combination of the philosophic and the historical. The facts of the evangelic tradition are known (1:2, 3; 2:3, 4, 13, 14, 17; 3:2; 5:5–9; 7:4, 26; 10:7; 12:2, 3; 13:12, 20). The recalling of the gospel-narrative where Jesus calls men his own brothers is notable (2:11, 12). The language in which Melchizedek is set forth as a type of non-Aaronic priesthood, underived and unlimited, having no father or mother (7:3; cf. 10:5), might lend itself to docetic Gnosticism, but such is not in the mind of the author: "for it is evident that our Lord sprang from Judah" (7:14).[1] These earthly, human experiences by which he came to understand man's infirmities and needs were a preparation for his highpriesthood in our behalf; the center of interest is his heavenly activity on our behalf, offering sacrifice and interceding with God. He came out of the heavenly world, lived through the eternal Spirit a life of faith, courage, obedience, sinlessness, sympathy, and self-sacrifice, and passed into the heavens as our perfect high priest—the same yesterday and today and forever.

There are several striking facts about Christ's sacrificial priestly work as here presented. Certainly he offered himself upon the cross once for all (7:27; 9:14, 25, 26; 10:12, 26), the word λύτρωσις occurring twice (9:12, 15) and καταλλαγή, common with Paul, not at all. But his supreme function is as high priest in heaven, and sometimes it appears that it was

[1] Philo says of the Logos-priest that God was the father and wisdom the mother, *De Profug.* 20.

upon the heavenly altar he presented himself as a sacrifice to God (9:14). His single and final sacrifice on earth has a counterpart in an offering at the heavenly altar, and there is also a perpetual atoning work carried on in the upper sanctuary. Secondly, the blood of Christ is not only sacrificial, but also cleansing. Sanctification did not belong to the priestly office of the Jews, but his cleansing is not ceremonial, but real and inward, securing deliverance from the power of sin (9:13, 14, 26, ἀθέτησις τῆς ἁμαρτίας). As in First Peter, the stress is upon the moral effects of Christ's sacrifice (καθαρίζειν, ἁγιάζειν, τελειοῦν). How this purification is wrought is not here elaborated; the fact is one of religious experience. Paul would have said that it was through the indwelling Christ, transforming the believer by his Spirit.

Eschatology.—The common eschatological ideas of the period are found: Christ's appearance a second time apart from sin to complete the salvation of his own (9:28; 10:25, 37); the approaching day when earth and heaven shall tremble and things not stable be overthrown, and the kingdom that cannot be shaken shall remain (12:26–28); the sabbath-rest of the messianic age typified by the rest of Canaan (σαββατισμός, 4:9); the better and abiding possession, the great recompense of reward, the better, heavenly country, the city that has foundations, whose builder and maker is God, the heavenly Jerusalem inhabited by a host of angels and saints (10:34, 35; 11:10, 16; 12:22, 23)—all of which will outweigh the hardships of the present life. Salvation is future, dependent upon the faithful observance of God's will; but faith now makes it present —the substance of what we hope for, the proof of things that we do not see (11:1). Colored as is his language with current eschatology, the author comes very near transcending that standpoint through his doctrine of immediate access to the world of reality, as Paul did by his doctrine of the indwelling Christ and the Fourth Gospel did by its doctrine of the Spirit and eternal life. Christianity is identified with the upper, heavenly world, which is indeed future, but is also present, and indeed from the beginning has been the world of reality, so that even now men can taste the good word of God and the powers of the age to come (6:5).

VIII. CHRISTOLOGY IN FIRST PETER AND FIRST CLEMENT

FIRST PETER

Questions of introduction to First Peter present, in the words of Wrede, "eine Reihe von Schwierigkeiten und Dunkelheiten."[1] The difficulties are created by the address and the conclusion, and Harnack solves the problem by removing the address and the conclusion altogether, understanding 5:1 (*μάρτυς τῶν τοῦ χριστοῦ παθημάτων*) not in a literal sense.[2] According to this view the author was a prominent teacher and confessor of about 90 A. D., perhaps earlier, who did not pretend to be Peter. Another, probably the author of Second Peter, invented the beginning and the end of the epistle in order to give it apostolic authority. The view of McGiffert[3] is similar, except that he holds to its true epistolary character (1:3, 4, 12; 2:13; 4:12; 5:1–5, 9). The epistle was, he thinks, originally anonymous, like Hebrews, Barnabas, and the Johannine epistles, and the name of Peter was attached in the second century, some scribe probably writing it on the margin of the manuscript, because he thought he saw reason for regarding it as the work of Peter. If we take the epistle as it stands, the only reasonable theory open to us is that of pseudonymity, unless indeed we make Silvanus responsible for the epistle in the name of Peter. That was an age in which men could think it a virtue for a writer to withhold his own name in favor of some great master. It must be acknowledged that this straightforward epistle does not bear such palpable marks of pseudepigraphy as for example Second Peter. But in view of the pseudepigraphic customs of the time it is conceivable that a Roman Christian, wishing to issue a letter of consolation to his persecuted fellow-Christians of Asia Minor under an apostolic title, chose the name of Peter. In fact we know six early Christian writings connected with the name of Peter—the two canonical letters, the Acts, the Gospel, the Preaching, and the Apocalypse of Peter. Great as are the difficulties in connection with the authorship of First Peter, the most difficult position of all would be the assumption that Peter, the apostle of the circumcision, wrote in fairly good Greek, even with the help of Silvanus, this letter, saturated as it is with

[1] "Bemerkungen zu Harnack's Hypothese über die Adresse des I. Petrusbriefs," *Zeitschrift für N. T. Wissenschaft*, I, 1900, S. 75–85—an able reply to Harnack.

[2] *Chronologie*, S. 451–65.

[3] *Apostolic Age*, p. 596.

characteristic Pauline thought and vocabulary, to gentile churches of Asia Minor founded chiefly by Paul.

The conditions set forth in the epistle, reflecting a general persecution of Christians as such (4:15, 16; 5:9), are best satisfied by the reign of Domitian (81–96), and the doctrinal affinities are mostly with the literature of this period. But we must leave open the possibility of a date within the reign of Trajan (98–117), either about 100 (Jülicher) or about 112 A. D. The fact that one suffered ὡς χριστιανός (4:15) reminds us of the famous letter of Pliny to Trajan regarding the treatment of Christians, about 112 A. D., and if we take the word ἀλλοτριεπίσκοπος in the same verse to refer to the judicial informer, the delator, which is not necessary, this late date is confirmed. But this would take the epistle far down toward the *terminus ad quem*, the letter of Polycarp (*ca.* 116 A. D.), which makes frequent quotation from First Peter. If the use of First Peter by Clement of Rome could be established, the year 95 would be the *terminus ad quem*, but the numerous striking resemblances (for example, ἀγάπη καλύπτει πλῆθος ἁμαρτιῶν, I Pet. 4:8, and I Clem. 49:5) may be explained by proximity of date and place of composition.

First Peter was written apparently from Rome (5:13; Apoc. 14:8. So far as we know, Babylon played small part in early Christian history) to Christians of Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia (1:1)—five provinces that comprise the whole of Asia Minor north of Mt. Taurus. Though παρεπίδημοι Διασπορᾶς, the readers were in general gentile believers (1:14, 18; 2:9, 10; 4:3, 4). The purpose of the epistle is to admonish and encourage (παρακαλεῖν, 5:12) its readers patiently to endure sufferings that have come upon them on account of their Christian confession and to live in every way worthy of the Christian name. The incentives to this course are to be found in the hope of a blessedness to be obtained through suffering and obedience, and in the example of Christ. The common church-doctrine is employed wherever it will serve the practical aim. While the object is not indoctrination, for the writer the Christian world-view lies behind all right thinking and right conduct. The epistle offers no original doctrinal contribution to the development of early Christianity, but it does bring incidentally to light ideas that are not given definite expression in other writings that have come down to us from the period to which it belongs.

The epistle is then not to be understood as in any sense representing the most primitive Christianity—either as actually pre-Pauline, or as Petrine with comparatively slight Pauline influence. We find here no genuine reminiscence of Jesus and no echo of the old controversies about

the law and faith and the relative standing of Jew and gentile. The permanent Pauline contributions to Christianity are presupposed throughout, but by this time the sharp points of his system have been worn down. Some of Paul's characteristic expressions and ideas are employed, especially from Romans, but the specifically Pauline thoughts of justification by faith, freedom from the law, dying to the flesh and living in the Spirit, mystical union with Christ, are wanting. Paul's use of baptism in Rom. 6:3: "All we who were baptized into Christ Jesus were baptized into his death," recurs after a fashion in I Pet. 3:21. In this chapter Paul continues in his striking and profound mystical manner (Rom. 6:6 ff.): "Our old man was crucified with him, that the body of sin might be done away, that we should no longer be in bondage to sin, for he that has died is justified from sin," etc.; whereas in I Pet. 4:1 it is expressed: "He that has suffered in the flesh has ceased from sin." On the other hand the consciousness of the value of Christianity, of the high and peculiar calling of God's people, of the greatness and preciousness of the promises, of the sacred obligations of the Christian profession, are no less clear and impressive than with Paul.[1]

We now inquire what lies central in the doctrinal background from which this practical homily proceeds. That which for the writer comes first is the revelation of God and a way of life in Christ. His religious world is the Christian world, his view of God is that which has historically come from Christ; he worships "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ" (1:3); God is a faithful Creator (4:19), is mighty (5:6), is holy (1:5), is judge of living and dead (4:5), is one who judges righteously (2:23) and without respect of persons (1:17), is one who foreknows the elect (1:12), is one who resists the proud (5:5); but he is above all Father (1:17) and the God of all grace (5:10), is long suffering (3:20) and merciful (1:3). The means by which this grace is communicated is the preaching of the gospel, the word of good news which is preached (1:12, 25). This then is the first and most general item in the writer's Christology: the God he worships is, as he thinks, the God of Jesus, and his readers are οἱ δι' αὐτοῦ πιστοὶ εἰς Θεόν (1:21). In Christianity, in Christ, he finds a helpful, satisfying experience of God, and as a correlate of that faith the true way of life.

The second item in his christological faith is the redemptive death of Christ. "For Christ also died once for sins as the righteous one for the unrighteous, that he might bring us to God" (3:18). He "bore our sins in his body on the tree, that having died unto sins he might live unto righteous-

[1] So Pfleiderer, *Das Urchristentum*, 2d ed. (1902), II, S. 506.

ness; by whose bruise you were healed" (2:24). This language means just what it seems to mean; namely, that, as it is expressed in Heb. 9:28, Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many, and it is here added that the cross was the altar upon which he was offered. The writer constantly uses the conception of Isa., chap. 53. To be sure, there is introduced an ethical significance: in Christ's sacrificial death there is an example for our imitation; those to whom he writes were redeemed from their vain heathen life handed down from their fathers, with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without spot and without blemish (1:18, 19), and in suffering for them Christ has given them an example, that they should follow his steps (2:21). But fundamental is the thought of the expiatory death, though the use made of the death of Christ is ethical.

An ever-present thought is that of the coming glory of Christ, when he is revealed, and in this Christians shall share. Its certainty rests on his resurrection and exaltation. God has begotten us again unto a living hope through the resurrection of Christ from the dead (1:3). This hope has been awakened by the preaching of the gospel; the readers have been begotten through the living and abiding word of God (1:23). The test and fruit of Christian faith and hope are to be found in obedience, which consists in a holy life after the character of God (1:14–16); more especially in patient endurance of suffering, and in fervent brotherly love, which covers a multitude of sins (1:22; 4:8).

The christological peculiarities are the doctrine of the inspiration of the prophets through the spirit of the pre-existing Christ, and that of the descent of Christ to Hades for the purpose of preaching to the spirits in prison, and for this reason a fuller treatment will be accorded these subjects than has been given to other features of the Petrine Christology.

1. Upon the first topic the following are the passages to come before us:

"For this Christ was indeed destined before the foundation of the world, but he has been manifested at the end of the times for your sake" (1:20).

"To this salvation the prophets, who prophesied in regard to the grace intended for you, directed their inquiries and researches, seeking to find out to what season or what kind of a season the spirit of Christ within them was pointing, when testifying in advance to the sufferings which would befall Christ and the glories which would follow; and to them it was revealed that not for themselves but for you were they performing this service in regard to truths which have been announced to you through those who, by the Holy Spirit sent from heaven, have brought you the good tidings—matters into which angels are longing to look" (1:10–12).

In the first of these passages we find contrasted the foreknowledge by God of Christ before the foundation of the world and his manifestation at the end of the times. As the translation given above implies, foreknowledge (προεγνωσμένου is the form here) in this passage as elsewhere in the Scriptures ("Before I formed thee in the womb I knew thee"—Jer. 1:5) is not colorless prescience, but previous designation to a position or function.[1] The idea of Christ's designation before the foundations of the world were laid is a familiar one, finding frequent expression both in Jewish messianism and in Christian literature (Eph. 3:11; II Tim. 1:9).

"Foreknown" by itself does not of course necessarily imply the personal pre-existence of the object foreknown; the expression is used of believers in I Pet. 1:2. But pre-existence is taken for granted, and the second clause places it beyond all doubt. That which is manifested existed in a state of concealment before its manifestation. Nowhere is it said of believers that they were first foreknown before the foundation of the world and then manifested. In some of the passages either in a primary or a secondary sense Pauline it is the mystery concerning Christ which is manifested, as in Rom. 16:25, 26: "the mystery kept in silence through times eternal, but now manifested;" but in the passage before us it is Christ himself who is manifested.

Both clauses find an exact parallel in Enoch 48:6, 7: "And for this reason he has been chosen and hidden before him before the creation of the world and forevermore, and the wisdom of the Lord of Spirits has revealed to him the holy and righteous;" and again, 62:7: "For the Son of man was hidden before him and the Most High preserved him in the presence of his might and revealed him to the elect." To these may be added Apocalypse of Ezra 12:32: "This is the anointed one, whom the Most High has kept to the end of days, who shall spring up out of the seed of David, and he shall come and speak to them and reprove them for their wickedness and their unrighteousness, and shall heap up before them their contemptuous dealings." In I Tim. 3:16 we have a fragment of an early Christian hymn, of which the first line is: "He was manifested in the flesh" (ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί). The idea is common in the Johannine writings: John 1:14, 31; I John 3:5, 8, for example.[2]

In the second passage it is stated that the prophets of old who foretold

[1] See Hort, *Commentary*, on this passage.

[2] It will be seen that First Peter is using, not the Pauline conception of an incarnation, but the messianic conception of a revelation. For Paul, Christ's appearance was not a mere φανεροῦσθαι, but a κενοῦσθαι, ταπεινοῦσθαι, πτωχεύειν. So Harnack, *History of Dogma*, I, p. 328.

the messianic salvation sought to fathom its meaning and to determine at what appointed date it would come; the Spirit of Christ within them pointed out the sufferings that would come upon Christ and the glories that would follow them, and it was revealed to them that the realization of their vision was not for their own time, but for the recipients of the good tidings in the time of the Holy Spirit's ministration.

The problem here is to determine in what sense the Spirit of Christ inspired the prophets. Kühl[1] understands the reference of the ideal Christ, who existed only in the foreknowledge of God. Hort says: "This cannot possibly mean the sufferings of Christ in our sense of the word, i. e., the sufferings which as a matter of history befell the historical Christ." Why not? "It is intelligible only from the point of view of the prophets and their contemporaries, the sufferings destined for Messiah." But the New Testament writers did not take the point of view of the prophets and their contemporaries; they wrote from their own standpoint. Their presupposition was the identity of the Old Testament and the New Testament salvation; see, for example, I Pet. 1:25. The use of Christ's pre-existence in this connection is but a part of the process of Christianizing the Old Testament. The Old Testament was the Bible of the Christians, and they read back into it their new experiences. The conception of sufferings destined for the Christ is a common one: as in Luke 24:26, 46; Acts 3:18; 17:3. In Acts 26:22, 23 we are told that Paul testified (μαρτυρόμενος), saying nothing but what the prophets and Moses had said should come, how that the Christ must suffer. There is no sharp contrast between the pre-existent Christ and the historic Christ, and of "the ideal Christ" the writer knew nothing.

The conception was common that the Holy Spirit is the source of prophecy (Acts 1:16 and often). In Paul's thought the Spirit and Christ are very closely related, indeed at times used almost interchangeably (I Cor. 12:3; II Cor. 3:17, 18). In the period in which our writing arose there was no difficulty in considering Christ as the inspirer of prophecy, whether as pre-existent, historic, or glorified. The historic Christ was represented as the revealer (Matt. 11:27; characteristically in the Fourth Gospel, as 1:18), in whose name men prophesied (Matt. 7:22), and who sent forth prophets (23:34). The exalted Christ poured forth the spirit of prophecy from heaven (Acts 2:33). "The testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy" (Apoc. 19:10). Between Hebrew and Christian prophecy there is in this respect no distinction; in each instance Christ inspired the prophets. So Barnabas in chap. 5: "The prophets, who

[1] Meyer, *Kommentar.*

received grace from him, prophesied of him" (*οἱ προφῆται, ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἔχοντες τὴν χάριν, εἰς αὐτὸν ἐπροφήτευσαν*).

The prophetic searching for the time of messianic deliverance will be recognized as a characteristic of Jewish messianism. An instance of such inquiry is in Dan., chap. 9, where the seer discovers in the prophecy of Jeremiah (25:11, 12; 29:10) that the number of years for the accomplishing of the desolations of Jerusalem was seventy. But as the Jews were still being oppressed by the heathen and the temple was again desolated, he was perplexed by the prediction. While he was praying, the man Gabriel flew swiftly and caused him to understand the vision. He explained that the period was not seventy years, but seventy weeks of years, and that after the 490 years were ended reconciliation for iniquity would be made, the polluted temple reconstructed, and the messianic age introduced.

The service that the prophets were rendering a future age is also frequently brought out in apocalyptic literature. Daniel was to close and seal the book till the time of the end (12:4, 9). Our passage may even be a quotation from Enoch 1:2: "I understood what I saw, but not for this generation, but for the remote generations that are to come."[1] The interest of the angels in these matters may have been suggested by Enoch 9:1. The thought is closely akin to that of Eph. 3:10.

2. Our second special topic is set forth in the following passages:

"In the spirit also he went and preached to the spirits in prison, who had once been disobedient, when the patience of God waited, in the days of Noah, while the ark was being prepared; into which a few souls, that is eight, escaped through water" (3:19, 20).

"For this is why the good tidings were preached even to the dead, in order that they might be judged indeed as men in the flesh, but live according to God in spirit" (4:6).

The objection to the obvious sense of the passages before us has been principally the strangeness of the conception. Perhaps a closer acquaintance with the eschatology then current will remove this. Sheol, the dark underworld in which the ghosts of the dead flitted about, had become a definite and familiar region to the thought of late Judaism. In the older prophetic stage Jehovah's self-manifestations were mostly bound up with the nation's fortunes, although there were even then current among

[1] J. R. Harris (*Expositor*, VI, iv, 194–99) suggests an interesting emendation. Compare the following passages: Enoch 1:2; Matt. 13:17; Luke 10:24; I Pet. 1:12, 13. In the latter passage *διηκόνουν* is a textual error for *διενοοῦντο*, after *διενοούμην* of Enoch 1:2. Then there should be no break in the paragraph, I Pet. 1:13 following naturally with *διανοίας*.

the people ideas regarding the abode of God and his angels and the region of the departed (Gen. 28:12; Exod. 24:10; I Kings 22:19; Isa., chap. 6; Ezek., chap. 1). Passages on Sheol are too numerous to cite. See also Gressmann (*Ursprung der israelitisch-jüdischen Eschatologie*). The Old Testament Sheol is essentially the Homeric Hades. This conception prevailed till the second century B. C., though individual voices had been raised against it in favor of a more moral and religious view. Then it became a place where men are treated according to their deserts with separate divisions for the righteous and the wicked. The idea of an intermediate state also entered. Finally it was used of the abode of the wicked only, either as their preliminary or their final abode. Gehenna was the place of final condemnation.

In order to realize the change from the Old Testament Sheol, a place of a semi-conscious, non-moral state of existence, where family, national, and social distinctions of this world are in a way preserved, to a place of fully conscious existence, where distinctions are primarily moral, we should pass in review the Book of Enoch, the Book of the Secrets of Enoch, and the Testament of Levi. We note in this other-world the freedom with which spirits come and go and converse is held. A second instructive observation is the solicitude and sympathy now and then manifested for those whose lot is hard. This latter characteristic comes out most strikingly and most beautifully in the Apocalypse of Ezra. The writer's heart is not satisfied with contemplation of the messianic, eschatological programme according to which this evil world will be destroyed and a new world take its place, for "the world to come will bring delight to few, but torments unto many" (7:47). The fact is that his difficulties are never satisfactorily met. It is likely that there were others both in Judaism and Christianity who shared the same concern in regard to the destiny of sinful men after death.

The *descensus ad inferos* appears a number of times in the Christian literature of the New Testament period. It is a special form of the belief that is found in First Peter. Certain descriptions of Sheol by Old Testament prophets seem to have influenced the New Testament development of the conception, as Isa. 14:9, 10; 24:21, 22; 42:7; 49:9; 61:1, 2; Ezek. 32:17–32. Some significant New Testament passages are the following: I Cor. 15:29; Rom. 10:6, 7; 14:9; Phil. 2:5–11; Matt. 12:40; 27:52; Acts 2:27–31; Eph. 4:8–10; 5:14; Apoc. 1:18; 3:7; 5:13; 6:9–11; 20:7. To these may be added the Epistle of Ignatius to the Magnesians 9:3 and Hermas, *Sim.* 9:16:5, 6. In the Gospel of Peter it is related that a voice from the heavens was heard on the morning of the resurrection: "Hast thou

preached to those that sleep?" And an answer was heard from the cross: "Yes."

It would be easy to show how congenial the conception was to the larger world into which Christianity was entering, which had its own stories of how divine beings had gone down into the kingdom of the dead and returned victoriously, but the form in which the conception appears in First Peter is explicable without resorting to foreign influences.[1]

We see, then, that belief in the descent of Christ into Sheol or Hades after death was natural and necessary in the light of the ancient view of the world, and that it appears again and again. We find suggestions that in connection with his presence there divine power was exercised. We know that among Jews and Christians there was concern for those who had died in their sins. A fundamental declaration in the Christian message was that salvation is possible only in Christ (Acts 4:12). So far as regards the present generation Paul had applied to Christian preaching the words of Ps. 19:4:

> Their sound went forth into all lands,
> And their words into all the world. (Rom. 10:18.)

They had had and would have their chance. But to former generations had not been granted the opportunity of believing on Christ. Now as Christ was once in Hades, he must have preached to them there.

There are other interpretations of these passages in First Peter, the most probable of which is that which identifies the spirits in prison with the fallen angels—the sons of God of Gen. 6:1–4, and the sinful angels of the Book of Enoch, who had seduced the daughters of men and whom God cast down to Tartarus (Jude 6; II Pet. 2:4). According to one view the text of I Pet. 3:19 may be emended so as to read that Enoch preached to the spirits; according to another view Christ after his death proclaimed their judgment. But κηρύσσειν is uniformly the preaching of salvation, and the proclamation of judgment to angels is not appropriate to the context.[2]

FIRST CLEMENT

Arising in all probability at about the same time and in the same place as First Peter and resembling it in thought and language, the First Epistle

[1] See Pfleiderer, *Das Urchristentum*, II, S. 181, 288, and Clemen, *Religionsgeschichtliche Erklärung des Neuen Testaments*, S. 153–56, with full reference to the literature in Clemen. The defect of Clemen's treatment is that he is afraid of making "an unnecessary concession to the religionsgeschichtliche Schule."

[2] A fuller treatment of "Christology in First Peter" may be found in an article by the present writer to appear in the *American Journal of Theology*, 1910.

of Clement to the Corinthians has for us further interest and value, in that it is the earliest non-canonical Christian writing that we possess, although many scholars continue to date the Epistle of Barnabas still earlier. The letter was evidently written about a generation after Nero and after the death of the apostles Paul and Peter (5:1; 44:2). The persecution experienced at the time of writing was more annoying than bloody (1:1; 7:1), and answers to that of Domitian, who vexed the Roman church during the last years of his reign. The name Clement does not occur in the letter, but according to tradition Clement, the third or fourth bishop of Rome, wrote it by order of the congregation. In the oldest Roman list Clement was bishop from 88 to 97 A. D. Africanus places him in the twelfth year of Domitian.[1]

First Clement is a letter from the Roman to the Corinthian church. Goodspeed[2] makes the ingenious conjecture that this Epistle of Clement was in some degree called forth by Hebrews, whose destination was Rome. The Roman church occupied an important position, had a long Christian experience behind it, had been especially privileged, and it ought to teach (Heb. 5:12). Now it proposes to discharge its responsibilities.

Unforeseen and successive misfortunes and reverses that had befallen the Christian community at Rome had prevented an earlier communication, but an unholy insurrection against the regular church authorities at Corinth had so injured the good name of that most steadfast and ancient body that a brotherly letter of admonition was called for (chaps. 1, 47, etc.). Accordingly the purpose of the letter is wholly practical; it is the restoration and maintenance of harmony, in view of the serious breach of discipline among factious Corinthians. These differences in the Corinthian church were not doctrinal, but consisted of personal rivalries. The emphasis of the letter is upon the ethical bearings of the Christian calling, and doctrine is effectively employed with a view to these ends.

In the course of his admonition, passing from ancient examples, the author comes to more recent champions, the noble examples of Peter and Paul, the greatest and most righteous pillars, the good apostles, who suffered martyrdom (chap. 5). Striking reference is made (chap. 47) to "the epistle of the blessed Paul the apostle"—our First Corinthians. More especially does he draw upon the language and thought of the Epistle to the

[1] Pfleiderer is not impressed by these indications of a date about 95 A. D., and on considerations of a general character dates the letter in the period from 100 to 120 A. D. (*Das Urchristentum*, II, S. 585, 586).

[2] *Epistle to the Hebrews*, p. 23.

Hebrews. He knows and uses the evangelic tradition, but in a form that varies from our Synoptic Gospels.

The letter is characterized by moderation, sobriety, "sweet reasonableness" (ἐπιείκεια), resembling in this respect First Peter, and contrasting with the intensity of the letters of Paul, the Apocalypse of John, and the letters of Ignatius. Twice the almost paradoxical expression, "earnest moderation" (ἐκτενὴς ἐπιείκεια), is used (58:2; 62:2). A word characteristic of the Christian ideal as he conceives it is παιδεύειν with its cognates, the idea being that of training, education, instruction.

Taking up now the christological conceptions that emerge, we note:

1. *The mediatorial character of Christ.*—The words διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ occurring twice in the salutation are characteristic of the thought of the whole letter. In two passages God, Christ, and the Spirit are named in the order of the baptismal formula of Matt. 28:19 (46:6; 58:2). Through Jesus Christ "the eyes of our heart were opened; through him our foolish and darkened mind springs up toward (his wonderful) light; through him the Lord would have us taste of undying knowledge" (36:2). Through his beloved Servant Jesus Christ, God has called us from heathen darkness to light, from ignorance to the full knowledge of the glory of his name, to be numbered among his elect in the whole world; through Christ he has instructed, sanctified, honored us (59:2, 3).

2. *The pre-existence of Christ* is made use of in the spirit of II Cor. 8:9 and Phil. 2:5 ff., as in chap. 16: "For Christ is with the lowly-minded, not with those who exalt themselves over the flock. The scepter of the majesty of God, the Lord Jesus Christ, came not in the pomp of arrogance or of pride, though he might have done so, but in lowliness of mind, as the Holy Spirit spoke concerning him" (16:1, 2). Then follows appropriately a long quotation from Isa., chap. 53.

The pre-existent Christ, as in I Pet. 1:11, inspired the Old Testament writers: "Now all these things the faith which is in Christ confirms, for he himself through the Holy Spirit thus exhorts us" (22:1). Then is given an extended passage from Ps. 34:11–17, quoted also in another connection in I Pet. 3:10–12. Thus the Old Testament revelation and the Christian revelation have a common source.

3. *Rank and significant titles of Christ.*—Following the Epistle to the Hebrews the letter sets forth that being the effulgence of his majesty, Christ is as much greater than angels as he has inherited a more excellent name. To him have been given nations for his inheritance and the ends of the earth for his possession. He sits at the right hand of God with his enemies for a footstool (chap. 36).

In 2:1 the statement is made that "his sufferings were before your eyes," where, as the passage stands, the reference is to God himself—a form of expression common somewhat later, but probably the reference to God is not intended here. One is reminded of the loose reference in Heb. 1:8. As in Heb. 3:1 Christ is called "the Apostle," so here it is said that "Jesus Christ was sent forth from God," as the apostles were from Christ (42:1, 2). Through him God is glorified (chap. 64). As in Hebrews Christ is often spoken of as our High Priest (36:1; 61:3; chap. 64). There is also the title of Patron or Guardian (προστάτης), and he is the Helper of our weakness (36:1).

4. *His redemptive sufferings and death.*—The letter dwells upon the subjective effect of the death of Christ upon the mind and conscience of the believer. The thought is akin to that of Heb. 13:15, where it is said in connection with the priesthood and suffering of Jesus: "Through him then let us offer up a sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is, the fruit of lips that make confession to his name." But the stronger sacrificial idea more common in Hebrews is found here also: "Let us fix our attention on the blood of Christ and know how precious it is to God his Father, because, being shed for our salvation, it offered to the whole world the grace of repentance" (7:4). There is repeated mention of the blood of Christ (12:7; 21:6; 49:6), and frequent use of the conceptions of ransom and deliverance. The attitude toward the death of Christ is very near to that of First Peter.

5. *The Christ of faith.*—All our hopes are in God. Like the Old Testament saints, "we that have been called through his will in Jesus Christ are not justified through ourselves, nor through our own wisdom or understanding or piety or works which we wrought in holiness of heart, but through faith, whereby Almighty God justified all men who were from the beginning; to whom be the glory unto the ages of the ages. Amen" (34:4). Here as in Paul we have a recognition that divine grace is the ground of holiness and Christian morality, but faith as the primary condition of acceptance with God and the mainspring of the Christian life is not insisted on as by Paul. Important as was the grace of hospitality for members of the Christian brotherhood, who were strangers and sojourners in the world, Paul would not have co-ordinated it with faith, as Clement does twice (10:7; 12:1); nor would he have written ἔργοις δικαιούμενοι καὶ μὴ λόγοις (30:3). For Clement grace is not in opposition to law, and faith is not set over against works of law. Yet there is no degeneration of Paulinism; only the presuppositions, the Pharisaic training, the experience of the curse of the law and longing for redemption from it, the polemical

demands of Paulinism, are absent. The letter is neither Pauline nor Jewish Christian, and even Pfleiderer's term "Deutero-paulinism" is not altogether a happy one.[1]

Faith consists of a religious frame of mind involving love and obedience to the will of God; it is the mind directed toward God, trust in his promises, obedience to his will, seeking out those things that are well-pleasing and acceptable to him (35:5).

The phrase ἐν Χριστῷ occurs (1:2, etc.), but the Pauline doctrine of the mystical union of the believer with Christ, as in Rom., chap. 6, is not dwelt upon; our mystical and ethical participation in the resurrection of Christ does not appear. His resurrection is mentioned as a ground of assurance of the apostles who went forth with the tidings that the kingdom of God was about to come (42:3).

6. *Eschatology.*—Up to this point in our treatment the christological standpoint has been almost exactly that of First Peter, but it is striking how little use Clement makes of eschatological conceptions in comparison with the large part they play in First Peter. The ἀποκάλυψις Ἰησοῦ of First Peter is not so constantly before this author's mind. The future hope has been entirely transcendentalized (ζωὴ ἐν ἀθανασίᾳ, 35:2). A considerable section is given to the resurrection that is coming, of which the resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ was made the first-fruit when he was raised from the dead (24:1), and of which nature offers many analogies (chaps. 24, 25).

7. *Ethical bearings of the Christology.*—Ethical precepts of Jesus are quoted (13:2; 46:8). The chief mark of Christian piety is love of the brethren (chaps. 48, 49, 50). Chap. 49 reminds us of I Cor., chap. 13.

[1] *Das Urchristentum*, II, S. 573–86.

IX. APOCALYPTICAL CHRISTOLOGY

(THE APOCALYPSE OF JOHN)

No Christian literature of our period is entirely free from apocalyptical influence. The eschatological interpretation of Jesus that dominated the primitive Jewish-Christian community persisted even after he was interpreted in a larger way. But it was natural and inevitable that minds of a certain type and in certain situations should make larger use of the apocalyptical conceptions of Judaism in attempting to relate Jesus to the problems which they were facing. Among the Christians the same conditions obtained that fostered the growth of apocalypticism in Judaism: oppressive social convulsions and the messianic hope. Although the Christians did not constitute a nation, they inherited the religious-national feelings of the Jews and regarded themselves the true Israel. What the Israelite thought would take place in the day of Yahweh, the Christian looked forward to at the second advent of Christ. Several representatives of this type of literature may be specified.

1. *Second Thessalonians.*—This epistle may have been Pauline, but there are considerations that weigh against this view (cf. 1:6, 8; 2:11, 15; 3:6). It appears to lie out of the main line of development, having points of contact with the Pastoral Epistles, with the Apocalypse of John, and possibly with Second Peter. It has the appearance of an extract from First Thessalonians, the single original contribution being the apocalyptical section, 2:1–12, for the sake of which possibly the epistle was chiefly written.

As a consequence of the belief that the day of the Lord's coming was about to dawn, many had fanatically abandoned their employments. The epistle insists that Paul gave no teaching to justify such a course. The apostasy must first come and the man of lawlessness be revealed—the son of perdition, who opposes and exalts himself against everything called deity (*θεόν*) or an object of worship; he sits in the sanctuary of God, setting himself forth as deity (2:3, 4). The mystery of lawlessness is already at work, but is being held in check by a restraining power (*το κατέχον, ὁ κατέχων*, 2:6, 7). The Lord Jesus will slay with the breath of his mouth the lawless one, who deceives and works miracles (2:8–10). The Jewish belief in a final manifestation of the powers opposed to God and his Messiah under the lead of Antichrist here appears, but the specific reference, if there be one, is not so certain. Probably the Satanic power

was identified with Jewish anti-Christian fanaticism and the restraining power with the Roman empire. According to the representation in Acts the Roman power protected the church from Jewish enemies. If this be correct, the situation is very different from that of the Apocalypse of John, where the writer's attitude is wholly hostile to the Roman empire.

2. *Apocalypse of Peter.*—This work, of which only a fragment is extant, probably falls somewhere in the first half of the second century. It contains detailed descriptions of the redeemed in heaven and the lost in hell. What is of special interest to us is that its sources appear to be Greek and not Jewish: namely, the Orphic cult, which in turn drew from oriental sources.

3. *Papias.*—Attention is called to the millennial passage in Papias, ascribed to the teaching of the Lord.[1]

4. *Shepherd of Hermas.*—This is somewhat distinct in character, and will receive special treatment later.

5. *The Apocalypse of John.*—Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, who died about A. D. 264, held on sound critical grounds that the Apocalypse of John was not written by the apostle and was not written by the author of the Fourth Gospel and the Johannine epistles.[2] The parallels between it and the Fourth Gospel are superficial, such as the characterization of Christ as the Lamb of God (John 1:29, 36) and the occurrence of the term Logos in the Apocalypse (19:13). The author does not claim to be an apostle but a Christian prophet, and he calls his book a prophecy (1:1–3, 9; 22:7, 9, 10, 18, 19). The Hebraistic style and the Jewish conceptions mark him as a Jew by birth. He probably wrote in Asia Minor, but used Palestinian materials. Irenaeus correctly fixed the date "toward the end of the reign of Domitian."[3] The persecutions of Nero and Domitian are distinguished by the author (6:9–11; 17:11). Apparent indications of some other date of composition are due to the use of earlier material (11:1, 2; 13:18).

Like the Jewish apocalypses, it is written to encourage believers to endure trial and death if necessary in view of the speedy coming of God for judgment and salvation, only in this apocalypse both are mediated by Christ. It is a violent protest against the fanatical hatred of the Jews and the cruel persecution of the Romans, over against which it affirms a confident faith that destruction must overtake these hostile elements and bring in the messianic deliverance. The troublous times are the signs that herald the

[1] Irenaeus, *Haer.* 5:32.

[2] Euseb., *H. E.* 7:25.

[3] *Haer.* 5:30:3; Euseb., *H. E.* 5:8:5, 6.

coming of the messianic age. Domitian's enmity to both Jews and Christians was due to their unwillingness to pay him the honors he demanded.[1] Refusal to worship the image of the emperor was punished with death (13:15; 20:4), though not many martyrdoms had yet taken place. By this means there was engendered a sense of irreconcilable opposition between the church and the empire. The war was to be fought to the bitter end, but it was a spiritual conflict. Behind the world-empire are spiritual powers of darkness. The older expectation of Christ's speedy return to establish his kingdom was revived with intensity. Leading the armies of heaven against the hosts of Satan, he will finally triumph over every foe.

The main sources are Jewish. It is not, however, like the Jewish apocalypses written in the name of ancient patriarch or prophet, and does not cover stretches of past history. Christians did not need to go back to find prophetic names, for there were ever in the church Christian prophets, who were held in high honor. The work does not then seem to be pseudonymous, though we have such a book in the Apocalypse of Peter. It became common to re-edit Jewish apocalypses in a Christian sense. In some instances our author appears to have done little more than this. The picture of the Messiah is taken from Jewish sources; he is a Warrior-Messiah (19:11–16). The artificial interweaving of imagery from various sources produced all sorts of anomalies. A passage representing Jewish particularism stands side by side with the broadest universalism (7:1–10). Also, we have a passage written before the destruction of the temple (11:1, 2). The seven letters seem to be an altogether original and unique feature. The conception of Christ's setting up an earthly kingdom at the time of his return, of the reign of the saints with Christ a thousand years, of the loosing of Satan out of his prison, and finally of the last judgment, is decidedly Jewish (20:1–10). The presence of Jewish elements did not trouble the author of the book, for he believed that the Christians were the true Jews. But some of his combinations would appear to us grotesque, were we not already familiar with them: the Lamb's book of life (13:8; 21:27), the marriage of the Lamb (19:7), the bride, the wife of the Lamb (21:9), the lamp is the Lamb (21:23), the throne of the Lamb (22:3).

The older apocalyptists did not exhaust the material of which use could be made. Babylonia was still rich in mythological lore. Doubtless from Jewish sources our author drew new material whose origin was Babylonia. Events originally related of the beginnings of things are told again of the

[1] The enforcement of emperor-worship in Asia Minor was introduced for the sake of unifying and Romanizing the diverse elements of the empire. It was offensive only to monotheistic faiths.

last days. Creation arose out of chaos through the conquest of the gods of the underworld by the gods of heaven, and again we see Christ as the heaven-god leading the angelic host against hostile powers. The old serpent or dragon of the ancient chaos becomes Satan and the Roman power (chaps. 12, 13). In chap. 5 there seems to be the introduction and enthroning of a new deity into the pantheon, his superiority being demonstrated by his ability to open the magical book.

Since the book consists chiefly of Jewish apocalyptic and Babylonian myth, what is the Christian element? One fails to find in the picture of God the fatherly traits taught by Jesus, and yet by the identification of Jesus with this Jewish Messiah in a Jewish kingdom, God is brought nearer to men, and as we shall see in a moment, the Jewish limitations are really swept away. He is frequently designated by the personal name Jesus (1:9; 12:17; 22:16); sometimes is called the Christ (11:15). He is of the tribe of Judah and the family of David (5:5; 22:16). The number of his apostles, his crucifixion in Jerusalem, his resurrection, his exaltation, are mentioned (1:5, 18; 2:8; 3:21; 11:8; 12:5; 21:14). Most characteristic is the designation "Lamb of God." It is probably connected with Isa. 53:7 and the Passover, and is a symbol of obedient and self-denying love, though, as we have seen, it has come to be applied without any reference to its original signification. As in First Peter, Hebrews, and First John, the death of Christ is presented as a means of purification from sin: he loosed (λύω not λούω) us from our sins by his blood (1:5), and the saints have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb (7:14; 22:14). The figure of purchase is used (ἀγοράζω, 5:9; 14:3, 4). He is the Lion that is of the tribe of Judah, the Root of David, but the seer saw a Lamb standing as slain (5:5, 6). The inevitable Daniel-passage (7:13) appears, but in 14:14 the one like unto a son of man does not appear to be Christ at all but an angel who takes directions from another angel.

The Christology is not that of Jewish Christianity, although a mass of non-Christian material has been incorporated without being thoroughly assimilated. The author believed in the salvation of uncircumcised gentiles and did not think of the Jewish ceremonial law as binding on any Christian (5:9, 10; 7:9). There is here no pre-Pauline Christology, rather a high conception of Christ, a broad universality, and freedom from Jewish particularism. As with Paul, it is only the redeeming death of the earthly Jesus that is dwelt upon, and chap. 5 reminds us of Phil. 2:5–11: through his redemptive death Jesus gained a place of glory and power above the highest angels (5:9). The dignity, glory, and authority of Christ and

the greatness of his redeeming work are set forth in exalted terms and the strongest imagery is employed (1:5). He is a priest (1:13), is Lord of the church (1:12–16), is pre-existent and eternal, and determines who shall enter and who be released from the realms of the dead (1:8, 17, 18; 21:6; 22:13), is King of kings and Lord of lords (17:14; 19:16), is the bright, the morning-star that will rise upon the world to usher in the consummation (22:16). When he is described as ἡ ἀρχὴ τῆς κτίσεως τοῦ θεοῦ (3:14), we are reminded of Col. 1:15, 18: πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως, ... ὅς ἐστιν[ἡ]ἀρχή. He is the Logos of God (19:13), though this passage looks like an interpolation in view of the fact that in the preceding verse it was stated as a mark of his transcendence that no one knows his name. His name is constantly associated with that of God (7:10; 20:6; 21:22; 22:1, 3). Given titles that belong to God, and worshiped by men and angels, Christ reigns not only during the earthly millennium, but sits with God in the final consummation.

X. CHRISTOLOGY IN THE PASTORAL EPISTLES

The pastoral epistles arose in the first or second decade of the second Christian century, possibly somewhat later. The doctrinal situation is similar to that found in the letters of Polycarp and Ignatius. It is likely, but not quite certain, that these epistles were known to Polycarp and Ignatius.[1] They were not improbably based on genuine letters or notes of Paul to Timothy and Titus. There are Pauline passages and personal notices that bear marks of genuineness, especially in Second Timothy and Titus. Yet the attempt to distinguish the authentic passages is hazardous, and hypothetical reconstructions are not here attempted.

One who regarded himself a loyal follower of Paul proposed to safeguard the church against error in life and doctrine, and to this end he urged good and pious living and warned against novelties and vagaries of faith. Like Ignatius, he saw in church organization a defense against evil tendencies. The false teachings attacked were those of the incipient Gnosticism of the early second century. The notable reference in I Tim. 6:20 to "the antitheses of *gnosis* falsely so called" (*ἀντιθέσεις τῆς ψευδωνύμου γνώσεως*), is possibly a later addition and may refer to Marcion's *ἀντιθέσεις*, a voluminous work in which he attempted to show the contradiction between the Old Testament and the gospel. If it be noted that the writer failed to distinguish between tendencies of an opposite character, the false teachers being now antinomian and now ascetic (I Tim. 4:3–5), now legalistic (Tit. 1:10, 14) and now spiritualistic (II Tim. 2:18), we may not forget that these various elements are to be found also in Gnosticism. The dualism combated in I Tim. 4:3 and Tit. 1:5 lay at the foundation of Gnosticism. When the life of flesh and sense is regarded as wholly evil, two courses are possible: the flesh may be either repressed or indulged without restraint, and history furnishes abundant examples of both courses. For those who despised the flesh a literal resurrection was out of the question; the resurrection had already come in a spiritual rising from the dead —an error possibly due also to a misunderstanding of Paul's doctrine of the resurrection of believers at baptism to the new life in the Spirit. But it is evident that our author understood by the resurrection only that of the fleshly body. Reference is frequent to intermediate divine beings: the "endless genealogies" (I Tim. 1:4; Tit. 3:9) are hierarchies of aeons and archons, Christ being the center of these angelic powers. If the

[1] Pfleiderer makes too little of the evidence.

author is content with indiscriminate denunciations in place of a demonstration of the fallacy of the heretical positions, it is because he is convinced that the deposit of the faith—the true *gnosis*—has been handed down by the apostles against all sorts of error. We are reminded of Polycarp. The gnostic position is further met by placing the emphasis on obedience and ethical activities instead of on knowledge and speculation. Christianity is an ethical religion and not an esoteric philosophy.[1]

There are some striking Pauline ideas and passages, but for the most part characteristic Pauline truths are absent. Instead of the doctrines of death to the flesh and life in the spirit, of union with Christ so that Christ lives in the believer, our author emphasizes piety and good works. Faith appears as the means of salvation in I Tim. 1:16 and II Tim. 3:15; elsewhere πίστις is mentioned among other virtues, is used of correct belief, or stands for an objective system of accepted truth. Answering to Paul's idea of faith is piety (εὐσέβεια, θεοσέβεια) manifesting itself in good works.

Savior (σωτήρ), used elsewhere of Christ, is here (in First Timothy exclusively) applied to God, as in Luke 1:47 and Jude, vs. 25. The unity of God is emphasized, it may be in opposition to the Gnostic distinction between the God of creation, of the Old Testament, of the flesh, on the one hand, and the good God of love and redemption, revealed in Christ, on the other.

In I Tim. 3:16 we find a liturgical confession set over against gnostic docetism—"the mystery of the religion" (τῆς εὐσεβείας):

He was revealed in flesh,
He was attested by the Spirit,
He was beheld by angels,
He was proclaimed among nations,
He was believed on in the world,
He was taken up in glory.

The union of the human and spiritual sides of Christ, suggested also in I Pet. 3:18, is developed with greater fulness in the letter of Ignatius to the Ephesians (7:2): "There is one physician, both sarkical and spiritual, made and not made, God coming in flesh, true life in death, both of Mary and of God, first passible and then impassible—Jesus Christ our Lord"—a passage quoted by Athanasius. As in Ignatius and the Johannine theology, the higher nature and origin of Christ is fundamental: he came into the world (I Tim. 1:15). Over against the many divine principles and intermediate beings of gnostic mythology we read: "For there is one God,

[1] Scott, *Apologetic of the New Testament*, p. 181.

also one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all, the testimony in its own times" (I Tim. 2:5, 6), where special emphasis is upon his true manhood. In the notable passage, Tit. 2:13—in the reference to the blessed hope and appearing of the glory of the great God and our Savior Christ Jesus—by the "great God" is probably meant Christ himself. He made an end of death and brought life and immortality to light through the good news (II Tim. 1:10). The Pauline doctrine of the significance of the death of Christ finds echoes, as in I Tim. 2:6 (*ἀντίλυτρον*); but as in First Peter it is the ethical side that is dwelt upon (Tit. 2:14). Our God and Savior Christ Jesus has appeared primarily to redeem us, not from the curse of the law, as in Paul, but from lawlessness, from an immoral life. Against gnostic exclusiveness the universality of salvation through Christ is set forth (Tit. 2:11; I Tim. 2:4; 5:6).

XI. THE JOHANNINE CHRISTOLOGY

The author of the Fourth Gospel was after Paul the most profound religious genius of our period, and in originality and spiritual insight he does not suffer even in comparison with the great apostle to the gentiles. And yet we know nothing further of him. Since the latter part of the second century he has been identified with the apostle John. Internal evidence does not tend to confirm this tradition. The book does not appear to have been written by one who had been a personal disciple of the Lord throughout his public career. To cite a single illustration, the son of Zebedee was a Galilean, but for this writer Galilee has little interest, while in Jerusalem—in his account the main scene of the Lord's ministry—he is at home. From external evidence a strong case can be made for apostolic authorship, but John the apostle has evidently been confused with John the Elder—a great personality who arises vaguely out of the darkness of the times. Irenaeus says that as a boy he used to hear the blessed Polycarp describe his intercourse with John, who published the gospel while dwelling in Ephesus.[1] Now Papias distinguishes between the apostle John and the elder John, but Irenaeus seems to have misunderstood him. In this instance Eusebius detected the confusion of Irenaeus.[2] The age was one liable to such mistakes. The fact that Irenaeus ascribes not only the gospel but also the apocalypse to the apostle John suggests caution in accepting his testimony. It is a question whether the apostle John ever worked in Asia Minor.[3] Writing to the Ephesian church Ignatius addresses them as those who have been initiated into the sacred mysteries with Paul (Παύλου συμμύσται, 12:2), but mentions no such relationship with John, one of the Twelve, as would have been likely had he had a long Ephesian residence.

There is little reason to doubt the ancient tradition that the Johannine writings rose on Asian ground. The Christian communities of Asia Minor played a leading rôle in the history of the primitive church, and the Fourth Gospel is their most valuable gift to the world. The time was probably that of Trajan. We have to allow for the use of the Synoptic Gospels, and the general situation is such as to make extremely improbable any time before the second century. In the letter of Polycarp (7:1) there appears to be a reminiscence of the Johannine epistles (I John 4:2, 3;

[1] *Haer.* 3:11; Euseb., *H. E.* 5:20, 24.

[2] Euseb., *H. E.* 3:39.

[3] See Bousset in the Meyer *Kommentar*, "Die Offenbarung des Johannis," and *Encyclopedia Biblica*, article "Apocalypse."

II John, vs. 7), but this should not be pressed. The year A. D. 110 may be given as an approximate date for the Fourth Gospel. The Johannine epistles may have either preceded or followed. But we must leave open the possibility of a still later date for the Fourth Gospel. Identity of authorship cannot be established for the gospel and the epistles. They belong to the same school and are closely related in language and thought. The resemblances make all the more striking the strong divergences, in view of which it is best to treat them apart. The Apocalypse of John has already been treated, as belonging to an earlier period and to a different class of literature.

These writings then proceeded from an Asian school which seems to have originated with John the elder. It is generally assumed that the author of the Fourth Gospel was a Jew by birth, on account of the Hebraic cast of his language and his knowledge of contemporary Palestinian Judaism. But the fact that the work furnishes the most extreme case of dejudaizing in the New Testament suggests that the author may not have been a Jew. Personal relationship to Jesus and direct witness to the events recorded appear to be claimed in gospel and epistle (John 1:14; I John 1:1–3), but the consciousness of an immediate relation with the spiritual Christ and such passages as I John 3:6 and III John, vs. 11, suggest a different interpretation.

THE FOURTH GOSPEL

The Fourth Gospel has no parallel in the history of primitive Christianity. In the author are combined receptivity and rare creative power. Gentile-Christian thought takes the form of gospel literature. The interest is not historical but theological. Indeed, we do not look for purely historical interest among the writers of the ancient East. History was employed as a means of conveying the writer's own ideas. Men composed poetry with its legends and myths before they wrote history. The Synoptic Gospels are primarily pure history; they were written for the purpose of evangelization and indoctrination, and not mere chronicling; the adoption of the gospel-form was the authors' way of preaching Jesus Christ, and the popularity and influence of the gospels proved a justification of their effort. But in spite of the theological aims and idealizing tendencies of the synoptists, they were interested in the facts. In his preface Luke proposes to give an orderly narrative of the facts of the life of Jesus. John is after the meaning of the facts. Now Matthew's purpose is certainly similar, but he reproduces his sources with more fidelity. John has transformed everything. He gives us not a photograph but a painting, an interpretation, such as Plato gives of Socrates. Facts are related because of their

revealing power. For this purpose the traditions of Jesus' life current in the church are drawn upon. It seems that the most important sources were our Synoptic Gospels, but to some extent they are supplemented—at some points possibly even corrected. The impressive story of the interpolated passage, 7:53—8:11, proves that there were elements in the evangelic tradition that the synoptists had not incorporated in their books.

What now was the writer's controlling purpose? It is perhaps an editor who has added 20:30, 31, where the purpose is said to be that the readers might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and believing have life in his name; but in any case it well sets forth the character of the gospel. The author presents in the form of a record of the works and words of Jesus his own idea of the significance of his person. The historical life has abiding meaning. All facts are read in the light of his conception of Christ's person. The messianic title and office are absorbed and lost in his larger and higher view of the eternal Son of God. The great figure around which all else revolves, he treads the earth but is not of it. Historical development, adaptation answering to changing environment, are mostly wanting. From the beginning Jesus knows that he is to die at the hands of the Jews, is aware of the character of Judas, foresees the future, and is indeed omniscient (1:48; 2:24, 25; 4:16–19; 6:64; 13:18; 16:30; 18:4; 19:28). Under these circumstances there is no need to mention the Baptism, the Temptation, the scene in Gethsemane, or prayer except for the sake of his hearers (11:42; 12:30). The discourses are about the nature of the Christ, what lies back of his manifestation in humanity, his relation to God, his pre-existence, his risen life and work as Spirit; and in it all Jesus speaks beyond those immediately addressed to the readers of the book. From beginning to end, and whatever the situation, the content of the teaching is largely the same. Taken up as the book is with discourses, there is not a parable of the kind familiar to us in the Synoptic Gospels; instead there are allegories, as of the good shepherd and the true vine.

There were specific historical circumstances that called forth a work of just this character, and we may discover reasons even for his remarkable contrasts and contradictions. There is for instance the controversy with "the Jews." It does not concern messiahship or theocratic hopes or the law in the older sense, but the divine claims of Jesus and the problem of reconciling them with monotheism (5:18; 10:36).[1] The break with the Jews had become irreparable; synagogue and church stand apart,

[1] The difficulties that present themselves to Jewish opponents are like those of the Talmud and those Celsus derived from the Jews.

but there is recognition of the historical relation of Christianity to Judaism (4:22; 5:46; 12:41). We hear echoes of a controversy with the sect that still held to John the Baptist, with which Paul also is represented to have come into contact at Ephesus (Acts 18:25; 19:3, 4; see also the Clementine Recognitions 1:54, 60). Within the church there is the Eucharistic discussion (6:32–59). In a word there was a new situation to be faced, there were new ideas and interests of which to take account, old forms and arguments were outgrown, a reinterpretation of Christianity was demanded; and within the church there was one man whose nature and outlook were sufficiently large and catholic, whose hold upon the essential element in Christianity and whose understanding of the abiding meaning of the historical life of Jesus were so true, that his religious genius proved adequate for the crisis. Three of the determining influences in the construction of his Christology will receive special consideration.

1. *Paulinism.*—A half-century had elapsed since the death of Paul. But Paul had made a deep impression on Asia Minor, his influence being manifest in Ignatius and in gnostic circles, all of which adopted certain of his conceptions. Perhaps the Epistle to the Ephesians took its name from the place of its origin; it carries forward the development on strictly Pauline lines. One more powerful witness to his influence is furnished by the Johannine literature. But we must not suppose for a moment that John was a man who would take over anything directly and literally from Paul. He made no such use even of the Synoptic Gospels. Every Pauline doctrine that he holds has been transformed and correlated with his own religious experience.

Both Paul and John proceeded in their christological thinking from their experience of the risen, spiritual Christ, whom they knew not after the flesh. Paul claimed that his vision and knowledge of the risen Lord was as real and valid as that of those who had seen and known him in the flesh. John is possessed of the same conviction regarding himself. Indeed it is his consciousness of communion with the living, eternal Savior, who still reveals himself to those who believe in him, that justifies his free use of his materials, in the spirit of I Cor. 2:9, 10 (John 14:26; 15:26; 16:12–15). But there is a difference: John values as Paul did not the life lived in the flesh. He did not think of it as a kenosis or humiliation, though it was a condescension. He sees the glory of the exalted Christ resting upon the earthly life, as indeed the disciples were disposed to do from the beginning. Paul and John make somewhat the same use of pre-existence in connection with Christ's redemptive work: Christ is able to reveal the Father and to save because he came down from heaven, but

for John he did not as for Paul divest himself of his glory and divine prerogatives.[1]

The universalism of the gospel of Christ is common to Paul and John. Our author was a world-Christian to whom Jewish law and prerogative meant nothing and to whom the requiring of circumcision and the observance of Jewish law of gentile converts would have been repugnant. In his hostility to the Jews he goes far beyond Paul, holding out no such hope of the ultimate salvation of Israel. Christ brings freedom from sin (8:34–36), but not freedom from all law; John does not scruple to represent the Christian life as the keeping of Christ's commandments. Yet in general he reproduces Paul's idea of spiritual freedom, employing even the figures of servant and son (8:33–39). And where could be found a more excellent statement of Paul's doctrine of faith and works than in 6:29: "This is the work of God, that you believe on him whom God has sent"? Nevertheless the view of faith is not exactly the same. In John faith is an attitude toward Christ as the supreme manifestation of God, fixing primarily not upon Christ in his redemptive work for the sinner but upon him in his relation to God. Instead of trust it tends to become belief, just as in First John the recognition of the divine Sonship of Jesus and the reality of his incarnation is made the test of the Christian's standing before God.

A fundamental difference between Paul and John in their conception of Christ in his relation to men is that Paul thinks of him primarily as the Redeemer from sin and the flesh, and John as the Revealer of the Father and of truth. The redemption wrought by Christ is for Paul release from the flesh and means entrance upon a new and holy life in the Spirit. In John likewise there is the contrast between flesh and spirit, but the new birth is into a world of light and redemption, a transfer from darkness to light. Christ came to take away sin, but his central work was the revelation of the Father. Sin is not so much moral evil as limitation, incapacity for the higher life, and unbelief in Christ (15:22; 16:9).

While some of Paul's controlling ideas were taken up by the church, others just as essential to his thought were not appropriated. His conception of the believer's oneness with Christ was too much out of line with the ordinary experience of the Christian man to mean much to the church, even when Paul's phraseology was retained. But in one form or another the abiding presence of the spiritual Christ continued a matter of conscious experience, and great mystic souls like John and Ignatius could not dispense with bold, vital expressions of their sense of union with the Lord. The union as conceived by Paul was not only ethical but somehow

[1] Therefore there is no occasion to introduce the Transfiguration.

ontological; so John thought of the life communicated through personal union with Christ as a kind of transmitted essence, though he often describes it in ethical terms. In this connection belongs the Eucharistic discussion of chap. 6. So also Ignatius writes to the Ephesians that they break one bread, which is medicine of immortality, an antidote against dying, causing them to live forever in Jesus Christ (20:2). Although Paul was still looking for the coming of Christ, practically he could realize his presence in the Spirit, and it was a real presence. John was able to make it still more real (if possible) by his spiritual understanding of the *parousia;* for him Christ had already come and was realized as an invisible and abiding presence. The coming of the Paraclete was that of Christ himself (14:16, 18).

We recall that Paul fixes upon the death of Christ as the crowning act of divine love, in which Christ's character, revealing the character of God, is summed up. John too sees in his death an expression of love (15:13), but with him it is chiefly the life that is revelatory. Overwhelmed with consciousness of sin and the law, Paul found peace in the grace of God revealed through the cross, which was an expression of the mind of Christ and God. For him it was enough to know Christ crucified; the death furnished the key to the purpose and meaning of the life. In John the life as a whole occupies the place assigned by Paul to the death. There seems to be logically no need for the doctrine of the expiatory death in the Johannine Christology, but at this point John makes no formal break with the current church doctrine. He appears to dissociate the Christian sacrament from the Jewish Passover by placing the Supper on the 13th of Nisan instead of the 14th, and making it the prototype of the Agape, so that the crucifixion coincides with the killing of the Paschal lamb (I Cor. 5:7). An explicit connection of the death with sin occurs in 1:29 —by no means a characteristic manner of speaking with him and most likely a reminiscence of the church doctrine. The death is an act deliberately accomplished and necessary to his entrance into glory and return to his disciples.

Paul's idea of the Son of God was not only the religious and the apocalyptic but the gentile and literal, the title expressing the essential relation of Christ to God; Christ was God's own Son (Rom. 8:32), pre-existing in the form of God (Phil. 2:6). John pushes this conception of the nature of the Son and his relation to God a step farther, employing the name "Son of God" in the full sense it would convey to the Greek mind—one who was of the same nature with the Father and was always Son. He does not go as far as Ignatius and without scruple call Christ God; the

Logos is θεός, not ὁ Θεός (1:1). The exclamation of Thomas is not to be taken as our author's characteristic way of speaking (20:28), though it is of great significance for his thought.

2. *Alexandrianism.*—Alexandrian ideas early gained a foothold in Asia Minor. In Acts 18:24 we are told that a certain Jew named Apollos, an Alexandrian by race, a learned man, mighty in the Scriptures, came to Ephesus. The epistles to the Colossians, the Ephesians, and the Hebrews, all of which probably rose in Asia Minor, bear witness to the extent to which Alexandrian thought and method had already entered the Christian movement when the Fourth Gospel was written. In his masterly and penetrating work on the Fourth Gospel, to which this treatment is under heavy obligations, Scott expresses more than once his conviction that John was directly acquainted with the works of Philo and was conscious of his indebtedness to them.[1] This does not seem probable. We have seen that Philonic ideas had already gained currency and entered Christian thought. The case is altogether different in Hebrews, where the author shows himself to be a thoroughgoing literary Hellenist. John's undertaking was, like Philo's, that of naturalizing in the Hellenic world religious ideas originating among the Jews of Palestine; but he had no such philosophical interest and equipment as the Alexandrian thinker. What Philo and his school found in the Logos, he found in Christ. As Philo used allegory to read Greek philosophy in the Old Testament, so by means of allegory John was enabled to see through facts to their true import. Allegory had been employed in the rabbinical schools of Palestine, but the allegorical character of the Fourth Gospel is due to Alexandrian influence. Outward facts are symbolical. Persons are types. The use of the temple, the brazen serpent, the manna, and the passover-lamb (2:21; 3:14; 6:31, 32; 19:36) is after the manner of Hebrews.

Plato had elaborated the theory of ideas which separated the material world from the world of higher reality—a conception of which Hebrews made much. The Stoics brought the worlds into correlation by the hypothesis of Heraclitus that a λόγος, a principle of reason, pervades the universe. The Logos is both reason and activity, inward and declared (λόγος ἐνδιάθετος καὶ προφορικός). Now Jewish thinkers, confronted by the same dualism in view of the growing impression of God's transcendence, bridged the gulf by hypostatizing Wisdom and the Word (Memra), by the mediation of angels that filled the space between earth and heaven, and by increased reliance on their law. In the spirit of Plato, Philo looked upon visible things as the types and shadows of reality, and with the Stoics saw

[1] *The Fourth Gospel*, pp. 55, 154.

in the Logos reason and uttered speech, divine energy and self-revelation. True to his Hebrew monotheism, he subordinated the Logos to the supreme, self-existing God. In his thought man is by virtue of his intelligence akin to the divine Logos, and men who know one Creator and Father of all things are sons of God.[1] The Father of the universe brought the Logos into being as his eldest son, his firstborn, who imitates the ways of his Father.[2] The Logos distributes to all the true manna, the heavenly food and nourishment of the soul.[3] John's prologue contains distinctive Philonic conceptions: the eternity of the Logos, the relation to God (πρὸς τὸν Θεόν), his creative activity, and his function in the illumination of men (1:1–4). After the prologue the term is used only in the sense of spoken discourse. John's interest is not in the abstract Logos but in the personal Logos made flesh, not in his cosmic but in his saving significance. Philo's cosmology falls into the background. It is possible but not likely that along with a number of alterations in the text of the Johannine literature the prologue also was affixed. The Logos-doctrine is in a way assumed throughout.

We have then a truth of religious experience stated in terms of Alexandrian speculation. The fact was that Jesus had revealed God. Therefore he is identified with the divine reason and essence on the one hand, and on the other with God's principle of activity and revelation, which manifests itself in creation and the soul of man. Thus Jesus was different in nature from the men around him. A mysterious halo is about his person. In all his words and deeds a glory shines out. He manifests his glory by miracles, which are signs (σημεῖα, 2:12; 9:3; 12:4)—exhibitions primarily not of compassion but of power, designed to inspire belief in his claims (4:48; 9:3; 11:40). Where there is dependence on the synoptists, the marvelous is chosen and heightened. About his presence there is an overawing majesty (7:46; 18:6). It is one who came forth from God and returns to God that washes the disciples' feet (13:3). By nature they were his servants, but in his divine love and condescension he calls them friends (16:15). He is self-determining, independent of outward circumstances and compulsion, master of his own fate (7:30; 8:20; 10:18). His words are divine (6:63, 68; 15:3). With the Logos-hypothesis there is no need of adducing the tradition of the virgin-birth (cf. 1:45; 6:42; 7:27).

3. *Gnosticism.*—The presence of incipient Gnostics in Asia Minor in the first century is witnessed by the epistles to the Colossians and the

[1] *De Mundi Opif.* 51; *Conf. Ling.* 28.

[2] *Conf. Ling.* 14.

[3] *Quid Rer. Div.* 39; *De Profug.* 25.

Ephesians. Their large influence there early in the second century is testified to by the zeal of Ignatius. The Fourth Gospel makes no express mention of Gnosticism, but there is reason to believe that it was present to the mind of the author. Emphasis on certain physical details which prove the reality of Christ's life and especially of his death; the avoidance of the substantives γνῶσις and πίστις, though the ideas and the verbal forms ever recur, σοφία also being replaced by ἀλήθεια; the comparative absence of angels; the honor paid the Old Testament as foreshadowing the revelation in Jesus; the exclusion from a part in creation of the mediating aeons of gnostic mythology (1:3); special mention that Jesus "went out bearing the cross for himself" (19:17), the gnostic legend being that Simon of Cyrene was crucified in place of Jesus—these facts taken all together point toward a conscious opposition to Gnosticism on the part of the writer. Loyal to the church's evangelic tradition, he insists that Christianity be not detached from its original and vital connection with the person of the historical Jesus. He is satisfied with no Logos of bare speculation, but with one known in personal human form.

But like every wise apologete for the faith, John is sympathetic and receptive toward the deeper thought-currents of the time, and careful to appropriate and conserve what is true and helpful. On this account his work became a favorite gospel of gnostic schools. At the close of the second century it was even said that Cerinthus was its author. The docetic Gospel of Peter follows it in preference to the Synoptics. It cannot be denied that in tendency it is at times almost docetic. The doctrine of a present resurrection is close to gnostic thought (5:24). The antitheses of the lower and the higher worlds, darkness and light, earthly men and spiritual men, are fundamental. The religious life is one of knowing, though knowledge always includes ethical elements. It is evident that the distinction between orthodox and gnostic had not become marked. Later Christians often combated only special fantastic forms of Gnosticism, not understanding its real spirit. But John and the Gnostics drew in part from a common source—the general religious culture of the age. The saving work of Christ must be brought into relation with the needs of the Greek world; hence he is conceived as one who brings illumination and eternal life. To know God is all-important, but this is to know his character and will. Christ reveals the Father by the manifestation of himself. He was more than a messenger come to bear witness of the light; he was the light (1:7–9, 18). The acceptation of this revelation brings eternal life and its rejection eternal death. Christianity is new knowledge. The Fourth Gospel thus fostered the tendency in the church toward an intel-

lectual apprehension of Christianity. Faith, however, is still an act of the soul—not yet "the faith," but approaching that.

Eschatology.—Perhaps there is no feature of the Johannine reinterpretation of Christ more remarkable than the transformation of the current eschatology. Most vital to John was his consciousness of the presence of the living Christ. For this he reads history symbolically and finds in it prophetic allusions. Expectation of the *parousia*, a cardinal article of faith in the primitive church, had through all these years undergone a severe strain. Some clung to the hope almost frantically, staking everything, as it were, upon it;[1] but all in some degree maintained the hope. John holds, on the other hand, that it has already taken place. Christ comes to the believer inwardly and spiritually (14:21–23). He said he would come in a little while, and he fulfilled his promise immediately after the ascension to the Father. And so the discourses at the Supper take the place of the apocalyptic discourses of the Synoptics, and the coming of Christ in the Spirit is substituted for the *parousia*. This seems very simple, but there is confessedly some confusion. The future advent of 21:22 ("till I come") belongs to the appendix. The future coming of 5:25, 28, 29 seems to be a contradiction of the context, and the last two verses look like an interpolation. The meaning of 14:3 seems to be a coming at death to take the believer to a heavenly abode. Possibly there is reference to the appearances after the resurrection in 16:16, 22. But the prevailing reference to his coming in the Spirit is unmistakable (14:18, 23, 28).

The resurrection of Jesus effected the confirmation of the disciples' faith in him (20:8, 28), and the possibility of his return to the Father to send the Spirit. His resurrection secured to believers a universal, inward, permanent divine presence. There was no clear place for the ascension, such as is described in Acts, but as belonging to the tradition it is referred to in 20:17.

Paul taught that the Christian man has already experienced a spiritual resurrection. This is with John a cardinal conviction; Christ imparts spiritual life, and the believer in him has already passed out of death into life (5:21, 24). Martha's idea of the resurrection was eschatological and physical; Jesus transfers the emphasis to the present (11:24–26). But the traditional belief in a final resurrection which is to include those that have done evil is not excluded (5:28, 29; 6:39, 40, 44, 54).

In the traditional messianism Christ was to be judge (II Cor. 5:10). John carries the messianic judgment back into the earthly life of Jesus

[1] Apoc. of John; Apoc. of Peter; Papias (Iren., *Haer.* 5:33); II Peter, "Where is the promise of his *parousia?*" (3:4).

(5:22, 27, 30; 8:16; 9:39; 12:31). Again it is said that he does not judge; he came to save (3:17; 5:45; 8:15; 12:47). His judgment is not formal; he has come into the world as the light, the revelation of God, and light brings all things to the test (3:18–21). Men choose for or against him. The word he speaks judges (12:47, 48). As a matter of course the judgment "in the last day" also appears (5:28, 29; 12:48).

Summing up, we may view the Christology of the Fourth Gospel in Christ's relation to God, to the Holy Spirit, and to men.

The title "the Christ" has for the most part lost its original significance in connection with the national Israelitish history and hope, and like "the Son of God" has come to stand for the supramundane nature and dignity of Jesus (11:27; 20:31). "Son of man" occurs in twelve passages, but in most cases it takes strained exegesis to find special significance in its use, as for instance the emphatic acknowledgment on the part of Jesus of a human nature. The distinctive name is "Son of God," sometimes with the Philonic epithet of "only-begotten" (1:14, 18; 3:16, 18). This sonship is literal and essential; Christ is a heavenly being, different in kind from men. He shared the glory of the Father before the world was, and by his own act entered the world as man; hence there is no need to introduce the tradition of the virgin-birth. As pictured by the synoptists Jesus fixed his thought on God's fatherliness, his own sonship being a correlative, to be sure, but in the background. Father and Son implied a reciprocal fellowship; as in Hebrew thought, the son was the object of the Father's favor, and the name was more personal than official. In the Fourth Gospel, however, both Fatherhood and Sonship approach a literal relationship. Of course sonship implies a distinction and a subordination (5:19; 12:50; 14:28). J. Weiss is in error when he says of John that "he does not even hesitate not only to say of the premundane Logos: he was God (1:1), but also lets the bodily risen one be addressed by Thomas as his God (20:28)."[1] These are isolated instances, and the first is not correctly translated, while the second is an exclamation, found in reverse order in Ps. 35:23.

Nevertheless there is an equally vital ethical and religious side to John's Christology. He does not entirely forget that Jesus was a man with genuinely human and moral traits. Jesus revealed God perfectly to men because in him was realized an ideal communion with the Father (14:9, 10). His life and character made known God to men. He is Son of God by virtue of his inner life of fellowship, his obedience to the will of God, his love and devotion expressing itself in self-sacrifice (4:34; 5:30; 8:29; 10:

[1] *Christus: Die Anfänge des Dogmas,* S. 85, 86.

17, 37). The communion of the disciples with Jesus and of Jesus with the Father are placed side by side as though they were of the same kind. Even for Jesus, fellowship with God is conditioned; he is assured of the love of the Father only so long as he does his will. By this apprehension of the historical Jesus the moral element that was threatened under the influence of the doctrine of an abstract Logos is restored.

The death of Jesus made possible his return to the disciples as an all-pervading presence for the larger task of gathering together into one the children of God that are scattered abroad (7:39; 10:16; 11:52, 17:20, 21). Bereft of his bodily presence, the disciples will have the Spirit. Now the conception of the Holy Spirit was a phase of primitive Christian thought of which John found it convenient to make special use. In certain passages the Spirit is expressly distinguished from Jesus (ἄλλος παράκλητος, 14:16, 26; 15:26; 16:7, 14, 15), while in others the reference is to the presence of the glorified Redeemer (14:18; 16:16). After his resurrection Jesus breathed on the disciples and said: "Receive the Holy Spirit" (20:22). The confusion at this point is paralleled in every phase of the Johannine thought we have taken up, and is dissolved when we recall the varying influences and interests with which our many-sided author had to reckon.

In relation to men it is the function of Jesus to disclose the mystery of the unseen God (1:18; 14:9), to bring grace and truth (1:14, 17), and to impart eternal life. He is the Water and Bread of life, the Light, the Way, the Shepherd, the Vine. It is not to his message but to himself that men are to look for salvation. In his discourses he does not teach, but asserts his divine character—his self-consciousness—his relation to God and men. The eternal life which he imparts is thought of in its essence after the manner of the Greeks, and in its ethical quality in the Hebrew spirit. The means by which men come to partake of eternal life is union with Christ, so intimate that prayer may be addressed immediately to God (16:23, 24), mystically grounded on an almost ontological relationship, ethically based on spiritual fellowship. The continuity of this divine life is such that death —the dissolution of the body—is but an incident.

The Fourth Gospel is then an interpretation of Jesus—a setting-forth of his significance for the world. It is not to be taken as historical in form and detail. As an interpretation, however, its main contentions are not without support in the synoptic tradition. Love as the distinguishing mark of discipleship finds even larger expression in the synoptic account, while love as the central trait in the character of God in his relation to men finds place in the message of Jesus as recorded in the Synoptic Gospels (John 3:16; 13:34, 35; Mark 12:30, 31; Matt. 5:43–48). The total impression

of his life and character, his words and deeds, gained from the Synoptic Gospels, is that of one who reveals God, and that Christ manifests God is the fundamental conviction of the author of the Fourth Gospel. In the synoptic account the person of Jesus does not stand out so prominently as the source of salvation, but Jesus does invite the weary and heavy laden to come to him for refreshment and does represent his body and blood as given for his followers. He does not in the Synoptics ask for belief that he is the Son of God, who has come from heaven, but he does say: "Follow me" (Mark 1:17). Now what kind of a being must he be of whom such things can be said? It is with this problem that the Fourth Gospel deals. John's conviction of the divine sonship of Jesus finds support in the synoptic tradition (Mark 1:11; 9:7; Matt. 11:27). From the beginning his followers had attempted to answer the question, but former categories and interpretations did not fully satisfy John's experience and view of the world. The profound answer he himself has given is not surpassed by any thinker of the primitive Christian period.

THE JOHANNINE EPISTLES

There is little reference in these epistles to the historical Jesus—his message that God is light, his command to love, the mention of water and blood and of "the teaching of the Christ" (1:5; 3:11, 23; 5:6; II John, vs. 9) being the possible allusions.

As in the gospel, Christ is primarily the Revealer of the Father, and the Christian character corresponds with God's character ("which thing is true in him and in you," 2:8; 4:11, etc.). There is the same strange combination of opposites: the teaching is now mystical, now intellectualistic, and yet so ethical that Christianity appears to be only a fulfilment of the law of love. J. Weiss[1] says that Jesus Christ is "without hesitation" called "the true God" in 5:20, but the case is not so clear; further, it is possible that the closing verses are a later amplification.

The explicit connection of the death of Christ with sin is more prominent than in the gospel. "The blood of Jesus his Son cleanses us from all sin" (1:7). "And he is a propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only but also for the whole world" (ἱλασμός, 2:2). Their sins are forgiven for his name's sake—an expression not frequent in the New Testament (2:12). "He was manifested to take away sins and in him is no sin" (3:5). "In this is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us and sent his Son as a propitiation for our sins" (4:10).

As in the gospel, the expectation of a final bodily resurrection is subordinated to the present spiritual resurrection of believers (2:29; 3:14;

[1] *Christus*, S. 84.

5:12). But the coming manifestation of Christ occupies a place that is not given it in the gospel (2:28; 3:2). The "last hour," which has already arrived, as is witnessed by the rise of many antichrists, and "the day of judgment," are mentioned (2:18; 4:17). Paul's doctrine of Christ as an ever-living Intercessor (Rom. 8:34), elaborated in Hebrews (7:25), is here continued in the thought of an Advocate with the Father (*παράκλητος πρὸς τὸν πατέρα*, 2:1), Jesus Christ the righteous.

Of special interest is the explicit reference to gnostic teachers, who were only implicitly present in the gospel. We learn that they are numerous, are itinerant preachers; they originally went out from the Christian community; the separation now between them and the churches is an open one, and its initiation was not from the side of the false leaders but the churches (2:18, 19; 4:4; II John, vss. 7, 10). They have met with a measure of success: "the world hears them" (4:5). The author sees in them the expected antichrists (2:18, 22; 4:3; II John, vs. 7). They are not to be received into the house or greeted, for greeting would mean participation in their evil works (II John, vss. 10, 11).

Their chief offense is their false Christology: the denial that Jesus is the Christ and the denial of the Father and the Son (2:22; 4:2, 3; 5:1, 5–8; II John, vss. 7–9). The docetic error is apparent enough. There is also the contention on their part that the union between the Christ and the man Jesus was only transitory and external, beginning with the baptism and closing with the sufferings.[1] In opposition to this the author asserts that Jesus Christ came not only with the water but with the water and the blood, that is to say, not only in baptism but in suffering (5:6, 8). With this interpretation agree the opening words to the effect that the Word of life was heard, seen, and handled (1:1–3). The textual reading of *λύει* in 4:3 instead of *μὴ ὁμολογεῖ* is significant: whoever divides the historical person of Jesus is not of God. The denial that Christ has suffered with and for men robs his death of significance (1:7; 2:2; 4:10). Another error is that of antinomianism—the contention that the Christian man is bound by no law (1:8, 10; 2:4).

Our author is not content to denounce and condemn, like Jude, Second Peter, and the Pastoral Epistles, but he exhibits the true gospel in opposition to the false *gnosis*. With the gospel of the same school he insists upon the reality of Christ's appearance in the flesh, demands obedience as well as knowledge, and employs the categories of light, life, and love. It is a striking fact that there is no direct allusion to the Old Testament.

[1] It is this docetic interpretation of Jesus that appears in the Gospel of Peter: "And the Lord cried out and said: My power, my power, thou hast forsaken me. And when he had said it, he was taken up."

XII. THE IGNATIAN CHRISTOLOGY

The seven genuine letters of Ignatius[1] and the letter of Polycarp to the Philippians were written either during the latter part of Trajan's reign,[2] or during that of Hadrian (117–38 A. D.).[3] These letters present an interesting contrast from a christological standpoint, and those of Ignatius mark the beginnings of a new type of Christology.

I. POLYCARP

The epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians was occasioned by a communication from the Philippian church to Polycarp, requesting that he convey to Syria a letter they had written at Ignatius' suggestion, and asking also that he send them any of Ignatius' letters he might have, as well as a letter from himself for their edification (3:1, 13). Polycarp wrote to them simply, practically, and temperately. Most striking is his large use of the New Testament books. The repeated use of First Peter attracted the attention of Eusebius.[4] Great value attached to the words of Jesus, which are introduced as in First Clement with the formula: "The Lord said" (2:3; 7:2). Paul is referred to by name, especially in connection with the fact that in person he taught the Philippians carefully and surely and when absent wrote them a letter (or "letters," ἐπιστολάς). In one instance the words of Paul are quoted as from sacred Scriptures (12:1: "sacris literis . . . . his scripturis"), but part of the quotation is from the Old Testament (Ps. 4:5; Eph. 4:26), which Polycarp probably had in mind.

Although he is not animated with the dogmatic spirit of the fiery Ignatius, yet he takes occasion to warn against prevailing false doctrine. Ever prone to regard matter as the source of evil, gnostic teachers denied that Christ entered into actual contact with earthly things; his coming in the flesh and his suffering and death were illusory. The resurrection of believers was spiritual only. Turning from these false teachings to the word delivered from the beginning, Polycarp declares: "For everyone who does not confess that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh is Antichrist, and

[1] It is to be noted that Pfleiderer (*Urchristentum*, II, S. 227), although he had, along with the Tübingen critics, opposed the genuineness of these letters, later acknowledged that Lightfoot had convinced him of their genuineness.

[2] Euseb., *H. E.* 3:36.

[3] The traditional date is 107; Lightfoot gives 110, Harnack 117, Pfleiderer 130.

[4] *H. E.* 4:15: *κέχρηταί τισι μαρτυρίαις ἀπὸ τῆς Πέτρου προτέρας ἐπιστολῆς.*

whoever confesses not the testimony of the cross is of the devil, and whoever perverts the oracles of the Lord to his own desires and says that there is neither resurrection nor judgment, that man is the firstborn of Satan" (7:1).

The language used of Christ is in general that of the traditional Christology (2:1, 2). As in First Peter and Clement, the example of the Lord is appealed to in an ethical manner (2:2, 3). Christ is most frequently called "our Lord;" once, as in Hebrews, "the eternal high priest" (12:2: *sempiternus pontifex* for ὁ αἰώνιος ἀρχιερεύς). If we follow the quotations in Timotheus and Severus instead of the Latin there is a reference to the "God Jesus Christ" in 12:2, after the style of Ignatius; and farther on in the same passage there is similar language according to a not improbable Latin reading.

It is in line with a tendency of the time that the Christian prophets are ignored, and appeal is made to the Lord himself who gave commandment, the apostles who preached the gospel, and the prophets who proclaimed beforehand the coming of our Lord (6:3).

II. IGNATIUS

Circumstances connected with his approaching martyrdom occasioned the seven genuine letters of Ignatius that we possess. He has been condemned to the wild beasts, on what definite charge is not known to us, and the Flavian amphitheater is the appointed place of execution. At the time of his departure for Rome the peace of his Antiochene church is disturbed. On his Romeward journey he is in the custody of ten soldiers, "leopards," who treat him with harshness. On reaching Smyrna he receives delegates from churches of Asia Minor. Four of his letters written from this place are extant. Those addressed to the Ephesians, Magnesians, and Trallians, who had sent delegates to him at Smyrna, have to do with doctrine and ecclesiastical order. The fourth, that to the Romans, written on the twenty-fourth of August, is occupied with the thought of his coming martyrdom. He fears that his friends will interpose in his behalf, and thereby inflict a wound upon him. Here his fierce enthusiasm reaches its highest point. He longs for the honor of discipleship which martyrdom will confer upon him. He is wheat of God, and is ground by the teeth of wild beasts, so as to be found pure bread of the Christ (4:1). From Troas he writes three letters. The first and second are addressed to the churches of Philadelphia and Smyrna, which he had visited personally on the route; the third is to Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna. Having heard that peace has been restored in the church at Antioch, he desires that the churches with

which he communicates and Polycarp send delegates or letters to Syria to congratulate and exhort the Antiochene brotherhood.

Ignatius is tremendously impressed with the fact that the churches are confronted with a real danger from false doctrine. Doctrinal purity, the unity of the faith, is to be secured by strict ecclesiastical order, of which the bishop is the center; this is urged in every letter. Everywhere it is apparent that it is a thoroughgoing docetism against which his teaching is directed, such as is dealt with in the epistle to the Colossians, the Johannine epistles and gospel, and the Pastoral Epistles. Before the mind of Ignatius is a particular form of Judaistic Gnosticism. Now we know that Antioch was a center of gnostic syncretism. Saturninus, a native of Antioch who flourished 100–120 A. D., taught that Christ was without birth, body, or figure, appearing in semblance as a man. Basilides flourished during the reign of Hadrian; he was educated in Syria and the East, and taught in Alexandria. It was his contention that Simon the Cyrenian was crucified, by a trick or magic, instead of Jesus.[1]

A few passages from Ignatius will suffice to show how he meets these errors. Against phantasmal conceptions he urges the word ἀληθῶς. The birth, passion, and resurrection of Jesus Christ truly and assuredly took place in the time of the governorship of Pontius Pilate.[2]

Be deaf, therefore, when any man speaks to you apart from Jesus Christ, who was of the race of David, the son of Mary, who was truly born and ate and drank, was truly persecuted under Pontius Pilate, was truly crucified and died in the sight of those in heaven and on earth and under the earth; who was also truly raised from the dead, his Father having raised him; and he will in like manner raise us who believe on him—that is, his Father will raise us in Christ Jesus, apart from whom we have no true life. But if it were as certain persons who are godless, that is unbelievers, say, that he seemed to suffer, being themselves the seeming, why am I bound, and why also do I desire to fight with wild beasts? So I die in vain; accordingly then I lie against the Lord.[3]

To the Smyrnaeans he writes:

I glorify Jesus Christ the God who bestowed such wisdom upon you; for I have perceived that you are established in immovable faith, nailed as it were on the cross of the Lord Jesus Christ both in flesh and spirit, settled in love in the blood of Christ, fully persuaded with reference to our Lord that he is truly of the race of David according to the flesh, Son of God according to the will and power of God, born truly of a virgin, baptized by John that all righteousness might be fulfilled by him, truly nailed up in the flesh for our sakes under Pontius Pilate and Herod the tetrarch—of which fruit are we, of his most blessed passion—that

[1] Iren., *Haer.* 1:24:4.

[2] Mag. 11. [3] Tral. 9, 10.

he might raise a signal unto the ages through the resurrection for his saints and faithful ones, whether among Jews or among gentiles, in one body of his church. For he suffered all these things for our sakes, that we might be saved; and he suffered truly, as he also truly raised himself (an unusual expression), not as some unbelievers say, that he seemed to suffer, being themselves the seeming; and as they think, it shall also happen to them, because they are bodyless and demoniacal. For I know and believe that he was in the flesh even after the resurrection. And when he came to those who were about Peter, he said to them: Take, handle me and see that I am not a bodyless demon. And instantly they touched him and believed, holding to his flesh and spirit. Wherefore they also despised death, moreover were found superior to death. And after the resurrection he ate with them and drank with them as sarkical, though he was spiritually united with the Father (1–3).

We are constantly coming upon the most striking and startling expressions. He delights in speaking of "Jesus Christ our God." He mentions "the blood of God" (Eph., chap. 1) and "the passion of my God" (Rom. 6:3). "Our God Jesus the Christ was conceived in the womb by Mary" (18:2). "Even the heavenly beings and the glory of the angels and the rulers both visible and invisible" are under the necessity of believing in Christ's blood for salvation.[1] False teachers appealed to the archives—doubtless chiefly the Old Testament scriptures. Ignatius is willing to quote what is written, but adds: "But as for me, my archives are Jesus Christ; the inviolable archives are his cross and death and his resurrection and the faith which is through him" (Phil. 8:2). Jesus Christ is the "door of the Father," through which prophets and apostles and the church enter (Phil. 9:1). "There is one God who manifested himself through Jesus Christ his Son, who is his word proceeding from silence, who in all things pleased him that sent him."[2]

The prophets in whom Ignatius believes are those of the Old Testament. "For the divine prophets lived according to Christ Jesus. For this cause also they were persecuted, being inspired by his grace. . . . . Even the prophets, being his disciples in the spirit, were expecting him as their teacher; and on this account he whom they rightly awaited, when he came, raised them from the dead."[3]

"Wherever the bishop appears, there let the multitude be; just as wherever Christ Jesus is, there is the universal church."[4]

The contrast between these two contemporaries and friends, Polycarp and Ignatius, is striking throughout. In Polycarp there is no mention of

[1] Smyr. 6:1.

[2] Mag. 8:2.

[3] Mag. 8:2; 9:3.

[4] Smyr. 8:2: ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία.

the episcopate, though in Ignatius it constitutes the guarantee of orthodoxy and unity. In Polycarp there is no word about the unity of the church, the only occurrence of ἐκκλησία being in the address. Ignatius turned to large practical use the Pauline thought of the oneness of the church as the body of Christ.

Ignatius is akin to Paul on the mystical side, especially in his emphasis upon the union of the believer with Christ. Polycarp's likeness to Paul is on the practical and ethical side; his letter resembles First Peter, Clement, and the Pastoral Epistles. Ignatius speaks of Jesus Christ and Christ Jesus; Polycarp of the Lord and our Lord, with and without the addition of Jesus Christ. Three times in Polycarp we read of "God and Christ" (3:3; 5:2, 3); not at all in Ignatius. There is in Polycarp nothing of the blood and suffering of God. He mentions the cross of Christ twice (7:1; 12:2) in referring to enemies of the true faith, and the blood of Christ once (2:1), as a crime demanding vengeance. On the other hand Ignatius lays the greatest stress on the passion and death of Christ, though he does not develop its theological significance, as Paul attempted to do.

Polycarp, the younger man, is the sane and conservative representative of the apostolic tradition; Ignatius, the elder, realizing present dangers and looking toward the future, is the passionate champion of the new, the pioneer in doctrine and polity, masterful in personality and pre-eminent in originality, surpassed only in his generation by that profound religious genius of the same part of the world whose spiritual insight into the character of Jesus and prevailing religious tendencies brought to the interpretation of the person of Christ more enduring expression in the Fourth Gospel.

XIII. CHRISTOLOGY IN THE EPISTLE OF BARNABAS AND IN LATER WORKS

I. THE EPISTLE OF BARNABAS

The Epistle of Barnabas is a monument of Alexandrian Christianity. The earliest notices of it are found in the Alexandrian Fathers. The closing chapters (18–21; ἑτέρα γνῶσις) constitute a manual of Christian conduct to be viewed apart from the rest of the book, both internal and manuscript evidence weighing against original unity. On the basis of chap. 4 Lightfoot would date the work in Vespasian's reign (70–79 A. D.), but the allusion to the Roman emperors is too uncertain and elastic for the fixing of the date. Harnack finds in chap. 16 a reference to the proposed building of the heathen temple at Jerusalem under Hadrian in 130 or 131. The allusion is doubtful, but this later date comes nearer corresponding to the general course of thought in the epistle.

The most striking characteristic of the epistle is the author's peculiar attitude toward Judaism and the Old Testament. In his rejection of Judaism and his Christianizing of the Old Testament he stands on familiar orthodox ground. But he does not hold with the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews that historical Judaism was a divinely ordained and preparatory stage of revelation. For Barnabas it was a perversion of true religion due to an entire misunderstanding. He is likewise removed from the gnostic opposition between the Old Testament and the New, as though the Old Testament were the work of another and lower God than the God of Christianity. Yet he approaches that position more nearly than orthodox Christian writers would have dared in a later time, when the lines were closely drawn; for he represents that the practice of circumcision was due to the suggestion of an evil angel (9:4). Nevertheless the Old Testament is still for him divine revelation and is quoted throughout as authoritative. Only it is so thoroughly Christianized by the allegorical method familiar to Alexandrians that the spiritual meaning alone is left. The Jews misunderstood the law and the prophets from beginning to end. Sacrifice, circumcision, the distinction of clean and unclean meats, the Sabbath, and worship in a material temple were not originally intended to be literally observed. Commands for such ordinances were uttered in a spiritual sense.

The same world of gnostic thought is probably presupposed, as stands uot prominently in the passionate exhortations and denunciations of

Ignatius. But however vigorously they might protest against the new ideas, most of the writers who came in contact with them were influenced by them and in a measure appropriated them. An example is found in the Epistle to the Ephesians, and a still better example in the Fourth Gospel. Now the same is true of Barnabas. He too can protest: note the polemics against esoteric customs and other errors (4:10; 3:6; 4:6). He is certainly not a docetist. The Son of God really came and suffered in the flesh (chap. 5). But some of his language is so close to docetism that it would not have been kindly received by the church at a somewhat later period, as the following: "See again Jesus, not Son of man but Son of God, yet in type (*τύπῳ*) manifested in flesh. Since then they are going to say that Christ is son of David, David himself, fearing and understanding the error of sinners, prophesies: The Lord said to my Lord: Sit on my right hand till I set thine enemies a footstool of thy feet. . . . . See how David calls him Lord and does not call him son."[1]

The passage, "As it is written, Many called but few chosen," is supposed to mark the words of Jesus as Holy Scripture (4:14), but it is possible the quotation is from another source, and *ὡς γέγραπται* may be employed in a more general sense. The thought of the inspiration of Old Testament prophets by Christ, occurring in First Peter, Clement, and Ignatius, appears here: "The prophets, receiving grace from him, prophesied concerning him" (5:6). As Lord of all the world he was consulted by God in the creation of man (5:5).

With First Peter and Ignatius, following Paul, he emphasizes the death of Christ as a means of redemption: "For to this end the Lord endured to deliver his flesh to corruption, that by the forgiveness of sins we might be cleansed, which is by the blood of his sprinkling. . . . . Now he himself endured that he might destroy death and show the resurrection from the dead, because it was necessary that he be manifested in flesh, that he might also redeem the promise made to the fathers and by preparing the new people for himself might show, while he was on the earth, that having himself brought about the resurrection he will judge" (5:1, 6, 7). He came also for judgment upon those who slew his prophets (5:11)—not only a familiar messianic thought, but also in another way a prominent Johannine conception. The doctrine of regeneration appearing in First Peter and the Johannine writings is here set forth repeatedly: "Since then he renewed us in the remission of sins, he made us another type, so as to have the soul of children, as if he were creating us anew" (6:11). The abode of our heart is a holy temple to the Lord (6:15). "If then the Son of God,

[1] 12:10, 11; Pfleiderer, *Urchr.*, II, S. 560, 562, pushes the author's words too far.

being Lord and about to judge living and dead, suffered, that his wound might make us alive, let us believe that the Son of God could not suffer except for our sakes" (7:2).

The connection between faith and hope is similar to that in First Peter, with the added element of γνῶσις. The author writes in order that with their faith the readers may have their γνῶσις perfect. The three dogmas of the Lord are hope of life, righteousness, and love. Hope of life is the beginning and end of our faith (1:5, 6). The new law of our Lord Jesus Christ is without a yoke of constraint (2:6). The covenant of the beloved Jesus is sealed unto our hearts in the hope of faith in him (4:8).

II. THE EPISTLE OF JAMES

The Epistle of James is singularly misunderstood when taken to represent pre-Pauline Christianity. It is a practical homily arising probably in the second quarter of the second century, possibly somewhat earlier; but neither external attestation nor the conditions reflected favor an early date. The author was probably a Hellenistic Jew, but the wall between Jewish and gentile Christianity had long been broken down, and the homily betrays no reminiscence of the old issues. The address "to the twelve tribes which are of the Diaspora," in imitation it would seem of I Pet. 1:1, possibly attached by a later hand, is as in First Peter figuratively applied to Christians in general. Hermas makes the same kind of use of "the twelve tribes."[1] Christians had entered into the heritage of the Jews as God's chosen people; Paul's doctrine of Christ's people as the true Israel passed over into the consciousness of the church.[2] Such election was ever conditioned on men's conduct.[3] The mention of the synagogue in 2:2 need not surprise us; Hermas uses the word in the same way.[4] The likeness to Hermas suggests Rome as the place of composition. Both are protests of popular piety against the secularization of the church through wealth and intellectual pride. The apocalyptic element of Hermas is wanting in the straightforward Epistle of James; otherwise the general conceptions and the conditions to which they are addressed are the same. James makes the larger use of other literature; his mind is well furnished with the Old Testament and later Jewish and Christian literature, but he does not make direct quotations. The epistle is a good specimen of the Jewish Wisdom-literature as it was carried over into the Christian church, and we are reminded of the Sermon on the Mount.

Admonitions against erroneous teachers are like those of Hermas.[5]

[1] Sim. 9:17:1.
[2] As in II Clem. 2:3.
[3] II Pet. 1:10; Her. Sim. 8:6:2.
[4] Man. 11:9, 13, 14.
[5] Ja. 3:13–18; Her. Man. 11; Sim. 8:9.

His characterization of pseudo-wisdom as psychical (3:15) reminds us of Jude, vs. 19. The intimation that some claim to be tempted of God (1:13) recalls the murmurers and complainers of Jude, vs. 16. Against an ultra-Pauline *gnosis* he appeals for a practical Christianity.

The conception of Christ as the revealer of a new and higher law for the government of human life—a view common to nearly all writings of the latter part of the first Christian century and of the second—here finds striking expression. Outside of the Ebionitic communities of Palestine, whose members were the successors of the Judaizers, the name of the apostle Paul was ever held in high honor, and his influence had entered permanently into the Christian movement. But the Christianity of the latter part of the first century and of the second century was of quite another type. Paul's teachings had grown out of his own experience, and it could not be expected that gentiles and Hellenistic Jews who had not undergone the same discipline of conscience and never possessed natures of such religious depth should appreciate or understand his profound way of putting things. Other missionaries had their own way of seeing things, and the easiest and most natural way was that of thinking of their religion as God's law revealed in Jesus Christ. The freedom of the Christian, whether gentile or Jew, from all obligation to observe the Jewish ceremonial law was no longer questioned; the old controversy was well-nigh forgotten. Among non-Christian Hellenistic Jews and proselytes there were many to whom the observance of ceremonial rites meant almost nothing; their religion consisted of faith in one God, his moral law, and a final judgment. When they became Christians, righteousness still consisted in obedience to the revealed law of God; but it was a "perfect law which is of freedom," a "royal law" (1:25; 2:8, 12); as Barnabas has so happily put it, "the new law of our Lord Jesus Christ which is without a yoke of constraint."[1] It really meant a new standard of living, and practically just that kind advocated by Paul. But Paul's bold principle was that the Christian is free from all external law; the very presence of Christ in the heart of the believer makes him a free child of God. For Jesus likewise, religion consisted in the filial relation to God expressing itself in unselfish love.

For James the law of Christ was not a burden, but a blessing, a part of the gospel, opening to men the way of life, as in Hermas.[2] The man who stands firm under temptation will, when he has endured the test, receive the crown of life (1:12). God chose the poor as to the world to be rich in faith and heirs of the kingdom which he promised to those who love him

[1] Bar. 2:6. [2] Sim. 6:11:1.

(2:5). The *parousia* of the Lord, which is at hand, is awaited with joy (5:7, 8).

Paul thought of faith as a spiritual act in which we identify ourselves with Christ in his death and resurrection. For James it is the opposite of doubt and doublemindedness (1:6, 8; 2:22), as in Hermas (Man., chap. 9) and Second Clement (chap. 11), or it is bare belief.

There is no further reference to the redemptive work of Christ. James calls himself "a bondservant of the Lord Jesus Christ" (1:1), and calls him "the Lord of glory" (2:1). The Lord's teachings as recorded in the synoptic gospels are drawn upon. He is the Judge standing before the doors.[1] To him is probably the reference in 4:12: "One is lawgiver and judge, he who is able to save and to destroy."

With the conception of Jesus as a lawgiver which prevailed in the church at this time it will be interesting to compare the view of Marcion, which rested on a Pauline basis and excluded everything that did not harmonize with the gospel preached by Paul. Marcion was a man of sincerity, energy, and deep religious faith, though in the eyes of church writers he was demon, firstborn of Satan, Jew, heathen, heretic, and wolf. Writing in the middle of the second century, Justin Martyr says that Marcion's preaching had already spread *κατὰ πᾶν γένος ἀνθρώπων*[2]—that is, in a period of about ten years. Unfortunately we are dependent on anti-heretical writings for his views.

Marcion was opposed to all statutory religion, and believed that the prevailing form of Christianity had been corrupted by Judaism; accordingly he sought to sever Christianity from the Old Testament. We are not here concerned with his gnostic views—enough that he popularized and simplified Gnosticism, making it no longer the secret doctrine of a school but the faith of a church appealing to the masses. What now interests us is that he was able to discern the religious peculiarity of Christianity in distinction from Judaism—to grasp the Pauline idea of Christ's relation to the law. His disciple Apelles held that those who hoped in the Crucified would be saved, if only they were found doing good works.[3] Tertullian[4] reveals Marcion's point of view: "Sufficit unicum opus deo nostro, quod hominem liberavit summa et praecipua bonitate sua." Tertullian complains that the Marcionites do not fear God at all, claiming that only a bad man is to be feared, while a good man is to be loved. If they were asked why then they did not sin, they answered, "God forbid!" (Rom. 6:1, 2).[5]

[1] 5:9; see Apoc. 3:20.

[2] Apol. 150.

[3] Euseb., *H. E.* 5:13:5.

[4] *Adv. Marc.* 1:27.

[5] On Marcion see especially Harnack, *Dogmengeschichte*, I, S. 254–71 (*History of Dogma*, I, pp. 266–86).

III. THE SHEPHERD OF HERMAS

This work is the most extensive that comes before us for consideration in our period. The author was a slave by birth, probably originally from Arcadia but sold by his master to a Roman lady.[1] He seems to have become a freedman and to have engaged in commercial pursuits. His parables are mostly taken from country life. He was a humble, simple-minded, devout man, who was deeply sensible of evil within himself and in the church. His characteristic message is that of repentance. He delivers his message in apocalyptic fashion as from divine messengers. The Muratorian Fragment of the end of the second century says that he was brother of Pius, bishop of Rome (140–55 A. D.). Internal evidence confirms this dating of the book. The church had experienced "scourges, prisons, great tribulations, crosses, wild beasts, for the sake of the Name."[2] The work was not produced at one time, but probably stretches over a period of at least ten years.[3] Something of a difficulty is raised by the command to Hermas to write two copies of his book and to send one to Clement and one to Grapte, whereupon Clement would send his to foreign cities and Grapte would admonish the widows and orphans; he himself is to read it in Rome along with the presbyters who preside over the church.[4] One thinks at once of Clement of Rome, the author of the letter written to the Corinthian church about 95 A. D., but it is difficult to get this work back that far. The name was a common one in Rome.

The work consists of five Visions, twelve Commandments, and ten Parables (unhappily called Similitudes). The book takes its name from the prominent part played in it by the angel of repentance, who appeared to Hermas in the guise of a shepherd and bade him write down the commandments and parables he would declare to him (Vis. 5).

Perhaps we ought not to look too closely for Christology in Hermas. There are whole sections much longer than the Epistle of James which contain just as little Christology as James. The conception of Christ is about that of the church writings of the period, but it is not always set forth in the current terms. Christianity is the new law and Christ the Lawgiver: "Having then purged away the sins of the people he showed them the paths of life, giving them the law which he received from his Father."[5] He is also the Judge, who decides which stones should be accepted or rejected in the building of his church. He is the Councilor of God, the holy, pre-existent Spirit, who created every creature, and

[1] Vis. 1:1:1; Sim. 9:1:4.
[2] Vis. 3:2:1.
[3] Vis. 2:1:1; 5:5; Sim. 9:1.
[4] Vis. 2:4:3.
[5] Sim. 5:6:3.

whom God made to dwell in flesh. The Spirit of God was united with the σάρξ, which was nobly subject to the Holy Spirit. He lived excellently, purely, vigorously, and courageously, co-operating with the Spirit (Sim. 5:6). The universality of Christ's saving mission is everywhere recognized. Even Old Testament characters in Hades stood in need that apostles and teachers should preach to them the name of the Son of God and administer to them Christian baptism (Sim. 9:16, 17).

His favorite title for Christ is "the Son of God." There is no mention of "Jesus" and "Christ." Κύριος is used of God. In the eighth parable the angel shows Hermas a great willow tree overshadowing plains and mountains and all the earth, and under its shade have come all that are called by the name of the Lord. This mighty tree is the Law of God given to go forth into all the world; and the Law is the Son of God proclaimed to the ends of the earth, and the peoples under the shade are they that hear the proclamation and believe on him. In the ninth parable the rock and the gate of the tower are the Son of God. The rock is old and the gate is new. The rock is old because the Son of God is older than his creatures; he was Fellow-councilor with the Father in the work of creation. The gate is new because he became manifest in the days of the consummation, that those who are to be saved may enter by the gate into the kingdom of God (Sim. 9:12).

A peculiarity is that he is prevailingly identified with the Holy Spirit: the Spirit is the Son of God (Sim. 9:1:1). We recall that this usage was not unknown to Paul and John. Nor should we be surprised that he is associated with six angels as their head. Hermas knew nothing of the Logos-doctrine. Before that took possession of the field there were those in the church who expressed their conception of the nature and office of Christ by designating him an angel.

There is no mention of the birth, death, resurrection, and ascension of Jesus; nothing is said of his priestly mediation and the atoning quality of his death. In his whole life and activity he saves, preserving and purifying God's people, and pointing out the path of life by promulgating the divine law (Sim. 5:6:2). It would of course be rash to conclude that because in general the Pauline conception of redemption is wanting, the author actually excludes the expiatory death.

Harnack[1] reduces the christological conceptions of our period to two, which are, strictly speaking, mutually exclusive: the Adoptian and the Pneumatic. According to the Adoptian Christology, Jesus is to be regarded as the man chosen by God, in whom the Spirit of God dwells; after being

[1] *Dogmengeschichte*, I, S. 181–90 (*History of Dogma*, I, pp. 190–99).

tested he was adopted by God and invested with dominion. In the Pneumatic Christology Jesus is a heavenly, spiritual being who took flesh and returned to heaven after the completion of his work on earth. Here are certainly two conceptions: a man who has become a God, and a divine being who has appeared in human form. But if Harnack is right in saying that "only one work has been preserved entire which gives clear expression to the Adoptian Christology, viz., the Shepherd of Hermas," then we ought to raise its Christology to the rank of an independent, distinctive type to be co-ordinated with the great original types, and to call it "Adoptian Christology." But this classification confuses more than it helps. Harnack says that the Pneumatic Christology may be traced back to the Pauline, but hardly had its point of departure in Paul alone, being found also in Hebrews and the Johannine writings including the Apocalypse, and it is represented by Barnabas, First and Second Clement, Ignatius, Polycarp, and the Pastoral Epistles. He might with equal right have added Hermas and all the other Christian writings we have considered.

IV. THE DIDACHE

The Didache is a composite work, reflecting accordingly several standpoints. In its present form it dates from about the middle of the second Christian century, finding its closest ethical and theological parallels in Hermas, James, and Second Clement. It has also relationship at more than one point with Barnabas. The proper title is: "Teaching of the Lord through the Twelve Apostles to the Nations." The original document is doubtless the Greek lying behind a Latin manuscript discovered by Schlecht in 1899, entitled *De Doctrina Apostolorum*. This sets aside the older supposition of an original "Two-Ways Document." Schlecht's Latin covers the first six chapters of the "Teaching" as we have it now in the fuller form, omitting certain gospel-quotations and other amplifications. To this was added a church manual and an apocalyptical chapter. The rural atmosphere of the work in its expanded form would indicate that it originated not in Alexandria but in Upper Egypt. However, in spite of the great mass of Egyptian papyri from the second century now known to us, very little of the papyri shows Christian influence.

The author regards Christianity in the aspect presented in Second Clement, as the truth made known to us by Christ. The point of view is brought out in the beautiful eucharistic prayers: "We give thee thanks, our Father, for the life and knowledge which thou hast made known to us through Jesus thy servant" (9:3). "We give thee thanks, holy Father, for thy holy name which thou hast made to dwell in our hearts, and for the

knowledge and faith and immortality which thou hast made known to us through Jesus thy servant. . . . . On us thou hast bestowed spiritual food and drink and life everlasting through thy Servant. . . . . Remember, Lord, thy church to deliver her from all evil and to perfect her in thy love, and to gather her from the four winds, sanctified, into thy kingdom, which thou hast prepared for her. For thine is the power and the glory forever. Let grace come and this world pass away! Hosanna to the God of David!" (chap. 10).

Baptism is, after preparatory fasting, to be administered in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit (chap. 7). The eucharist is spiritual food and drink, securing eternal life, as we have seen (10:3); it is also the offering of the church, answering to the Old Testament sacrifice, valid only as accompanied by confession of sin and brotherly love (chap. 14). Its Pauline connection with the death of Christ for the forgiveness of sins is not here indicated. However, the broken bread which was scattered over the hills and brought together and made one, symbolizing the church gathered from the ends of the earth into the kingdom (9:4), reminds one of 1 Cor. 10:16, 17.

The closing chapter is a bit of apocalyptic, drawn in part from the Synoptic Gospels, and in part, it would seem, from Barnabas (4:9). We have the last time, the false prophets, the world-seducer like a son of God, an apostasy on the part of some, an opening in heaven, the voice of a trumpet, the resurrection of the saints, the coming of the Lord upon the clouds of heaven (chap. 16).

V. SECOND CLEMENT

Second Clement appears to be in the strict sense a homily or sermon (17:3; 19:1), whether actually preached or not. Harnack, however, identifies it with the long-lost letter which the Roman Christians under Bishop Soter (165–75 A. D.) sent to the Corinthians, and which was by them to be preserved along with the genuine letter of Clement.[1] Lightfoot thinks that it was an anonymous Corinthian sermon, chap. 7 breathing the atmosphere of the stadium. Its traditional connection with First Clement and the kinship in thought to Hermas point toward Rome as its source. On the other hand the points of contact in thought with the Didache and with Second Peter and its use of an apocryphal gospel, probably that to the Egyptians, suggest Egypt. The word of the Lord cited in 12:2 is, according to Clement of Alexandria,[2] from the Gospel according to the Egyptians,

[1] Euseb., *H. E.* 4:23:11.

[2] Strom. 3:13.

and presumably other gospel quotations that are not otherwise known to us are from the same source (4:5; 5:3; 8:5). At any rate it is a typical Christian writing from about the middle of the second century. The Pauline coloring of First Clement is wanting.

The christological standpoint is indicated in the opening words and in the closing doxology. "Brethren, we ought to think of Jesus Christ as of a God—as of a Judge of living and dead" (1:1). For, he goes on to say, to think meanly of him would be to place a low estimate upon our Christian salvation. Faith in the deity of Christ meant a corresponding estimate of the Christian religion, which as compared with Judaism and paganism was the absolute religion—a position emphasized in the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Fourth Gospel. Of course the relation of Christ to the Father and to the Holy Spirit is not yet defined as it was later. A passage from Isaiah is quoted as the word of Christ (3:4), and a saying of Jesus in the gospels is ascribed to God (13:4). The ascription of salvation now to God and now to Christ is common in Ignatius and the Johannine theology. So also Christ is identified with the Spirit: "If Christ the Lord who saved us, though he was first Spirit, became flesh and thus called us, then we also shall receive the reward in this flesh" (9:5). In 14:4 Christ is again said to be the Spirit. So in Hermas the pre-existent Christ is pre-eminently the Spirit, to whom other spirits are subordinate. The Johannine writings were apparently not known to either Clement or Hermas.

The connection of Christ with truth and immortality is brought out in the final doxology: "To the only invisible God, Father of the truth, who sent us the Savior and Prince of incorruption, through whom also he revealed to us the truth and the heavenly life, to him be the glory unto the ages. Amen" (20:5). Christ's revelation of God, immortality, and the way of life forms the very center of this writer's Christology. Through Christ, who has displayed so great mercy toward us, we know the Father of truth (3:1). "He has graciously given us light; as a father he has addressed us as sons; he has saved us when we were perishing" (1:4). "Thus also did the Christ desire to save the things which were perishing, and saved many by his coming and calling us when we were already perishing" (2:7). The Pauline use of the death of Christ in this connection is almost wholly absent; in 1:2 we read: "he submitted to suffer for our sakes."

Gradually the Greek spirit displaced the Jewish. The Jewish idea of the visible kingdom to be established on earth in the new age at Christ's second coming was practically supplanted by the hope of the heavenly, eternal life in the presence of God and Christ and the saints. In some

circles the Jewish idea of the earthly messianic kingdom persisted. Yet the transition from the dualism of Jewish apocalypticism to the gentile dualism of matter and spirit was not difficult. "This age and the coming age are two enemies" (6:3). The corollary to the older messianic idea was the resurrection of the body. Even Paul placed emphasis on the spiritual side; the resurrection was a part of redemption from the flesh. But it is the resurrection of the flesh of which Second Clement speaks (9:1–5), as is also true of First Clement.

Another aspect of his Christology is found in the relation between Christ and the church. Those who do the will of God are of the first, the spiritual church, which was created before sun and moon—the church of the life, the living church which is the body of Christ. God made man male and female; the male is Christ, the female the church (14:1–3). Likewise Hermas teaches that the church was created before all things, and the world was formed for her sake.[1]

VI. THE EPISTLES OF JUDE AND SECOND PETER

1. *Jude*

This short and vigorous epistle probably dates from near the middle of the second century, though it may be much earlier. It is possible that the words ἀδελφὸς δὲ Ἰακώβου did not stand in the original, in which case the work is not pseudonymous. The use of the Book of Enoch and of the Assumption of Moses and the writer's possible knowledge of the Carpocratian heresy suggest Alexandria as the place of composition.

The aim and spirit of the letter are seen in the opening exhortation to contend for the faith which was once for all delivered to the saints (vs. 3). As in the Pastoral Epistles, faith is the deposit handed down from apostolic days (vs. 20). The occasion for the epistle is the existence of a presumptuous and aggressive gnostic libertinism. It is evident that they were libertines on principle; that their libertinism was bound up with their gnostic system and justified by it: they turned the grace of God into lasciviousness (vs. 4), in their dreamings they defiled the flesh (vs. 8), their mouth spoke pompous words (vs. 16), and they made divisions, being themselves psychical, having not the Spirit, though as implied they claimed the contrary (vs. 19). They perverted Paul's doctrine of grace and freedom: for them all things were lawful and they continued in sin (I Cor. 6:12; Rom. 6:1). It was just this that the followers of Carpocrates and his son Epiphanes did. The Gnostics also recognized two classes of men: the spiritual, capable of the higher wisdom, who separated themselves from the mass of

[1] Vis. 2:4:1.

Christians; and the inferior, psychical natures. Against the pernicious teaching and living of these antinomians the author appeals to the words spoken beforehand by the apostles of the Lord Jesus Christ, who foretold that in the last time such scoffers would appear (vss. 17, 18)—an apparent reference to the Pastoral Epistles.

The writer calls himself "a bondservant of Jesus Christ" and addresses his letter to "the called, beloved in God the Father and kept for Jesus Christ" (vs. 1). The false teachers denounced, who appear still to have met with the Christians in their love feasts (vs. 12), not only set at nought dominion (*κυριότητα*) and blasphemed glories (*δόξας*, perhaps angels, vs. 8), but even "denied our only Master (*Δεσπότην*) and Lord, Jesus Christ" (vs. 4). Such denial may have been the docetic denial of his true humanity, combated by Ignatius, or the denial that the man Jesus was the Christ, the Son of God, referred to in I John 2:22. The readers are to keep themselves in the love of God, "awaiting the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ unto life eternal," and putting forth efforts to reclaim these false teachers (vss. 21, 22). The epistle closes with a Pauline doxology, like that subjoined to Romans.

II. *Second Peter*

Nearly the whole of Jude is incorporated substantially, but not very happily, in II Pet. 2:1—3:3. Second Peter is a pseudonymous work in the strictest sense, arising probably in the second half of the second century. The use of the name of Peter suggests Rome for its origin; the use of Jude points toward Egypt. The reference to Peter's approaching death seems to recall the chapter added to the Fourth Gospel (1:14; John 21:18, 19). The author lacks the culture and depth of the writer of First Peter. The differences between the two epistles are fundamental throughout. The Paulinism, the use made of the example, the sufferings and the resurrection of Christ in First Peter are wanting in Second Peter.

The key-word of First Peter is hope; that of Second Peter is knowledge (*γνῶσις*, *ἐπίγνωσις*, 1:2, 3, 6, 8; 2:20, 21; 3:18). The writer is an opponent of the Gnostics, and yet betrays an unconscious sympathy with their way of thinking.[1] Yet knowledge is for him of a practical and

[1] The type of Gnosticism represented by Marcion and Apelles cannot justly be charged with identifying Christianity and knowledge; indeed, if such identification is Gnosticism, then their opponents were the Gnostics. Apelles said that he was persuaded that there was one principle (*μία ἀρχή*), but *how* he did not know; he believed there was one unbegotten God, but he did not know the *how* of it. Rhodon laughed and reproved him because, though calling himself a teacher, he knew not how to confirm what he taught (Euseb., *H. E.* 5:13:7).

religious character, including all things that belong to life and piety (1:3). A Greek idea of which the Gnostics made much—participation in the divine nature and liberation from the corruption of the world—is here appropriated (1:4). The authorities for Christian truth are the words spoken by the holy prophets and the commandment of the Lord and Savior through the apostles (3:2). Paul's epistles are ranked high, being associated with "the other scriptures" (*τὰς λοιπὰς γραφάς*), which the unlearned and unsteadfast twist to their own destruction, as encouraging to license (3:15, 16).

Faith in the second coming of Christ for salvation and judgment had been growing faint in some quarters on account of the long delay (3:4). The Gnostics rejected early Christian eschatology, including the second coming of Christ and the establishment of his kingdom on earth and the resurrection of the body. The fact is that this very tendency is apparent in general Christian literature at the time. But our author assures them that the day of the Lord is to come suddenly, the world is to be destroyed by fire, and from the wreck shall emerge new heavens and a new earth, in which dwells righteousness (3:10–13). The glory of the Transfiguration is pledge of a greater glory to be revealed in the *parousia* (1:16–18). At the second advent is to be ushered in "the eternal kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ" (1:11).

False teachers who introduce destructive divisions (*αἱρέσεις*) deny the Master who bought them (*τὸν ἀγοράσαντα αὐτοὺς δεσπότην*, 2:1).

Second Peter marks chronologically the close of the New Testament period.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

When we in our modern world interpret Jesus anew in the light of our new experiences, we are but doing what men of the first and second Christian centuries did, and what men have been doing ever since. In the reconstruction of our theological thinking that is now taking place, a new Christology is demanded; or, if we prefer not to use the word Christology in this connection, a new estimate of him whose life is the light of men, brought into relation with the rest of our knowledge. Many factors are entering into the situation. One of them must be an understanding of the way in which men have thought about Jesus in other ages. We have undertaken a study of the first period, which we are accustomed to think of as the richest and most creative that has yet been witnessed. It has been thought that a study of this character, designed in a purely historical spirit, might contribute toward the construction of the new Christology. There may be found in the foregoing pages no suggestion as to what use the theologian shall make of the material offered. We have been dealing largely with time-forms and symbols, content to leave to others an interpretation of the larger meanings.

A genetic study of this character is now for the first time possible. A glance at the selected bibliography will suggest how recent is the literature dealing with the subject. The larger part falls within the present century. Biblical theology has already accomplished much in the discovery and presentation of the religious thought of persons and books in the New Testament, but until recently has not undertaken the more comprehensive task of presenting that thought in its genetic relations and development. Now that New Testament study has entered upon this new phase, it is hoped that there may be found in these pages a helpful presentation in outline of the rise and development of primitive Christology as reflected in the Christian literature of the New Testament period.